

Domestic Microdramas

Everyday Life as Routine and Chaos

Orvar Löfgren

The Future's Looking Grey

Back in the 1960s a popular media genre explored the theme 'what might life look like in the year 2000?' This domestic science fiction could be found in newspaper features, family magazines, as well as on TV and the radio. On re-reading them, one is struck by their obsession with technology and a total lack of success in predicting major cultural changes. The kitchen might be full of gadgets and robots, but the housewife still occupies her usual role....

A Swedish TV series from 1967 provides a good example of this genre. It starts with a visit to a futuristic home in Stockholm. Slow and minimalist electronic music accompanies our entry into what proves to be an austere but elegantly designed space with walls of plexiglass, white curtains, slim modernistic chairs and glass tables. The family we are visiting has guests. Dinner, consisting of defrosted stuff on skewers, is served on elegant white plates. The children are swimming in the family's indoor pool and being filmed by their parents with an electronic camera; the result of which is shown on a white screen descending from the ceiling.

Moderation is a phrase that characterises life in the year 2000. There's no decorative excess, no objects cluttering up the place and everything is dominated by a pristine white and varying shades of grey. The family is dressed in shiny synthetic materials (slightly 'Star Trek'), so that nothing sticks to their clothes. The same goes for the walls. It is clear that life in the year 2000 will be high-tech, restrained and spotless. There is a clear homology between the minimalist and uncluttered life on the one hand, and bodily movements and emotional style on the other. Both the mental and material atmosphere is subdued and cool. People glide through the rooms, their body language is low-key and their conversation elegant. The narrator tells us that in the year 2000 people will be more sophisticated. They will also be better educated.

Such coolness is also apparent in the choice of the white and grey shades, although this is, of course, a black and white TV programme. I find the same range of subdued colours – shades of grey, beige and white – in another science fiction film from 1968,

Stanley Kubrick's colour version of '2001: A Space Odyssey' offers a similar kind of restraint: low-key design, refined body language, uncluttered surroundings. This is life without friction, where grey doesn't stand for boredom or triviality but for the smooth and cool everyday life of the future.

We now know that life in 2000 did not develop quite like this. When I look around my home I am instead reminded of another science fiction utopia, the everyday chaos of 'Blade Runner'. Today we are surrounded by more objects than ever before. Our lives are cluttered with gadgets, choices and activities. We devote indeterminable time, energy and money on deciding what to buy, store, discard or remember.

What exactly does a home in the year 2000 look like? Artist Michael Landy is one of the few who do know, because for several months of that very year he made a list of everything he owned. The list included everything from an old shirt button to a Saab 900 Turbo. He then transported them to a departmental store Mecca in Oxford Street. Passers-by could either peep through the shop window or step right in and inspect Landy's possessions at close quarters. One by one the goods were placed on a conveyor belt that led towards total destruction. For two hectic weeks it was possible to follow the fate of Michael's belongings: how they were split up, sorted, shredded and finally pulverised into a grey powder. Every single thing that he once owned was to be interred, most likely in a car park in front of a shopping centre.¹

Landy had long been obsessed by the ambiguities and paradoxes of consumer society: the joy of shopping and its tedium, acquisitiveness, extravagance and wear and tear. He took the final step and chose to display the totality of his chaotic life as a consumer. He realised that this also meant exposing the whole gamut of consumption – all the broken, clumsy and old-fashioned stuff that we collect in our homes. He also became aware of just how difficult it can be to condemn some things to destruction. Is everything to be obliterated? Will he really lose Dad's old sheepskin jacket that he inherited in his younger days, personal letters and photographs?

Realising that he owned more than five thousand articles of one description or another (many of us own considerably more) came as something of a shock to Landy – not to mention the fact that he'd forgotten many of these possessions. He found all kinds of bits and pieces hidden at the back of a cupboard or under a shelf that he didn't even know what they were for. He discovered well-meaning presents that had never even been used or ingenuous gadgets that either didn't work or were not appropriate. A shaver that had only been used once, a clever mosquito-killing lamp bought in 1984 but never tested, a broken alarm clock. He becomes acutely aware of all the five thousand things he possesses, although it is a collection that, to all intents and purposes, he has lost control over. It is as if his former life has come back to haunt him, with reminders of impulse buying, unfinished projects and changes in lifestyle.

