4 Traveling insecurely

The association of security and accessibility in public transport

Kristofer Hansson

The drivers can be unpleasant, especially bus drivers. I avoid taking city buses because there they are so stressed that they automatically become very, very unpleasant to me. It can be pure personal attacks.

These are the words of a young and active woman who likes to have the freedom to use public transport to go to the city centre or various shopping centres. Like other young people her age, she likes to hang out with friends, buy clothes and visit coffee shops. One can say that public transport is the infrastructure of her freedom to explore and develop a different lifestyle. But it is not friction-free for her to use this societal infrastructure. Here she is telling me her experiences of using different forms of public transport and how she relates, especially, to the bus drivers operating city buses. The woman, whom I will call Anna, uses an electric wheelchair which she manoeuvres on her own. As the quote attests, Anna doesn't feel secure when using city buses. Her personal experience is that bus drivers are under stress and therefore, she emphasises, unpleasant to the extent that it could be perceived as violence. This, as we will see in this chapter, is not her only negative experience of public transport.

As Vanessa Stjernborg describes in her chapter in this book, such feelings of insecurity often exist among people living with disabilities (cf. Stjernborg, 2019; Trafikanalys 2019; Egard & Hansson, 2020), although, of course, not everyone has these experiences. Using public transport is not uncomplicated; it is related to different prior experiences of what we could call a failure in using buses or trains. These experiences can be, as Anna describes, of a bus driver who is unpleasant or directly violent, but it can also be direct failures with using the bus or train. What these experiences seem to articulate are *feelings* that public transport is not really for people with disabilities. Sometimes these feelings become so strong that the person chooses not to use public transport at all (cf. Egard & Hansson, 2020). *Being secure* – which can be seen as the opposite of insecurity – when using public transport can therefore be seen as a central feeling in creating accessible public transport for all (Lucas, 2012).

Being secure is firmly on the agenda when public transport is discussed in Sweden today (Berg, 2020). It can be seen as a buzzword for the organisations working with public transport and especially in relation to questions concerning gender equality, mobility of the elderly and disability rights (Henriksson & Lindkvist, 2020). Security covers most parts of the journey: how to get on the bus, if the train is on time, whether the surroundings are threatening and so on. In this chapter I will look more closely at how security within these organisations is framed by analysing the reports and websites describing their activities. Above all, I want to analyse how the organisations working with public transport link security to accessibility. This analysis can then be used to better understand the insecurity travellers may feel when using buses and trains. So, at the end of the chapter, I will return to Anna and a few others I have interviewed to describe why they do not feel secure when traveling by bus or train. My aim is therefore to analyse how security has become a central matter for organisations in public transport, how it is linked to accessibility and to illustrate why this link needs to be problematised.¹

Method: studying public transport

This chapter examines how everyday processes in public transport can be viewed in relation to formal promises of accessibility, and what this says about the underlying social and cultural inertia in the societal work to fulfil those promises. Governments, the European Union and the United Nations strongly defend progressive disability politics as is highlighted in the introduction to this book and in various of its chapters. Yet, when I as a researcher turn to citizens using, for example, wheelchairs, I instead find experiences of negligence and resistance to their use of public transport. How, then, can the everyday experiences of Anna and others like her be understood in relation to societal discourses about accessibility?

My ethnographic work aims to answer this question by improving understanding of the hindrances and resistance that people like Anna encounter in everyday life. In interviews with 15 persons with various disabilities, I used open-ended questions to create good conversations. Some of the individuals also participated in a go-along, where we used public transport, such as buses and trains, together (cf. Kusenbach, 2003). For an hour or two we travelled around using various forms of public transport, and continually talked about the journey. This was a way for participants to point out hindrances and obstacles, but there were also situations where I observed frictions in public transport that my interviewees did not always reflect on during the observation or interview. My observations were initially documented in notebooks and later transcribed on the computer as a coherent ethnographic fieldnote. I also used my phone camera to document the hindrances that arose. These photographs are part of the ethnographic observations that make up the empirical basis for the analysis in this chapter.

