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Abstract

This study aims to investigate and explain the portrayal of refugees in Swedish media, and to use the media as a way of understanding society at large. The analysis is based on newspaper articles written during times when nationalist parties have been in parliament in Sweden, the periods being 1990 to 1995 and 2010 to 2015. By looking at how the media portrays and reports on refugees through the theoretical framework chosen, the aim is to explain why there is a reoccurrence of nationalism in society. The result suggests that there are issues in the existing world system; In the world system of today, trade is carried out across borders, with labour and goods flowing back and forth between nations. At the same time, there is no consensus on what the role of the welfare state is in the globalized world, leading to debates on the right of access to a welfare system of another state. Thus, nationalists can argue that an outsider are claiming rights to a system that is not theirs. This in turns leads to a division between “us” and “them”, based on citizenship. Citizenship is used as method of claiming that one has a greater right than another, which in turn then means that people are not inherently equal, but that equality is applicable to those with citizenship alone. As long as there is no consensus on the equal right to access the welfare system, nationalism can continue to claim that some have greater right than others.
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1. Introduction

In 2014, 59.5 million people were forcibly displaced worldwide. Out of these, 19.5 million were refugees, 38.2 million were internally displaced people and 1.66 million were asylum seekers. Further, there is an unknown number of stateless people in the world. That is the highest amount of refugees in the world since the records began. The largest portion of refugees are coming from Syria, fleeing the civil war that is raging there (UNHCR). This has led to an increase in refugees seeking refuge abroad, including Sweden.

With the break-up of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, beginning in 1991, the largest refugee crisis in Europe since the Second World War was a fact. The crisis started largely due to the violence that occurred following Croatia’s independence, making over 200,000 people flee the country. This was then followed by violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following their independence in 1992. This conflict raged on until 1995, forcing around 700,000 refugees to flee to western Europe (UNHCR). Since 1991, between 3.7 and 4 million people have become refugees in Yugoslavia (GRID-Arendal).

The distinction of a refugee in this study is someone who has fled to get away from war, political oppression or religious persecution. This distinction is from the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

The media that has been looked at in this study is the printed newspapers. Hence, the study does not look at news stories covered in other channels of media such as radio or television, nor does it entail the medium of social media.

This study will be conducted on Sweden, with the focus on times of strong nationalism leading to a nationalistic party getting into parliament. The two timeframes looked at is 1990 to 1995 and 2010 to 2015.

1.1 Aim

The aim of the study is to analyse and make for an understanding of the reoccurrence of nationalism in Sweden. By using the media from the two time periods in which nationalist parties have been in parliament in Sweden, 1991 to 1994 and 2010 onwards, and finding patterns in the media, an understanding of nationalism and how it can arise with short intervals between will be created. This will be examined and an attempt at explaining it will be made.
Further, by critically looking at the media and the way the global world system is constructed, and connecting the two, an explanation to understanding the reoccurrence of nationalism will be sought after. The aim is to contribute to a debate about nationalism and how it can be understood, giving a new perspective and point of view for analysis.

The study will take to shape of a research overview, using newspaper articles as a secondary source to provide empirical findings and evidence. The theoretical framework will then be applied to the findings in the secondary data to provide analysis. The theoretical framework will be based upon the creation of ‘us and them’ in the media, and world system theory to understand how the media and nationalism can be understood in a broader perspective.

By using these two time periods as timeframe for the analysis of newspaper articles, trends will be sought for. By looking at what is similar and different in how the media reports on issues of immigration and refugees during these times, which both saw an increase in refugees in the world as a whole and to Sweden in particular, an understanding for the nationalism that has been seen at those times will be formed.

1.2 Research question

The research questions are: (1) What are the similarities and differences in the media coverage of refugees during time periods of higher influx of refugees? (2) How can the reoccurrence of nationalism be understood in Sweden based on the way the media reports about refugees?

By looking at and answering these questions, a greater understanding of the media and society at large will be sought for. By focusing on Sweden, thus being a case study, the analysis and conclusion can be used to understand a broader debate on refugees and nationalism in Sweden. While the media coverage of the situation may not give a complete understanding of the phenomenon, it is a start to understanding the larger society, since media has a strong impact on how its receivers view society, be that positive or negative (Kitzinger, 1999).