Landy's project is a reminder of how many of our own possessions are condemned to a shadowy or completely forgotten existence in cellars and attics teeming with toasters and tin openers that manage to go astray between the kitchen and the subconscious. They can suddenly reappear to a shout of joyful recognition – or annoyance.

How Much is Too Much?

Back in 1967, the dreams of a perfect everyday life in the utopia of 2000 also mirrored dissatisfaction. Life seemed just as overcrowded and complicated then as for Landy in 2000. Many people dreamed of a simpler life. The following quote from 1970 is not untypical:

„The environment of the typical consumer is a jungle of things, growing denser and denser: a house and a summer cottage; cars and a boat; TV, radio, and a record player; records, books, newspapers and magazines; clothes and sport clothes; tennis racket, badminton racket, squash racket and table tennis racket; footballs, beach balls and golf balls; basement, attic, and closets, and all they contain.”²

In 1970 the Swedish economist Staffan Burenstam-Linder published his influential book, *'The Harried Leisure Class'*. Here he talks about a new kind of poverty created by the abundance of consumption and the resulting shortage of time, in which „mediation and poetry disappears and Lucullus and Venus are put aside” – as the blurb at the back of the book puts it. His chapters on time allocation, economic growth and affluence are accompanied by impressive economic charts, graphs and mathematical models. The style changes as his argument moves into the terrain of everyday culture. Here we find bland generalisations and statements about „how people live and think” that seem to be based on anecdotal information, newspaper clippings or the author's personal opinions: „In the old days, parents spanked their children. Now they would like to caress them, but lack the time”³. His argument often gets bogged down in the devolutionary discourse of „the decline of pleasure.” We enjoy our meals less and our sex life deteriorates. Just as food has been devalued to frozen nutrition eaten at break-neck speed, our sex life has also become harried and unromantic.⁴

Reading Burenstam-Linder means entering a classic genre of cultural critique that is still with us. It is a genre sometimes characterised by a little too much wisdom, encouraging the reader to merely nod in agreement: how true, how true. Not only is it a genre that is often predictable, it is also ahistoric and tends to view the world through the cultural filters of middle-class intellectuals. Although it is a tradition packed with critical insights into the capitalist logic of ever-increasing consumption and its conse-

quences both for the environment and for individual lives, it is often tainted by sweeping generalisations about „where society is heading” and a lack of reflection about where the author is coming from. Books like these often tend to fall into the trap of attempting tricky moral evaluations of life. While the authors may have their economic theory or philosophical postulates under control, when the analysis turns to everyday culture, almost anything goes.

So, why bother about ‚The Harried Leisure Class’? What I find interesting are the attempts of Burenstam-Linder to explore the ways in which people try to handle the mores of a „commodity intensive consumption”, as in his examples of *simultaneous consumption*. This is about forms of cultural compression, and my curiosity centres around the ways in which such competences are acquired and maintained in everyday life. What kinds of strategies do people in given settings resort to in order to prevent life becoming ‚too much’ – and too much of what? Burenstam-Linder appears to be obsessed by acquisition and accumulation. Wouldn’t it be more fruitful to develop questions regarding the management of overflow and techniques of absorption and disposal?

When Much Becomes Too Much

„After I gave up sleeping, it occurred to me what a simple thing reality is, how easy it is to make it work. It’s just reality. Just housework. Just a home. Like running a simple machine. Once you learn to run it, it’s just a matter of repetition. You push this button and pull that lever. You adjust a gauge, put on the lid, set the timer. The same thing over and over.”⁵

The housewife in Haruki Murakami’s short story has stopped sleeping and instead spends her nights reading Russian novels and enjoying nocturnal freedom from her snoozing family. It works well, because her daily routines are just flow without friction. In other words, she doesn’t have to invest much energy or emotion in the daily chores. Once you’ve developed routines, everyday life takes care of itself. There is no overload, no overexposure.