This ethnographic material is supplemented by three interviews with officials who work on accessibility in public transport authorities. These interviews provide a background to how different organisations work with accessibility in relation to public transport. Based on the topics that came up in the interviews, I conducted specific searches on Google to look for documents and webpages related to ‘disability’, ‘accessibility’ and ‘security’ in the context of public transport. I selected 17 documents and webpages for close analysis, and use quotes from four in this chapter. Only documents that are accessible on the internet were selected. These documents and webpages were categorised by theme and analysed with a focus on how security is described. These include statements and political programmes for how public transport should work with accessibility, and internal (but available online) organisation reports and investigations. Before I present the themes uncovered by the research, however, I will discuss the Foucauldian concept of *dispositif de sécurité*, which can help us understand how security has become a central topic in many societies today and why it is related to accessibility.

Security and the modern city

The city wants a uniformity so that the traveller recognises himself and thus can feel safe.

(my translation)²

Security is a key issue for the modern city and a recurring concern in public debate. There is an expectation that the city can mobilise safe places for its inhabitants, but also that one lives in the city for a sense of security it gives (cf. Cowan, 2005). In other words, as the quote above, from a consultant, suggests, the city has a uniformity that can give the individual traveling on public transport a feeling of security. The city can, from this perspective, be seen as a community where public interest and concerns are valued and taken into account. To use a philosophical metaphor, it is a space that protects its inhabitants from the wilderness outside the city walls. The philosopher and historian Michel Foucault saw this as one of the central themes in modern society and its urban planning, and it was something he presented in his lectures at the Collège de France between 1977 and 1978 (Foucault, 2007). Through knowledge – or *biopower*, to use Foucauldian terminology of the power over *bios* (life) – the city is planned with the intention to create security for its inhabitants. Through knowledge the modern city has as its assignment to control social bodies and in this way ensure a secure life for everyone (cf. Dillon & Lobo-Guerrero, 2008). This is what Foucault defines as ‘power over life’ (Foucault, 1978).

How does this philosophical perspective relate to public transport? In the modern city, public transport is one of the central actors in creating security for those living within it or in its environs. With the support of buses and trains, for example, the goal is to foster a space that is both environmentally

friendly and socially sustainable (cf. European Commission, 2009; Berg, 2020; Henriksson & Lindkvist, 2020). In this way, public transport is one actor among many in urban planning, and can secure life and create freedom for its inhabitants to move around. How the European Commission relates to transport that is *safe and secure* is evident in its own words: ‘Transport provides access to many of our freedoms – the freedom to work and live in different parts of the world, the freedom to enjoy different products and services, and the freedom to trade and to establish personal contacts’ (European Commission, 2009: 16). The commission also points out that this freedom will probably increase as European cities become more multicultural and as society ages.³

From this perspective we can talk about public transport as a *dispositif de sécurité*, a security apparatus, in the urban setting, and how various institutions and administrative arrangements maintain and enhance this form of control over social bodies (cf. Dillon & Lobo-Guerrero, 2008; Agamben, 2009). It is therefore more than a discourse about security; rather, it is a control that is set in motion in all different parts of the urban environment. The European Commission may of course be one of these institutional and administrative arrangements. In this chapter I will look closely at how institutions in Sweden are enhancing this kind of control, and why it is hard to step outside this way of arranging the world – or, more specifically, arranging the city and its public transport. First, however, I will highlight one more theoretical aspect. This is a change from the older perspective on biopower that focuses on the population, to a more modern understanding which can be seen as much more heterogeneous (cf. Dillon & Lobo-Guerrero, 2008). This *heterogenesis* helps us see that power relations between institutions and administrative arrangements are constantly being re-established (cf. Larroche, 2019).

The form of biopower analysed in this chapter is not fixed and immutable; it is instead a form of continuously changing governance in relation to the security of the population, where the population’s welfare should be seen as its objectives and means (Foucault et al., 1991). In today’s city, security not only aims to ‘protect its inhabitants from the wilderness outside the city walls’; also, it is constantly evolving, adapting to its inhabitants and changing. The inhabitants are no longer seen as an amalgamated mass inside the city walls, but as possessing everchanging diversity in terms of gender, disability, ethnicity, age, and so forth (cf. Berg, 2020; Henriksson & Lindkvist, 2020). The population’s welfare encompasses everything from security from stress (Fitzgerald, Rose & Singh, 2017), to creating the inclusive city (Prince, 2008), to generating more wealth (Hansson, 2019), to mention some examples. These fluctuating processes are central to understanding how the public transport is part of this new way of working with security in an urban setting.