1.3 Context

In September 1991, New Democracy (Ny Demokrati in Swedish) were elected into parliament with 6.7% of the votes (Statistiska Central Byrån). It was an anti-establishment party formed shortly before the election by Ian Wachtmeister and Bert Karlsson, claiming that the established politicians talk a good game but do not listen to the people. This anti-establishment and image of being more one of the people, rather than conventional
politicians, made the party gain in popularity. This would later become part of their downfall, as the non-politicians in the party revolted against their leader, Wachtmeister, leading the party to only get 1.2% of the votes in the next election, losing their seat in parliament (Arter, 1999: 106). Their policies on immigration, refugees and aid included temporary residency instead of permanent residency, that immigrants should get loans instead of benefits in order to motivate them to get a job, an immigrant who committed a crime should be deported, and immigrants should be allowed to stay in Sweden, but only if they get integrated into society, which is up to each individual to take responsibility for, not the state. Moreover, aid should be prioritized for countries close to our borders (New Democracy Party program).

The Sweden Democrats (Sverigedemokraterna in Swedish) “is a social conservative party with a nationalistic basic view” (Sweden Democrats website). They made it into parliament in 2010 with 5.7% of the votes, and then again in 2014 with 12.9% (Statistiska Central Byrå). They argue that it should be harder to become a Swedish citizen, that one must have lived in Sweden at least 10 years to be eligible, and a test should decide if you have sufficient knowledge in Swedish and Sweden as a society. Their aim is to limit the amount of people coming to Sweden by instead helping at the place they are leaving. Aid should hence be directed to places that migrants want to leave. They wish to limit immigration of relatives, and set higher demands of what is required by the relative to be allowed to immigrate. The most important thing, when living in Sweden, is to know Swedish according to the Sweden Democrats. Therefore, education in other mother tongues should not be state provided, and the money should instead go to education in Swedish. Multiculturalism is not something that should be sought after or celebrated, but rather something that creates fractions in society and creates differences between people of different backgrounds and religious beliefs (Sweden Democrats website).

1.4 Method

This study focuses on critical discourse analysis, seeking to explain how the use of language influences power and socially constructed differences in society (Bryman, 2012: 528). The main literature that has been analysed is Swedish newspaper articles published between 1990 and 1995 as well as between 2010 and 2015. These have been analysed by seeking patterns of how refugees, the situation in Sweden and the public opinion in Sweden are portrayed in the media. From the respective time periods, just short of 100 articles have been gathered that in one way or another relates to the topic of refugees, immigration and integration. These have
then been read and the words and phrases used in the articles have been categorized in four different categories. The categories are if the situation is portrayed as a problem for Sweden or its citizen, or if it is portrayed as a problem for the refugees, as well as if the words and phrases used have a positive or negative connotation to them, according to the following model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems for ‘us’ (Sweden)</th>
<th>Problems for ‘them’ (Refugees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words or phrases from newspapers that suggests that the refugee situation is a problem for the Swedish government, institutions or people with Swedish citizenship. Organized based on time period.</td>
<td>Words or phrases from newspapers that suggests that the refugees are facing challenges, either in Sweden or in their attempt to get to Sweden. Organized based on time period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive connotation</th>
<th>Negative connotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words or phrases explaining the refugee situation in Sweden, how the state or institutions are working with questions surrounding refugees, or the refugees themselves, in a positive way. Organized based on time period.</td>
<td>Words or phrases explaining the refugee situation in Sweden, how the state or institutions are working with questions surrounding refugees, or the refugees themselves, in a negative way. Organized based on time period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at the media coverage of refugees during times of greater influx of refugees and a strong nationalist party present in parliament, the study will seek to describe how this is understood and explained in the media. When taking the findings made in the newspapers and applying those to the institutions and issues they concern in society, the study will take a more explanatory turn, seeking to understand why the findings are the way they are and how that effects society at large (De Vaus, 2001: 3-5).

The decision to focus on media coverage as a way of understanding nationalism is based on several factors. The media has a large impact on how its receiver understands reality. By reporting predominantly positive about an issue, the receiver is more likely to have a positive outlook on it, and by reporting predominantly negative, the receiver is more likely to have a negative outlook on set issue (Kitzinger, 1999). The media is sometimes referred to as the ‘fourth estate’, a phrase coined by Burke in a statement made in the British parliament, where
he claimed that there were three estates in parliament, but the fourth one (the media) was more important than all of them (Carlyle, 1841). In Sweden, the media is the third estate, following the government and the parliament. This goes to show just how powerful the media is, further giving strength to Kitzinger’s (1999) claims about the power of the media. Hence, to study the media to understand society is perhaps not only valuable, but also necessary.