Routines are sometimes described with derogatory overtones in terms of the banal and the trivial. They should rather be seen as strong undercurrents of everyday life that gain power from their very invisibility or tendency to be taken for granted. The spaces between choice and habit are a rich terrain in terms of what has not been named and is often poorly explored. Classic discussions of routines and habituation can be found in the works of scholars like Gregory Bateson⁶, Pierre Bourdieu⁷ and Michel de Certeau⁸. More recent explorations of the ambiguities of routines have been undertaken by researchers like Jean-Claude Kaufmann⁹, Elizabeth Shove¹⁰ and Ben Highmore¹¹, who

all try to develop a more nuanced understanding of the field. How can we create a more open understanding of the micro-physics of making and breaking routines and the ways in which they structure everyday life in time and space? Routines are often seen as tools for economising, because they help actors conserve time and energy by developing their ability to switch over to automatic pilot. They can be described as territories of restfulness or security where 'you just know what to do'. Routines are also described as cultural straitjackets that constrain actors and block creativity and change. But routines are much more complex than such a polarity suggests. Sometimes, in the inconspicuous practices of daily life, these small repetitive actions can subtly change larger social structures, cultural values and gendered notions of self and society.¹²

It is when routines and habits break down that people experience overload. All of a sudden life simply becomes 'too much'. Flow turns into friction as routines are transformed into decisions and choices that have to be made. Stress mounts at work and at home. This is the kind of experience I encountered in an ongoing interview study of people who have ended up on long-term sick leave after having stressed themselves into 'burnout', depression or mental and physical exhaustion and who are now trying to climb back into normal life. Most of them are managers and administrators.¹³ In the past, overload was not a problem for them. They took pride in their ability to never say 'no'. They were gluttons for work, stretching themselves to their limits, living an accelerating life that in retrospect had a manic streak to it. Lars, who had built up a small electronic factory from scratch, described himself like this:

„Haven't been able to say no. I always thought: speed up and it will be OK. I could walk through the factory and make twenty decisions in two minutes. I felt in full control, it was almost compulsive: what the hell, I could make anything work!”

People like Lars had never or rarely had any sick-leave. As the stress mounted they began to feel irritable, had trouble sleeping and woke up early thinking about everything that needed to be done. Work had invaded most of their life. The road to breakdown was often long; a slowly growing overload. Many describe this phase of stress as a mounting insensitivity. You ignore the body's signals and don't listen to the warnings or admonitions of others.

For the people I met, life had changed abruptly. All of a sudden everyday life at work and at home became chaotic. Everything was just 'too much'. They found themselves sent home on long-term sick-leave. When Lars broke down he couldn't go near the factory. Even the family became too much and he spent long periods alone in a summer cottage in the woods just staring at the walls. For him and others it seemed as if all of a sudden reality had vanished and it became obvious how important that automatic pilot had been in dealing with work and home. The flow of everyday life

had turned into friction, order into chaos. Now they were at home on sick-leave with all the time in the world on their hands – in a domestic world that had also become ‚too much’. The stress and anxiety had been embodied by pain, muscle tension or loss of memory. They felt disoriented and many everyday routines became Herculean tasks. Someone else said that „it could be a full day’s job just to take a shower and wash my hair”. You have to make decisions about even the most trivial acts that automatic pilot had previously taken care of, such as: „I remember staring at a flowerpot for hours, trying to make up my mind if I should water it or not.”

In the crash landing of burnout, all those old routines, habits and technologies that help us to cope with the myriads of tasks and decisions in our everyday lives suddenly stop working. Life is out of step and out of sync. Habits are drained of content and become either meaningless or mysterious. One woman we interviewed worried for days about organising a children’s birthday party for her daughter. She felt that she had forgotten how to do it, which meant that the task became a gigantic and suffocating ‚Project’.

Lars expressed it like this: „It’s damned hard to be on sick-leave, all of a sudden you’re without routines and it was the routines that kept life running at work. It feels like the floor is pulled away from under you...” A striking theme in the interviews is the constant return to questions of overload. An overload of work had been transformed into new kinds of overload, namely, a body in constant pain or a state of sensory and social overexposure. The TV screen flickers too much, noises are too loud, smells too strong. You want to retreat into your bedroom, draw the curtains and just lie in the dark.

The novel *Ta itu*, written by Kristina Sandberg in 2003, describes a young mother’s nervous breakdown. The main character finds that she can’t cope with all the demands and expectations that both she and those around her are posing. Sometimes it seems as though she is being aggressively scrutinised by everything around her. Even the dust and fluff whirl accusations into the air:

„Pack, clean, make the dinner, take care of the plants, wash those dirty windows highlighted by spring’s merciless sunshine. Anders will be late. Let’s hope the children will behave themselves. I must clean out the fridge, then there’s dinner, fish fingers and mashed potatoes.”¹⁴

Everything gangs up on her. As soon as she lights a cigarette to calm her nerves, her son accusingly waves a brochure about stopping smoking. Mother-in-law calls with advice about cleaning. The homemade marmalade cake decides to sink in the middle and the icing turns into a puddle, the fridge door is all sticky, crumbs spread themselves all over the place and the kitchen smells of burning fat.