The researchers on public transport Malin Henriksson and Christina Lindkvist reason that we can see such a change in society, and in a volume about social sustainability and public transport they argue that questions about gender equality, mobility of the elderly and in relation to disability

rights are today more on the agenda (Henriksson & Lindkvist, 2020). At the same time, they argue, there is an unclear understanding of security for groups who are often categorised as ‘vulnerable’, and institutions and administrative arrangements have problems identifying these groups ‘in addition to the traditional categories’ (Henriksson & Lindkvist, 2020: 14, *my translation*). They point out that ‘class’ and ‘ethnicity’ have not been included in analyses of public transport and, as I will argue, ‘disability’ has also been downgraded from time to time. So, the security of populations affected by inequality focuses foremost on the majority, leaving outside groups that do not fit into constricted categorisations (cf. Hacking, 1999). Thus, it might be argued that security primarily covers certain groups in society and leaves others outside of what public transport should and could be. But today we can see a change, and organisations and companies are working hard to make trains, buses, platforms and the whole journey secure and thereby accessible. So, even as Anna meets hindrances and limitations when she uses public transport, there is a form of *dispositif de sécurité* emerging from public transport organisations.

Security as a category

Although this says little about actual experiences of accessible public transport, Sweden is a pioneer when it comes to public transport and disability. Already in 1979, a law was put in place that stipulated disability adaptations to public transport (SFS, 1979: 558).⁴ Despite the law, however, public investigations and individuals have pointed to shortcomings, as we saw in the beginning of this chapter. More recent reports in Sweden have noted, for example, that people with disabilities are more absent from public transport than other groups (Trafikanalys, 2019). At the same time, government institutions argue that more people in society should be able to use public transport (cf. Svensson, 2019). This is in line with political goals that society’s public transport should not only be accessible, but also usable *for all*. This is clarified in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) which was ratified by Sweden in 2008 and which came into force in 2009. Sweden also wishes to see itself as a leading nation in implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Regeringskansliet, 2019), which has further sharpened discussions about public transport for all in recent years.

I focus here on how this idea of public transport *for all* has, in recent years, become intimately intertwined with a discussion about security. Thus, when societal institutions present arguments about shared and accessible public transport, they also argue that this is a matter of security. In this way security becomes a sort of recurring concept for companies that work with public transport, and is used in many different contexts. The traveller should feel secure, not only when using buses and trains, but also while waiting for the bus and train to come, or for that matter, while traveling to the station. When public transport is presented as a mode of transport that everyone should be

able to use, security is also related to this discussion, in at least two ways: first, as a way of measuring people's experiences of public transport, and second, as text in different documents and webpages.

Security as number

To measure through surveys is in many ways central in traffic analysis in order to make visible how travellers relate to public transport: there appears to be a need to count (cf. Larsen & Røyrvik, 2017). I will illustrate this through an example of how this measurement can look, and how numbers are presented. In one report from Region Gothenburg, quantification is central.⁵ Under the title 'Obstacles to the Journey' we read that 54 per cent that have a disability and are passengers are 'unable to maintain their balance' in the bus or train, 47 per cent think it is 'stressful when getting on and off' buses and trains, 7 per cent think that it is 'difficult to get out of the home' and 18 per cent 'feel unsafe to ride' (Lindahl, 2008, *my translations*). What is of interest here is not the different percentages, but what they represent; how security is translated from individuals' feelings (like Anna's, in the introduction), to numbers and percentages. Through this quantification a naming practice takes place, one which make public transport – and security – intelligible for those who are in charge (cf. Eliassen, 2008; Hansson, 2020). This naming process is important, not at least for politicians who distribute tax money to public transport. But these numbers also call for a specific *dispositif de sécurité*, namely that security is transformed from individuals' experiences and feelings, into numbers, percentages and charts. These figures thus become a form of social categorisation for how to relate to security (cf. Hacking 1999; Hansson, 2020), but they say very little about the subjective experiences of insecurity.

It is not easy to transform data from the 'real' world and then present them in figures, and it is of course not easy when these data consist of answers based on people's experiences of different emotions. What, for example, is the experience with respect to emotions when it comes to stress 'getting on and off' the bus? Or, what emotions can an imbalance create for the traveller who has come close to falling, or has even fallen, when a bus started to move? Using sociological terminology we might say that human lifeworlds are colonised by the system world, that the phenomena of security are rationalised and made predictable and transparent (Habermas, 1989). The numbers can, in this way, be seen as a process of transformation, where the experiences of the travellers are framed in what I would call a *dispositif de sécurité*, namely the power relations that structure how we talk about public transport. But this is not the only way that this *dispositif* comes alive. In the next part of the chapter I will analyse how the organisations use words instead of figures to enhance and maintain the power relations that structure how we are supposed to talk about security.