The decision to focus on the time periods of 1990 to 1995 and 2010 to 2015 is based on the political atmosphere at the time, with nationalist parties taking place in parliament during each of the time periods, as New Democracy were elected into parliament in 1991, and the Swedish Democrats were elected into parliament in 2010. Moreover, the increase of refugees during those time periods, with the fall of the Republic of Yugoslavia in the 1990’s and the Syrian war during the 2010’s serving as the main reasons for the greater influx of refugees, was taken into consideration when choosing the timeframe of the study. The decision to not cover the entire time from 1990 to 2015 was made to create a comparative case.

The newspaper articles were found in an online archive called Retriever during January of 2016, where searches can be made based on year and specific terms. For this study, the word used to find articles suitable was refugees. For each of the years covered in the study respectively, refugees was typed into the search engine, and then articles were read and chosen based on their content. The subjects covered in the articles that were chosen was 1) what refugees had fled from, 2) discussing integration, and 3) talking about the challenges an increase of refugees causes for Sweden as a nation.

During the years from 1990 to 1995, the only newspapers available in the archive was Expressen and TT. This created a limitation to the study, as this meant that the range of different types of newspapers were not available for the analysis. However, I decided to proceed anyway with the research in its current shape.

During the years from 2010 to 2015, a wider range of newspapers were available. The newspapers used are traditional daily national newspapers (Dagens Nyheter, Svenska Dagbladet and the likes), newspaper of a more tabloid nature (Expressen, Aftonbladet, Kvällsposten), local newspapers (Norran, Sydsvenskan, Trelleborgs Allehanda and the likes) as well as monthly magazines from the church and medical associations. Some newspapers that are used are political, whilst others claim to be neutral. A decision was made to include as many different kinds of newspapers as possible, to create as broad of an understanding as possible of the coverage of refugees in the media.
1.5 Previous research

Several studies focusing on the power of media and the portrayal of refugees in the media exists prior to this study. Some examples will be brought up here, to give an understanding of what previous knowledge exists in the field.

One of the studies that started the thought process that would become this thesis was a master thesis from Malmö Högskola by Laczak, investigating the Swedish attitudes to immigration and immigrants. The study focuses on the increase in refugees and immigration during the late 1980’s and 1990’s. With the immigrants and refugees coming from increasingly distant places geographically, it investigates the tensions that are created between Swedish citizens and newcomers. The study focuses on the attitudes that are held towards newly arrived in Sweden, who holds these attitudes and how these attitudes can be understood in relation to the Swedish society at large. The study found that 57.6% of the respondents thought that foreigners came to Sweden to use our social benefits, 59.4% thought that it should be in the interest of the immigrants to become as ‘Swedish’ as possible, and 56.5% thought that immigrant children should be taught that Swedish is their mother tongue (Laczak, 1999).

The Glasgow Media group has conducted extensive studies on the media, with their work focusing on the how the media reports about issues surrounding race, immigration, development and mental health, as well as the power of the media to influence people and how the audience access, experiences and understands what is reported in media. Further, they have written about the question of ownership and responsibility of what is published in the media. They discuss the idea of an active, critical receiver versus a passive receiver, and how that influences the views held by the recipient.

A study made by Brune on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Sweden describes how the portrayal of refugees and immigrants has changed from the 1970’s up to the 2000’s (Brune, 2000). In the study, she finds that while the description of refugees from Syria was predominantly positive during the 70’s, it has become increasingly critical and negative towards Middle eastern refugees as the decades has gone by. According to her, this shift has historical ties, as well as the fact that Christian refugees have had the support of priests in Sweden, while Muslim refugees has not had a spokesperson present in Sweden, supporting them and creating a positive association towards Muslims. Moreover, Van Dijk has studied how some minorities and individuals are portrayed in the media. The study claims that it is the majority, or the established, who has the power on how minorities are explained and
understood, and that this in turn can limit the social and political power that a minority group has (Van Djik, 2005).

A bachelor study made in 2015 by Gottfridson and Lukkarinen handles the portrayal of the refugee crisis in the media during the fall of 2015. It focuses on how the media portrays the crisis, refugees, the Swedish nation and the Swedish population during this period, and then goes on to study the relationship between the established Swedes and refugees, based on what is covered by the media. The study finds that the refugee crisis and the refugees are understood as a threat to the Swedish society, with the refugees being dehumanized and understood based on prejudice and stereotypes. Meanwhile, Swedes are understood as morally superior, good and accepting non-racists (Gottfridson & Lukkarinen, 2015).