Crisis experiences like this help us to understand how people develop competenc-

es and technologies for handling ‚a lot‘. What kind of abilities are necessary in order to consume more, coordinate many tasks, digest more information or cram more stuff, ideas, objects, thoughts and sensations into a given situation or framework? It is when these competences are lost that they become most visible.

Multitasking

In an autobiographical novel, a freelance journalist, Felicia, describes her route to burn-out. She remembers interviewing a female hotel manager who told her how she constantly developed her talent for multitasking. Buying a headset for her cell-phone meant that she could vacuum the whole house while taking incoming enquiries from work. „This is something for me,” Felicia thought. But that was in the old days when she could combine any amount of work. She can no longer master the art of multitasking. It is no longer possible for her to eat pizza and watch television at the same time, cook dinner while talking on the phone, or sort the dirty laundry while sitting on the toilet. „Maybe I am turning into a man,” she thinks, „I can only do one thing at a time”.¹⁵

This comes close to the theme discussed by Burenstam-Linder as simultaneous consumption, or multitasking. He criticises the tendency to do too many things at once, and describes his villain like this:

„... he may find himself drinking Brazilian coffee, smoking a Dutch cigar, sipping a French cognac, reading The New York Times, listening to a Brandenburg Concerto and entertaining his Swedish wife – all at the same time.”¹⁶

Burenstam-Linder joins a debate that has been in full swing at least since the late nineteenth century. Just how much can a human being handle at the same time? It is a question that has interested brain specialists, psychologists, economists and marketing people, as Jonathan Crary¹⁷ shows in his history of attention. Even back in 1895, in his book ‘Degeneration’, Max Nordau worried about the kinds of overload that modern consumption and technology might present. Perhaps later generations would be more adept at handling stress:

„The end of the twentieth century, therefore, will probably see a generation to whom it will not be injurious to read a dozen square yards of newspapers daily, to be constantly called to the telephone, to be thinking simultaneously of the five continents of the world, to live half their time in a railway carriage or in a flying machine and ... know how to find its ease in the midst of a city inhabited by millions.”¹⁸

Multitasking is a competence that has to be acquired, and once in place it is often invisible, „it just comes naturally.” An historical perspective may be necessary to the unearthing of such learning processes. Drawing on a range of material where different generations narrate their lives with television and radio it is possible to see the gradual emergence of such competences.¹⁹ For the pioneer generations of radio and TV users, the intense concentration needed to view a TV programme or listen to the radio was striking. No distractions could be allowed if you were to follow the voices in the loudspeaker or the flickering figures on the screen. You had to give the media your full attention. A Swedish advertisement from the late 1920s recommends bananas as the perfect food when listening to the radio; they are easy to handle and soundless to eat. Step by step people developed the skills of half listening to the radio or merely glancing at the television set.

If we turn to documentations of domestic media life in the 1970s, media consumption may seem rather routine to a present-day observer. Let's take a peek at the family assembled on the TV sofa, where everyone has their own place. In comparison to earlier generations they have acquired some multitasking competences. The radio has already moved out of its once sacred position in the living room and there is now a transistor in the kitchen. The first person to get up each morning turns the radio on, and for the rest of the day it provides a soundscape for their kitchen activities. People learn to listen to the news, leaf through the morning paper and have breakfast – all at the same time. The wife sets up her ironing board in the living room so that she can iron and watch television simultaneously. It feels restful. Special tapes even provide entertainment while driving the car. Also common to this time are worries about teenagers who insist that they can do their homework while listening to music at the same time—something that was seen as the ultimate challenge to intellectual work. The threat comes from the cassette recorders now to be found in the teenagers' rooms.

It is often the novel kinds of multitasking that attract attention. Burenstam-Linder talks about new electric razors that make it possible to have your morning shave while driving to work. Multitasking technologies can be individual innovations as well as marketing strategies, such as the development of fast food that can be eaten with one hand (frozen yogurt on a stick for example) or the hands-free cell-phone. The Walkman and the iPod open up new combinations, like biking to music or creating your own urban soundscape.