Security as text

In the documents from the public transport organisations, the word ‘security’ often appears in short, concise sentences. The public transport operator for Region Skåne, for example, writes: ‘Work actively to ensure that all our traffic is perceived as safe, secure and accessible to travel with’ (Skånetrafiken, 2016: 9, *my translation*). A similar formulation from Region Stockholm is: ‘The traffic administration must design attractive customer environments so that passengers perceive them as clear, accessible and safe’ (Region Stockholm, 2020: 11, *my translation*). On a webpage about Region Halland’s public transport we read under the heading ‘All about accessibility’:

The goal for Region Halland’s public transport is for everyone to feel that it is easy, safe and comfortable to travel with us. We therefore work continuously to develop and improve our traffic and our vehicles. This is so that public transport will be accessible to everyone, even for you who have some form of disability.

(2021, *my translation*)⁶

We can understand from this text on the homepage that we all – but especially people who ‘have some form of disability’ – should feel secure when traveling by bus or train in Region Halland. In this way security – in relation to accessibility – is framed as something that people with disabilities can expect when they use public transport. It is also a security that is linked to improved traffic and vehicles. Security is linked to accessibility since it is through so-called safe travel that people with disabilities should feel that they can use public transport just like everyone else. In this way, security seems to be enacted in many parts of the organisation. This enactment is also central when, for example, Skånetrafiken, above, points out that traffic should be ‘perceived as safe, secure and accessible’, or when Region Stockholm emphasises that passengers should perceive the environments ‘as clear, accessible and safe’. I would argue that these texts become a part of how the organisations frame public transport and how they see accessibility as a question of security.

In 2012, Region Västra Götaland implemented a strategy for disability adaptation of public transport. In its report, security is again a central feature of public transport for all:

A better quality and greater security in public transport is requested by most travellers but is critical for a person with a disability to be able to take a trip. What is necessary for some is good for everyone. Despite all the measures that have been taken to complete all the steps in the whole journey, there are several shortcomings that make it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to travel by public transport if one has a disability.

(Västra Götalandsregionen, 2012: 14, *my translation*)

So, already in 2012, security was central. A recurring moral about designing environments and products that suit everyone is here paraphrased as ‘what is necessary for some is good for everyone’. Security becomes in this text a question that concerns ‘everyone’. It is not only for persons with disability, it is good for all users of public transport. To focus on security in the organisation is therefore something that can benefit all users. At the same time, the report highlights that there are shortcomings that create hindrances to accessibility, hindrances which the public transport needed to work on.

This perspective on security is developed further in the same report under the heading ‘Increasing security in travel’:

For a person with a disability, security can be crucial for their journey. The whole journey consists of many different parts and it is important that every part works, for example when boarding and changing. The traveller needs to feel confident that what has been promised actually works. Equally important is the human response, where drivers have a key role. It should be clear to the traveller which help they can get in connection with the trip. Special consideration must be given to the security aspects of traveling, both inside and outside the vehicle.

(Västra Götalandsregionen, 2012: 18, *my translation*)

Security is here defined not only as physical or environmental, but also as a matter of social relations. This is a division where security is seen as something that can be developed both through better technology and through better relations between humans. Security is also something that is both inside the bus or train, and outside on the platform, in the station or elsewhere. But what is central is that the person with a disability should feel secure when traveling on public transport: ‘security can be crucial for their journey’, as Region Västra Götaland puts it.

Thus, security becomes more than a number: it becomes a text which emphasises that security can be found almost everywhere, and is something that the organisations must work on continuously through ‘design’, ‘development’, ‘improvement’ and so on. It also becomes a term which is closely linked to accessible public transport: all organisations appear to suggest that a secure public transport system is also an accessible one. The links between these two words can be found in various areas: ‘on and off the vehicle’, ‘in all the steps of the journey’, ‘in the human response’ and so on. Security becomes a *heterogenesis* which is re-established constantly in relation to the different contexts in which it is enacted (cf. Larroche, 2019). It becomes difficult to talk about accessibility without also mentioning security; it is as if accessible public transport is manifested through, and framed through, a discussion about security: a *dispositif de sécurité*.