While these studies cover both of the time periods that are covered in this thesis, as well as how the media has an effect on the recipient, they do not compare the two periods as will be done in this study, nor do they have the same theoretical framework to understand the situation. This is what this study will seek to add to the debate; a comparative aspect over time as well as an understanding based on a different theoretical framework.

1.6 Limitations

As with any study, this study has its limitations, which will be brought up and discussed in this section. The main limitations that will be brought up is representability, scope and how much the analysis can be used for a tool of generalization.

Representability

This study focuses on Sweden alone. Hence, how much the findings found in the study is representable to other settings is difficult to know. The same goes for the time periods; while the findings might show something during these particular periods, their relevance on other occasions could perhaps be detested.

However, even if it should be the case that the findings made is representative only of this setting at this time, the study still provides a way of approaching the same questions in other places, making it relevant in that sense. Even if the usage of a similar method would be used in another case, but come to other conclusions, that could be meaningful as well, as that could prove that each case is different, leading to different conclusions. On the other hand, if the findings were to come back similar in several cases, geographically and time wise, that would then prove that some things are not just case-specific, but something that can be used to see
trends. As long as the pre-existing settings of each setting is showed, with their similarities and differences, the case study is a valuable tool to understand a phenomenon (George & Bennett, 2004: 19-21).

Either way, by using the tools used in this study to understand the questions asked in this thesis, it could be seen as a tool for comparison and an attempt on a broader understanding could be sought for, regardless of results that are different or similar.

The purpose of the study is to understand how the media reports on refugees during the two time periods chosen, and to use the findings in this to create an understanding of how nationalism can be reoccurring. While there are other reasons than the medial portrayal of refugees to be taken into consideration when trying to understand nationalism, this study focuses on the media alone, trying to explain the phenomenon based on what can be found in the newspapers. More research is needed in the field to create a complete understanding of nationalism, as this study is not enough to understand the social phenomenon that is nationalism, however the hope is that this study will add to a broader debate about nationalism and how it can be understood.

Scope

The scope of the study consists of just short of 200 newspaper articles, divided between two time periods. This, arguably, is not enough ground to understand a political trend on a national level. However, it could give some idea as to how this political issue can be understood and what can be done to avoid them, if that is the aim. More research would be necessary to provide a solution to the problem, but by raising the question, an interests and an understanding of the significance of the issue might be raised, which then in turn could lead to more research being carried out in set field.

The other issue with the scope of the study is the articles themselves that have been analysed. During 1990 to 1995 in particular, the availability of newspaper articles is limited. The ones that have been used here are from Expressen or TT (Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå), since that is what is available in the database used for this study during that time period. A larger variety of newspapers were available during the later time period, hence the articles from that period has a larger range of publishers. Despite this, an understanding of how the media reports on refugees, immigration and integration can still be brought through these articles. So while the newspaper articles might not show the entire story or situation, they can be used to get an understanding of the medial situation, which is how they are used in this study.
**Tool of generalization**

As has been mentioned above, whether this study can be seen as proof in the case of Sweden or in other context is debatable. However, by a continuous use of the methods to understand the media and nationalism, in the long run this might be possible. The conclusions drawn in the study are of a general nature. Hence, the conclusion being more than a hypothesis might not be possible, but with continued research in the matter, going more into depth on finding a solution instead of focusing on explaining the situation, these hypotheses might be proved or changed, depending on what further research show.

As the study is a case study, by using similar methods of analysis on other cases, either with similar pre-existing conditions or with a similar debate, cases can be compared to look for patterns in different cases. This could then lead to an understanding of how a similar situation can lead to different outcomes, or how different outcomes can come from a similar situation (George & Bennett, 2004: 19-21). This study could then instead be seen as providing an idea of how to look at certain issues and questions, and providing a framework within which the reoccurrence of nationalism can be understood, which in itself makes the study relevant.

Arguably, it is difficult to explain such a complex phenomenon that is nationalism by looking at the printed media in Sweden. By reporting predominantly negative about refugees, there might not be a rise in nationalism in politically organized terms. However, it could help cement xenophobic ideas into people’s minds. Different people react differently to the information that they are fed, but based on Kitzinger’s claims (1999) about how the media influences the receiver, at least some would be affected, taking a more xenophobic outlook on the situation, by a predominantly negative media on issues concerning refugees. So on the one hand, the media might not make people vote for a nationalist party, hence not creating an increased support for openly nationalistic parties in parliament or generally in the political spectrum, but it could create more xenophobic mind-set, or help justify an already existing mind-set. This could then, possibly, lead to people choosing to vote for a nationalist party, but that is not certain.