But the growth of multitasking is not unilinear – you can't just take on more of everything. Certain types of combination or multi-sensuality soon become tired, worn out and are consequently abandoned. Bourgeois culture of the 19th century fought against what was seen as the excesses of previous generations or the lower classes. As

Mats Hellspong²⁰ has shown, this was when opera audiences learned to keep quiet. The profusion and over-abundance of eating, drinking, flirting and talking that characterised the opera boxes of the 1700s were outlawed – musical experience had to be refined and cultivated. This means that even music once composed as an accompaniment to slurping, chomping and vociferous banqueting could now be listened to without disturbance in the concert hall, and preferably with eyes closed. Campaigns for ‘more of everything’ were gradually replaced by those promoting ‘less is more’.

The middle class critique of the vulgar or unseemly in other people’s simultaneous consumption reminds us that the definitions of which combinations are permissible and tasteful, and which are improper and voracious, are imbued with aspects of power. Questions concerning multitasking often resemble a battlefield where different interests are played out. It might concern class as well as gender, for example when the claim of being able to do many different things at the same time is seen as based on the genetic makeup of females. It can also be about small everyday conflicts, such as when other people’s combinations are disturbing. It might reach the point when Burenstam-Linder’s Swedish wife asks her husband to switch off Bach and put down his newspaper.

The Moral Economy of Everyday Life

The starting point of this paper has been how intensified forms of consumption and everyday life are seen as a problem – by whom and in what ways. What is a ‘satisfying experience’, ‘a point of saturation’, or how is ‘much’ transformed into ‘too much’? How are consumer experiences evaluated or defined as enriching or shallow? Are they mere distractions, or a deeply satisfying moment? Social science scholars are stepping onto a classic battlefield. As I have tried to emphasise, much of this debate gets trapped in evolutionary or devolutionary figures of thought, as for example in this quote from Erich Fromm:

„... concentration is rare in our culture. On the contrary, our culture leads to an unconcentrated and diffused mode of life, hardly paralleled anywhere else. You do many things at once; you read, listen to the radio, talk, smoke, eat, drink. You are the consumer with the open mouth, eager and ready to swallow everything ...”²¹

Working one’s way through this genre of culture critique, and reading how life steadily becomes shallower, more inauthentic or commercialised, offers an opportunity to see how similar arguments return in different eras. When I contrast Burenstam-Linder’s descriptions of overloaded domestic life in 1967 with the detailed documentations

and inventories available from the same period, another image appears; this time of an orderly and restrained home life with set rituals and routines. A classic visual defect is reproduced. Normally, it is the past or the utopian future that seems friction-free, orderly and routine, while the present emerges as being chaotic and overloaded, full of beginnings, half-hearted attempts and difficult choices. In retrospect, life in 1967 seems to have been under control.

This kind of discourse also contains a number of polarisations that are either conflated or combined in problematic ways. Here I am thinking of negative/positive polarities such as shallow/deep, poor/rich, empty/full, infantile/mature, artificial/authentic and uncommitted/committed. But what is seen as negative in one context may be positive in another. Sometimes the shallowness of a certain experience is precisely that which makes it satisfying. The half-finished project is abandoned at its most enjoyable point, and so on. I would suggest that we need to rethink these kinds of polarities.

There is also the problem of the many metaphors of Newtonian physics used to describe various forms of excess and stress: overheating, overloading, overflowing, etc. First of all they may trap us into thinking of culture as liquid in a container, or as a limited commodity. Excess is then produced through the mechanisms of pushing, swelling, spilling over, and so on. A kind of cultural hydraulic thinking often results. An overflow or elaboration in one cultural field must result in a draining away, scarcity, or thinning out somewhere else. Excessive consumption or overloaded lives thus makes experiences shallower, less sincere or engaged, and may drain everyday life of emotional content. A good example of this kind of thinking is found in discussions of a „post-emotional society” in the work of Stjepan G. Meštrović²² and others. His argument runs like this: in a mass-consuming and media-saturated society emotions have been transformed into Ersatz-feelings, drained of passion, commitment and authenticity, unlike back in the good old days when emotions were more intense.²³ Such cultural hydraulics often flaunt themselves in a cultural grammar that juggles with tensions between the prefixes of ‚over-‘ and ‚under-‘: *overload, overflow, overburdened, overkill* – or *underfed, underdone, underexposed...*

Instead of being obsessed with questions of ‚how much’, and writing a history of accelerating everyday life like Burenstam-Linder and many of his genre colleagues, we need to explore questions of how, when, where, and for whom. This calls for ethnographies of the management of everyday life, rather than sweeping arguments about ‚how we live today’, where the focus is not only on all the novelties, ideas, commodities, tasks and information that flood into people’s lives, but also on the ways in which they are handled, absorbed or disposed of. How are they made problematic or unproblematic, conscious or unconscious? I have only sketched some of these strategies – there are many more.