‘What if something goes wrong?’

I will now return to Anna, and other persons I interviewed, to share their experiences of using buses and trains. My main focus here is not on those who feel it works for them to travel by bus or train (though I have also interviewed such individuals), but on those who can give us an understanding of what it means to travel insecurely. I will do this by looking closely at the feelings people express when they meet limitations, resistance, hindrances, or even violence in public transport (cf. Reddy, 2001; Egard & Hansson, 2020). The focus of this analysis is to understand how people’s naming of emotions also affects how they feel in these situations – in their lifeworld (cf. Stearns & Stearns, 1985). This is a critical perspective for studying what the naming process can tell us (cf. Hacking, 1999), but also to see it in relation to how public transport organisations see security.

In the quote that opened this chapter, Anna can be said to be naming an emotion and at the same time also naming specific bus drivers as ‘stressed’ and therefore unpleasant. In this she is like a detective, helping me to see which parts of the city are accessible and which are not (see also David Wästerfors’ chapter in this book). In my interview with Anna I asked her to tell me more about her problems with unfriendly bus drivers.

They shout at you. They call me ugly things. They claim that it is not their job [to help Anna on the bus]. I have come across those who have said that they are not allowed to leave the cab. Then my friend countered with: ‘Are you glued to the chair? Then it will be hard to go home from work later.’ He muttered something. And someone even yelled at me: ‘you are not allowed to ride the bus without a personal assistant’.

This unpleasant treatment and negligence is problematic to say the least, and for most people it would probably create a reluctance to return to this means of public transport. But with Anna, this behaviour also risks hindering her use of public transport and creates unpredictability and feelings of insecurity since she doesn’t know if she will get the help she needs to access the bus and to get on and off safely. Once, she says, a bus driver started to drive before she was in her place, which is very risky since the wheelchair might start rolling away, uncontrolled.

In this way it is ‘not only’ an emotion, but also a naming process of how Anna relates to public transport. Together this risk creates major obstacles to using certain types of public transport – sometimes such big obstacles that she is left behind – and sometimes actual danger (cf. Stearns & Stearns, 1985). We can talk about hindrances to accessibility that are not physical but that have emerged in a social situation and later transform into an emotion (cf. Lid & Solvang, 2016; see also Hanna Egards’ chapter in this book). This comes up repeatedly in the interviews. An older woman – here called Josefin – who uses a mobility scooter, describes this feeling in an upset tone:

What if something goes wrong? Who do I call? How do I get help? All ticket offices and stations are closed. If I'm out in the dark one winter, how do I rebook a trip? How do I? [Imitating a conductor] 'But that wheelchair space is occupied.' 'That train does not run, and neither does this.' 'We have no seats.' How do I get home? Am I calling the police? What do you do? I do not know, no one can answer me on this.⁷

There are many ways to read Josefin's words. What I find central to them is the unpredictability and feeling of insecurity when public transport, and society as a whole, is not available to give her the security and confidence that she feels she needs, in this example, to use the train. This quote also highlights many different situations that can create hindrances to accessibility: the need for help like Anna requires, non-existent stations, insufficient accessible seats and so on. But it can also be seen as an unravelling of what accessibility should be when it comes to public transport in Sweden. Josefin's questions hang in the air, so to speak, and are a direct critique of insecurity in public transport.

The persons I meet do not always explain these emotions to me, but I can understand in the moment of the observation that the situation is developing to become something that will hinder or limit them. One such situation occurs on a warm summer day during a go-along with Lars, an older man who uses a wheelchair. Lars has the right to a personal assistant, who is with us on the journey. We start the day traveling by bus to a larger city and then change to a city bus. Everything goes smoothly for most of the day, but as we wait for the bus home, things change. We are standing five metres from where the bus should stop. All of a sudden, the bus arrives at the platform. All three of us move towards the entrance, but so do all the other passengers. These are mostly young people who are on their way home from school. In just a few minutes, the bus becomes crowded and the last one to get on is a father with a child in a pram. There is no place for Lars and his wheelchair. What happens next can be seen as a transformation, as this specific place turns from an opportunity to move freely using public transport between different cities into a *critical place* where the man is hindered from being part of this specific journey (cf. Hansson, 2019). This critical place is reinforced by the fact that the bus driver makes no effort to communicate with Lars, but chooses to simply close the bus doors and drive away.