**1.7 Thesis outline**

In the next chapter of the thesis, the theoretical framework will be explained, starting with Cohen as well as Elias and Scotson and their work on moral panic, the established and the outsiders. This will be followed by Massey and Wallerstein and their work regarding world system theory, and lastly Rawls and Marshall, who provide normative tools for analysis. After
that, the findings from the newspapers will be explained separated into the two time periods, starting with the 1990s, which is followed by a comparison of the two. This section of the thesis will look at what the research has found. The research consisted of reading newspaper articles from 1990 to 1995 and 2010 to 2015, and looking at their portrayal of refugees and the challenges these refugees and immigrants creates for Sweden.

Then comes the analysis, where the theoretical framework will be applied to the findings that have been made, to get an idea of how the data can be understood. Finally, a section where a general conclusion will be drawn based on the theoretical framework, as well as for the study at large.

2. Theoretical framework

In this part of the study, the theoretical framework that will be used in the analysis will be presented and explained. The theoretical framework is based on the works of Cohen, Elias and Scotson, Massey, Wallerstein, as well as Rawls and Marshall.

Cohen (2011)

Cohen introduces the concept of moral panic. While the tools for analysis is created in the context of newspapers in Great Britain, it will be applied to newspapers in Sweden in this study.

According to Cohen, the creation of moral panic is done by taking an issue that already exists and then exaggerating it compared to other problems. It can either be a new problem, that may be pre-existing but hard to recognize, or an old one that is traditionally seen as a bad thing in society. It can be a transparent or a vague issue, depending on how obvious it is to see the problem it creates for society. There are seven usual causes of moral panic;

“1) young, working-class male, 2) school violence in the form of bullying and shootouts, 3) wrong drugs used by the wrong people at the wrong places, 4) child abuse, satanic rituals and paedophile registers, 5) sex, violence and blaming the media, 6) welfare cheats and single mothers, and 7) refugees and asylum seekers flooding the country and swamping the services provided by the state” (Cohen, 2011: viii).

This study will focus on the last one.

The media usually makes no difference between immigrant, refugee and asylum seeker. The portrayal of different migrants is also based on race, race relations and ethnicity. Further, there is a distinction between the refugees, who gets compassion, and asylum seekers, who
have no rights and gets less compassion. The media, along with some governments, then make claims about how foreign refugees needs to be kept out as much as possible, that asylum seekers lie to get asylum, and that testing of the right to seek asylum must be done. The focus tends to be on how genuine the reason is for wanting to leave a home country; is it a genuine threat or are they driven by economic opportunity? This is especially common in tabloid press, where nuances are forgotten and single cases become norm. Unlike the other folk devils, refugees and asylum seekers is a more political problem, driven by hostility and rejection, created by global changes. When creating villains of a group it becomes more justifiable and common to dislike and use violence towards set group (Cohen, 2011: xxii).

Our perceptions of a social phenomenon is formed by seeing and selecting based on previous knowledge and experience, which shapes and gets added to a larger context of knowledge and attitudes (Cohen, 2011: 47). A large part of what is reported in the media is when something unusual and outside the norm happens and the consequences of those actions, which in turn creates a faulty image of what is the norm in society. It also creates a sense of us, the norm, and them, those who deviate from the norm (Cohen, 2011: 12-13).

**Elias and Scotson (1994)**

The framework provided by Cohen to understand the portrayal of refugees in the media will be combined with Elias and Scotson (1994) and their work on the established and the outsiders. Their work surrounds a town in the United Kingdom, focusing on the relationships between the middle class, working class and those who have recently moved to set town, while this study will use it to understand the relationships between those with Swedish heritage, immigrants who have lived in Sweden for an extended period of time and those who have recently arrived in Sweden.

According to their work, groups that are outsiders see themselves in comparison to the established, and their lack of power is a sign of being inferior to those with more power. Further, if a group is seen and described in a negative way, that group is more likely to live up to that description. The differentiation does not have to be racial or ethnic, but more about access to power (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 26-30).

A group is an outsider in relation to another; the middle-class has more power than the working-class who have lived in a geographical space long, and they in turn have more power than a newly arrived working-class. When immigrants or refugees arrive to a new country, they automatically form the lower-class (cf. Elias & Scotson, 1994: 15). These groups often
present a unified front outward, particularly those who have relatively less power. However, within the group, there are power relations as well (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 1-7).