Different Shades of Grey

So what are the different shades of grey that we have encountered? The fashionable cool and restrained grey of the future, the grey powder that Michael Landy transformed his entire home into, the grey mist of daily chores that the sleepless housewife was submerged in. Grey is the colour of dust; all the fine particles that gather under the sofa as a result of our active domestic life. Grey is a colour that mixes amenably with others. It is a colour that is constantly on the move in our domestic lives, often in surprising directions. It is the very greyness of routines that turns them into an enormous stage of intensive and creative everyday daydreaming – a kind of multitasking that combines mundane and routine chores with intensive dream-work

- ¹ *Michael Landy*: Breakdown. London 2001.
- ² *Staffan Burenstam-Linder*: Den rastlösa välfärdsmänniskan. Tidsbrist i överflöd – en ekonomisk studie Stockholm 1970, 90.
- ³ Ibid., 52.
- ⁴ Ibid., 81 sq.
- ⁵ *Haruki Murakami*: The Elephant Vanishes. London 2001, 96.
- ⁶ *Gregory Bateson*: Steps Towards an Ecology of Mind. London 1973.
- ⁷ *Pierre Bourdieu*: Outline of a Theory of Praxis. Cambridge 1977.
- ⁸ *Michel de Certeau*: The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley 1984.
- ⁹ *Jean-Claude Kaufmann*: Le Coeur à l'ouvrage. Théorie de l'action ménagère. Paris 1997, 195 sq.
- ¹⁰ *Elizabeth Shove*: Comfort, Cleanliness and Convenience: The Social Organization of Normality. Oxford 2003.
- ¹¹ *Ben Highmore*: Homework: Routine, Social Aesthetics and the Ambiguity of Everyday life. In: Cultural Studies, 18 (2004), 2-3, 306-327.
- ¹² *Orvar Löfgren* and *Richard Wilk*: Off the Edge: Experiments in Cultural Analysis. Ethnologia Europea 2005, 1-2.
- ¹³ The in-depth interviews mentioned here are being carried out by myself and Anne-Marie Palm in an ongoing interdisciplinary project on the stress of working life stress. So far, twenty interviews have been conducted. See *Orvar Löfgren* and *Anne-Marie Palm*: Att kraschlanda i sjukskrivning. In: Bodil Jönsson and *Orvar Löfgren* (red): Att utmana stressen. Lund (= Studentlitteratur), 59-87.
- ¹⁴ *Kristina Sandberg*: Ta itu. Stockholm 2004, 30.
- ¹⁵ *Eva Dahlgren*: Det här är inte jag. Dokumentärroman. Stockholm 2005, 71.
- ¹⁶ *Burenstam-Linder* (see note 2), 79.
- ¹⁷ *Jonathan Crary*: Suspensions of Perception, Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture. Cambridge 1999.
- ¹⁸ Quoted in *Crary* (see note 17), 30.
- ¹⁹ The discussion is based upon questionnaires where informants narrate their media life histories (see *Orvar Löfgren*: Medierna i nationsbygget: Hur press, radio och TV gjort Sverige svenskt. In: Ulf Hannerz [red.]: Medier och kulturer. Stockholm 1990, 85-120, for a discussion of the material) and a number of detailed documentations of contemporary family life carried out by Swedish museums in the 1970s and 1980s, in the SAMDOK project. (See the ongoing project „Home Made: The Cultural Production of the Inconspicuous”. *Orvar Löfgren*, *Thomas O'Dell* and *Robert Willim*: Home Made: The Cultural Production of the Inconspicuous. 2006. Online: <http://www.etn.lu.se/homemade/>.)
- ²⁰ *Mats Hellspång*: Att tämja massorna. In: Karl-Olov Arnstberg (red): Korallrevet. Stockholm 1983.
- ²¹ *Erich Fromm*: The Art of Loving. New York 1963, 91.
- ²² *Stjepan G. Meštrović*: Postemotional Society. Foreword by David Riesman. London 1997.
- ²³ See the critique of this kind of argument by Jonas Frykman. In: Jonas Frykman and *Orvar Löfgren*: Kultur och känsla. In: Sociologi i dag, årg. 35, 2005, 1, 7-34, here 9 sq.