Lars gets angry and irritated, and we talk about it. A couple of minutes later a new bus arrives and this time there are fewer people on the platform, so we get places on the bus and go back together to the smaller city where he lives. Of course, I cannot say anything about how this experience affected Lars at that specific moment, or on future trips using public transport. But it is these kinds of experiences that many of the interviewees in this project reflect upon as bad experiences, which later generate feelings of insecurity and a sense of unpredictability – in Josefin's words: 'what do you do' if something goes wrong? This is a question that not only makes 'traveling insecurely' visible, but also calls into question the political goal that society's public transport should be usable *for all*.

Conclusion: security as a moral and legal issue

In this chapter, I have tried to understand how (1) accessibility and security are linked in various ways, and (2) how security at the same time is a problematic word which gives different perspectives on what accessibility can be. Through interviews with people who use a wheelchair or mobility scooter, I have been presented with the realities of experiencing difficulty in using public transport more or less regularly. My interviewees expressed feelings of insecurity when using buses and trains, which, in their own words, creates inaccessibility in the moment, but also in the long term. The question lying at the heart of their feelings seems to be: Do I dare to travel and use public transport? When I then turned to public transport organisations in Sweden, I encountered guidelines that public transport should be accessible so that the individual can feel secure traveling on their buses and trains. These guidelines are also familiar to the persons I interviewed, and seemed to increase their frustration: how can it be that public transport, which should be useful for all, is not useful to them? It is as though the issue of public transport *for all* is not a political but a moral and legal issue (cf. Brown, 2001; Brännström, 2005).

Through the Foucauldian concept of *dispositif de sécurité* – seen as a security feature in the urban setting, and one which enhances a form of control over all social bodies (cf. Dillon & Lobo-Guerrero, 2008; Agamben, 2009) – we can argue that public transport has become increasingly permeated by a discussion about security as a moral and legal issue. It can be found almost everywhere, but in relation to accessibility it is seen as central to developing buses and trains and designing platforms in relation to legal issues. Likewise the question about the human response to the traveller has become more of a moral issue: What is good customer service that creates a secure environment for the traveller? When the traveller feels secure, proclaim the organisation texts, the traveller also has an accessible journey. The individual should simply dare to travel by bus or train, and not be afraid that something might go wrong. And if something does go wrong, the texts suggest, there will be help. In this way, *dispositif de sécurité* takes the form of language – and sometimes of figures – within organisations that frame certain social bodies, but not others, in public transport, and define how the problems that arise should be handled in relation to these social bodies.

But the social bodies that are engendered – enacted – in texts and in figures are not the same as the actual bodies that travel by bus or train and experience insecurity. Rather, there is a risk of discrepancy between the organisations' way of control over public transport on one hand, and the individual experiences that people have on the other. The individual experiences often only fit into the rhetoric if they are transformed into the organisations' way of looking at security. This risk creates frustration as experiences are transformed into moral and legal questions about how security should generate accessibility, not what is actually done to make travel secure. Meanwhile, certain bodies risk falling outside the *dispositif de sécurité* and continue to travel insecurely.

Notes

- 1 The chapter is based on a three-year research project entitled 'Accessibility and its Resistance: Everyday Deviations from Spatial and Social Practicability for Persons with Disabilities' carried out in collaboration between Lund University and Malmö University, and funded by FORTE: *Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare*. The project has received ethical approval (dnr 2018/145).
- 2 This quote is from a report from the company Trivector (2019: 17), which was assigned to provide a picture of how municipalities in Sweden work with public transport and accessibility.
- 3 What is not discussed in this chapter, but is closely related to questions concerning security, is the growing threat of attacks after 11 September 2001. In the document cited in this chapter the European Commission reflects upon how the attack changed the relation to public transport and security: 'The 2001 White Paper did not refer to security. After the attacks of 11 September 2001, however, a security policy was developed. Nowadays there are EU legislative measures on transport security for most transport modes and for critical infrastructures' (European Commission, 2009: 10). I argue that this was a central change also for people living with disability, but a more genealogical analysis is not possible in this chapter.
- 4 There has been some early research in the field which has tried to problematise and highlight the obstacles that people with disabilities face in Sweden. See for example: Carlsson, 2002; Iwarsson & Ståhl, 2003; Wretstrand, 2003.
- 5 Sweden has 21 regions – or regional councils – and two of their most important responsibilities are public transportation and public health care.
- 6 <https://www.hallandstrafiken.se/tillganglighet> (accessed 14 April 2021).
- 7 This quote previously appeared in a Swedish-language publication (Egård & Hansson, 2020).