Massey et al (1993)

Wallerstein (1974) introduces the world system theory, and then it is taken further by Massey et al (1993). The idea is that migration does not occur in relation to the labour markets on a national level, but instead because of structures of the world. The system drives owners of capitalist cooperation’s to enter poor countries to achieve higher profit. The main drivers of capitalists to venture into poorer countries are land, raw materials, labour, material links, and ideological links. This kind of venture into poorer countries creates neo-colonialism through the endorsement of elites, especially between former colonializing power and the colonialized, where the cultural and linguistic bonds still remain.

Migration is an unavoidable effect of capitalist development, and the more countries that join the capitalist world system by becoming open market economies with interests of trade across borders, the more migration will occur. The world economy is then run from quite a few urban cities around the world, where a large amount of modern services is provided. These areas are populated by highly educated and wealthy workers, who in turn have demand for unskilled service workers. This creates a strong demand for immigrants, since the uneducated natives usually avoid these low skilled service jobs. With industries and semi-skilled work opportunities moving abroad, this creates a gap in the supply of work opportunities (Massey et al, 1993).

Wallerstein (2004)

The current world system has been going for a crisis for quite some time now, according to Wallerstein (2004). Like any other system, it has been born and established, to later face problems which it cannot solve, leading to this systematic crisis. This is inevitable, but also not possible to solve within the system, and hence solutions need to be sought from other systems (Wallerstein, 2004: 461). This is what then will create a new system; the old system combined with solutions from another system. The solution is usually found in an old system, creating a hybrid. This means that in the long run we will eventually find ourselves in a new system.

With the current world system, we have gotten used to the crisis and instability of it, but the instability leads to anxiety and violence as groups of people fight to keep their power and
place in the hierarchy (Wallerstein, 2004: 462). An effect of this could be nationalism, where citizens fight for their relative power compared to non-citizens, claiming to have rights to the system that the non-citizens do not have.

Rawls (2003) and Marshall (1950)

The theory of justice provided by Rawls claims that each individual has rights that cannot be overridden by the good of another. Hence, the loss of freedom for some cannot be justified by what is considered to be the greater good. These rights through justice are not decided by political or social interests, and thus cannot be changed by these kinds of interests either. If everyone shares an idea of what justice is supposed to be, it would be ideal. However, in reality, this is not the case. Most can agree that as long as everyone has the same rights and duties in social life, that would be just, even though our opinion on what justice is different (Rawls, 2003: 3-4).

Rawls argues that if there was a principle of ignorance, where we do not know others abilities, class or access to goods, it could be ensured that no advantages were given based on the above, as the idea of what justice is would have to be determined in such a way that it would beneficial for all. Moreover, if all are seen as equal, it is unlikely that one would agree to sacrifice the rights of some for the greater good, since it would be difficult to argue how it is just that some have less in order for others to prosper (Rawls, 2003: 11-13). By applying this to institutions, all should have equal right to basic liberties, and inequalities would be arranged in such a way that they are to the advantage of everyone. Hence, injustice is inequalities that are not equally benefitting (Rawls, 2003: 53-54).

Citizenship has three parts, according to Marshall; civil, being the liberty of a person to speak, think, hold faith and have right to justice, political, which is the right to exercise power, and social, which is about social welfare, services and heritage as well as education (Marshall, 1950: 30). The original source of social rights was the membership of a local community, where social rights is supposed to be an absolute right to certain standards, which are determined through the general duties of citizenship, not by economic value (Marshall, 1950: 32 & 36).

By combining these two theories, supposedly an individual’s right to make claims to the welfare system should not be decided by abilities, access to goods or other factors, but instead on an agreed idea of what justice is. This will be explored further in the analysis.
Use of theory

The theories will be used in different parts of the analysis to create a broad understanding in the end. The work of Cohen (2011) as well as Nobert and Scotson (1994) will be used to understand the portrayal of refugees in the media. The work of Massey (1993) and Wallerstein (2004) will be used to understand the issues surrounding the arrival of refugees, which will then be taken further with the works of Rawls (2003) and Marshall (1950) to get an understanding of why these issues occur.

3. Result

3.1 Media 1990-1995

During the time period between 1990 and 1995, the terminology used often point towards the difficulties that refugees create for Sweden as a nation or for its citizens. The newspapers talk about how Sweden and the government cannot handle the situation at hand, and how that in turn is creating a strain on society. It is not uncommon that the cost of refugees is brought up, however usually not in actual costs, but more on how refugees are getting more benefits in monetary terms, and how that is prioritized by the government. It does not say how much money a refugee is entitled to in absolute numbers, but sometimes in relation to the benefits that Swedish citizens get. It is sometimes described as a cause and effect, where it is understood that if refugees get more money, others will get less. Moreover, a reoccurring trend is that Sweden is taking on more than it can chew, by letting more refugees come to Sweden than can be handled in an efficient way.

When describing the actual refugees, they are often described as passive. For instance, phrases like “sitting in a camp for refugees”, “social cases collecting benefits”, “not prone to move”, “have to teach them”, or “yield to” are used. This promotes an idea that refugees are lazy and passive, not doing anything to change their own situation or be part of a greater society. It also promotes the idea that refugees come here and claim rights but do not take on the responsibilities that come with living in Sweden and having certain rights. On the other hand, Sweden and its citizens are represented as having to take care of this other group coming from outside, who, according to the medial view, are either unwilling or unable to take care or responsibility for themselves. At the same time, Sweden is seen as doing a good job in dealing with the refugees, through phrases like the people working with these issues are naturally doing a grand job, doing our part, creating new jobs and filling empty
accommodations, giving professional aid to people who have struggled immensely, giving permanent residency, and will let them in if they are in a state of misery.

A reoccurring theme when describing the immigration of refugees to Sweden is a reference to weather or natural elements. Expressions such as a wave of refugees, pendulum wave, pendulum storm, poured out, beached, and stop the stream are used.

When handling the difficulties that the refugees are facing, it is about their living conditions, the risks they are facing where they fled from and their reasons for fleeing, the challenges they have faced while leaving their home and how they were treated on the way. The articles that are the most critical about the way refugees are treated in their receiving country are articles about refugees who have fled to other countries, not Sweden. When the articles are debating the refugees who have arrived in Sweden, the debate is mostly about the conditions they fled from or the challenges refugees pose to Sweden as a nation and its citizens. Little debate is put forth into what challenges refugees face when they have arrived in Sweden, and when something that could be seen as unjust treatment of refugees in Sweden, such as prejudice or being treated differently for being refugees, the debate becomes about why they were treated the way they were and not about the implications that has on the refugees themselves. Moreover, when there is a discussion surrounding integration, it is about how it has failed. The discussion usually circulates around how a lack of integration means that the refugees are not joining the workforce, do not learn the Swedish language and culture, and are not active members of society, instead choosing to live in sub-societies, with people coming from similar experiences, sharing the same values. The discussion is about how this is damaging for Sweden, how that leads to costs for society, a workforce that is not being utilized, and how it creates questions and lack of understanding from the Swedish citizens towards refugees. However, the discussion does not talk about why the integration is not working, how it could be improved, nor about how the refugees are experiencing this. Again, they are seen as a passive actor, seemingly without caring about partaking in society or community.

When debating the amount of refugees that should be taken in by Sweden, the arguments used are that Sweden cannot take responsibility for everyone, that there are not enough housing opportunities, that municipalities should be allowed to decide for themselves whether or not they want to welcome refugees, and if so how many, and that by bringing in too many refugees, it creates hostility towards refugees because the government is not taking a large
enough responsibility towards its citizen, nor for the integration of the refugees, making them outsiders in society. No differentiation is made between integration and assimilation, and measures such as education in Swedish sex and gender norms are seen as a successful way of integrating people into society, despite the fact that an action like that will not help create any networks to integrate. The question about education in Swedish is also debated, and suggestions such as stopping refugees from getting benefits if they do not finish Swedish for immigrants (SFI) are brought up as a way of motivating people to keep learning.

The housing situation seems to be seen as a particularly big and challenging issue, where the debate circles around both the lack of possibilities for housing, but also about whether or not refugees should be allowed to jump ahead in the housing queues. The pendulum seems to suggest that most people think that that should not be allowed, a view that is shared with real estate owners. Some go so far as to claim that they would rather have their real estate’s empty than renting it out to refugees. Politicians in power on the other hand seem to think that by making sure that refugees get proper housing as soon as possible, instead of staying in some kind of special housing just for refugees, integration will happen faster and smoother.