References

- Agamben, Giorgio (2009) *“What Is an Apparatus?” and Other Essays*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press. doi:10.1515/9781503600041.
- Berg, Jessica (2020) *Mobilitetsstrategier bland unga i förorten*. In: Henriksson, Malin & Lindkvist, Christina (eds) *Kollektiva resor: Utmaningar för socialt hållbar tillgänglighet*. Lund: Arkiv Förlag. doi:10.13068/9789179243517.
- Brown, Wendy (2001) *Politics Out of History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brännström, Leila (2005) På spaning efter den politik som flytt. *Fronesis: Politik, kritik, teori*, 19–20:18–23.
- Carlsson, Gunilla (2002) *Catching the Bus in Old Age: Methodological Aspects of Accessibility Assessments in Public Transport*. Lund: Division of Occupational Therapy, Lund University.
- Cowan, Robert (2005) *The Dictionary of Urbanism*. Tisbury: Streetwise Press.
- Dillon, Michael & Lobo-Guerrero, Luis (2008) Biopolitics of Security in the 21st Century: An Introduction. *Review of International Studies*, 34 (2): 265–292. doi:10.1017/S0260210508008024.
- Egård, Hanna & Hansson, Kristofer (2020) *Strandsatt och förbisedd – men envis: Erfarenheter av att resa med funktionsnedsättning*. In: Henriksson, Malin & Lindkvist, Christina (eds) *Kollektiva resor: Utmaningar för socialt hållbar tillgänglighet*. Lund: Arkiv Förlag. doi:10.13068/9789179243517.
- Eliassen, Knut Ove (2008) Tingens tale: Epistemologi, estetikk og eksistens hos Michel Foucault. *Norsk filosofisk tidsskrift*, 43 (4), 290–303.

- European Commission (2009) *A Sustainable Future for Transport: Towards an Integrated, Technology-led and User-friendly System*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://ec.europa.eu/transport/sites/transport/files/media/publications/doc/2009_future_of_transport_en.pdf (accessed 10 April 2020).
- Fitzgerald, Des, Rose, Nikolas & Singh, Ilina (2017) Living Well in the Neupopolis. *The Sociological Review*, 64 (1): 221–237. doi:10.1111/2059-7932.12022.
- Foucault, Michel (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel, Burchell, Graham, Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (eds) (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality: With Two Lectures By and an Interview With Michel Foucault*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1989) *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hacking, Ian (1999) *The Social Construction of What?*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hansson, Kristofer (2019) Kroppen och den motsägelsefulla staden. Kulturanalytiska perspektiv på funktionshinder och urbana rum. *Budkavlen. Tidskrift för etnologi och folkloristik*, 98: 9–38.
- Hansson, Kristofer (2020) A Number in Circulation: HbA1c as Standardized Knowledge in Diabetes Care. In: Hansson, Kristofer & Irwin, Rachel (eds) *Movement of Knowledge: Medical Humanities Perspectives on Medicine, Science, and Experience*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. doi:10.21525/kriterium.24.
- Henriksson, Malin & Lindkvist, Christina (2020) *Kollektiva resor. Utmaningar för socialt hållbar tillgänglighet*. In: Henriksson, Malin & Lindkvist, Christina (eds) *Kollektiva resor: Utmaningar för socialt hållbar tillgänglighet*. Lund: Arkiv Förlag. doi:10.13068/9789179243517.
- Iwarsson, Susanne & Ståhl, Agneta (2003) Accessibility, Usability and Universal Design. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 25 (2): 57–66. doi:10.1080/dre.25.2.57.66.
- Kusenbach, Margarethe (2003) Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool. *Ethnography*, 4 (3): 455–485. doi:10.1177/146613810343007.
- Larroche, Valerie (2019) *The Dispositif: A Concept for Information and Communication Sciences*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Larsen, Tord & Røyrvik, Emil (eds) (2017) *Trangen til å telle: objektivisering, måling og standardisering som samfunnspraksis*. Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press.
- Lid, Inger-Marie & Solvang, Per Koren (2016) (Dis)ability and the Experience of Accessibility in the Urban Environment. *ALTER, European Journal of Disability Research*, 10 (2): 181–194. doi:10.1016/j.alter.2015.11.003.
- Lindahl, Lisbeth (2008) "Jag åker kollektivt när jag kan och färdtjänst när jag måste." – en tredje rapport om KOLLA-resenärernas resor. Göteborg: FoU i Väst. https://goteborgsregionen.se/download/18.415b48a314276a8b9a7df53/1387345628483/2008_kolla_enk%C3%A4trapp.pdf (accessed 10 April 2020).
- Lucas, Karen (2012) Transport and Social Exclusion: Where are we Now? *Transport Policy*, 20: 105–113. doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.01.013.
- Prince, Michael J. (2008). Inclusive City Life: Persons with Disabilities and the Politics of Difference. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 28 (1). doi:10.18061/dsq.v28i1.65.
- Reddy, William M. (2001). *The Navigation of Feeling. A Framework for the History of Emotions*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

- Regeringskansliet (2019) Responses to Questions from the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 22 October. Stockholm: The Ministry of Health and Social Affairs. <https://www.regeringen.se/4ada4d/globalassets/regeringen/dokument/socialdepartementet/funktionshinder/crpd—submission-of-the-combined-second-and-third-report-s-of-sweden.pdf> (accessed 10 April 2020).
- Region Stockholm (2020) *Riktlinjer Tillgänglighet för barn, äldre och personer med funktionsnedsättning*. Stockholm: Trafik Förvaltningen, Region Stockholm. <https://www.sll.se/globalassets/2.-kollektivtrafik/kollektivtrafik-for-alla/riktlinjer-tillganglighet-for-barn-aldre-och-personer-med-funktionsnedsattning-sl-s-419765.pdf> (accessed 14 April 2021).
- SFS (1979:558) Lag om handikappanpassad kollektivtrafik. Stockholm: Infrastrukturdepartementet RST TM. https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/lag-1979558-om-handikappanpassad_sfs-1979-558 (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Skånetrafiken (2016) *Tillgänglighetsprogrammet för allmän kollektivtrafik för åren 2016–2020*. Hässleholm: Skånetrafiken. <https://skane.se/Public/Protokoll/Kollektivtrafikn%C3%A4mnden/2016-05-02/Tillg%C3%A4nglighetsprogram%20f%C3%B6r%20den%20allm%C3%A4nna%20kollektivtrafiken/Tillg%C3%A4nglighetsprogram%20f%C3%B6r%20allm%C3%A4n%20kollektivtrafik%202016-2020.pdf> (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Stearns, Peter N. & Stearns, Carol Z. (1985) Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards. *The American Historical Review*, 90 (4): 813–836. doi:10.2307/1858841.
- Stjernborg, Vanessa (2019) Accessibility for All in Public Transport and the Overlooked (Social) Dimension—A Case Study of Stockholm. *Sustainability*, 11 (18): 1–16. doi:10.3390/su11184902.
- Svensson, Helena (2019) *Förändringar i antal färdtjänststillstånd och resande med färdtjänst - Intervjuer med tjänstpersoner från några regioner i Sverige*. K2 rapport, <https://www.trafa.se/globalassets/rapporter/underlagsrapporter/2019/fardtjanststillstand.pdf> (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Trafikanalys (2019) *Kollektivtrafikens barriärer – kartläggning av hinder i kollektivtrafikens tillgänglighet för personer med funktionsnedsättning*. Rapport 2019:3. https://www.trafa.se/globalassets/rapporter/2019/rapport-2019_3-kollektivtrafikens-barriarer.pdf (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Trivector (2019) *Kommunernas del i hela resan: Underlag till kartläggning av hinder för tillgänglighet inom kollektivtrafiksystemet för personer med funktionsnedsättning*. Lund: Trivector Traffic. https://www.trivector.se/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/kommunernas_del_i_hela_resan_trivector_rapport_2019_1.pdf (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Västra Götalandsregionen (2012) *Strategi för funktionshinderanpassning av kollektivtrafiken*. Antagen av kollektivtrafiknämnden 2012-2009-27. Västra Götalandsregionen. http://www.vt-pool.com/download_publ.asp?Document_ID=126217 (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Wretstrand, Anders (2003) Wheelchair Passengers and Local Public Transport Vehicles: Perceptions of Safety and Comfort. *Bulletin*, 220. Lund: Lunds tekniska högskola, Institutionen för teknik och samhälle, Lunds universitet.