All in all, the situation is usually explained as a challenge for Sweden, but not to the refugees themselves. While the government and municipalities are doing what they can, according to the media, the refugees are passively accepting the terms they are put under, and do nothing to change their status or situation. The question of rights to different benefits seem to be at the core of the debate, where a frequent concern is that refugees are getting more than other citizens, and that this is both wrong and not just. There is a reoccurrence of comparing ‘regular Swedes’ with refugees, and pinning the two against each other. This creates a sense of us and them (Cohen, 2011).

3.2 Media 2010-2015

Between 2010 and 2015, the themes are in many ways similar to 1990 to 1995, but some new trends can be found. Firstly, there is a sense of worry towards the fact that many refugees coming to Sweden are Muslims, and what implications that has on Sweden. It is claimed that the Muslim refugees are harder to integrate than the Christian refugees. The question of integration seems to be at the core in general, with the lack of housing, and how to ensure that people take part in the labour market and the challenge that creates in focus. It is not explicitly stated what the main challenge to getting refugees to partake in the labour market is, but one might assume that it is the language barrier. There is, however, no real debate about how the
education in Swedish is being carried out, nor about what needs to be done in order for it to be more effective. As far as the lack of housing is stated as a challenge, it is also stated that that cannot be used as an excuse to not take in and care for refugees in need of help.

The media is at this point rather critical about how the refugee situation is handled by the politicians, and towards politicians in general. Arguments such a fault in the system, not taking a humanitarian responsibility, harsher refugee policies, and taking in fewer than promised are put forth, and there is a sense of lack of trust in that the government can handle the situation it is facing. The Sweden Democrats are referred to as a racist party, and the other parties are criticised for holding on to their political colour when handling the refugee question, rather than what is the right thing to do.

Words such as solidarity and responsibility are brought up, but simultaneously there is a debate that there should not be as many refugees arriving to Sweden, that there should be stricter control of who should be allowed to come and who should not, and that the country cannot handle all the refugees who have come. When solidarity and this kind of reasoning are used together, it is to show how the policies that are implemented, or suggested to be implemented, are becoming increasingly hostile towards refugees. However, most of the time the question of solidarity and responsibility is not raised when discussing how to lower the number of refugees arriving in Sweden, nor when talking about that there are too many refugees in Sweden. All in all, there seems to be two debates taking place at the same time, with very different arguments; those who claim that Sweden are taking in too many refugees and that the country is unable to handle more or even the amount that has already arrived, and those who claim that there is a moral responsibility to be taken towards refugees, and that solidarity should be felt towards those fleeing their homes.

As far as what the people of Sweden want and act, a slight change has occurred, either in the way the media reports about it or in the way people act. In the beginning of the time period, there was little debate about what the average Swede was doing, but towards the end of the time period, the images portrayed is one where people want to help refugees in different ways as they arrive to Sweden. It is reported that there are people that want to help by providing food and water, and that there is in fact a sense of solidarity towards refugees, that they have a right to come to Sweden and seek help, because it is a human right to do so. This portrayal of Swedes, not as a unanimous group, but with individuals and groups wanting to take initiative
and challenging the way that the authorities are handling the situation was not there in the beginning of the period.

The refugees during this period are not explained as more than a group of people, a group that is quite homogenous. There is a differentiation between Christian and Muslim refugees, but apart from that no individualisation of the group is made. When their hardships are described, it is the challenges they faced while still in their country of origin, or what they faced on the way to Sweden. Further, when there is a debate about how they are treated in the receiving country, the receiving country is not Sweden, but some other European country. Moreover, when their life is explained in Sweden, they are seen as a group that are lacking the possibility to be integrated and wanting to live in areas with large amounts of refugees, receiving benefits, and struggling to get a job. The media does not report about cases where the refugees have succeeded, at any level, to integrate, nor does it report about the implications that the above stated ways of explaining refugees have on the life of a refugee, what they themselves are doing or can do to change their situation, or what is being done to actually integrate refugees into society. They are seen as a passive actor, doing as told by the government, nothing more or less, and with no motivation or ambitions to take initiative and actively seek to change their situation.

3.3 Similarities and differences

What has been found in the collection and analysis of newspaper articles is that there are many similarities between the 90’s and the 2010’s. During both periods, there is an extensive focus on the difficulties and challenges that Sweden is facing due to an increase in refugees, while at the same time largely failing to report the challenges that the refugees are facing in Sweden, as well as their experiences leading them to leave their homes. There is little or no explanation on what they experienced on their way to Sweden, why they came to Sweden and what their hopes for arriving in Sweden are. All in all, during both time periods, refugees are understood and portrayed as a passive, homogenous group that are collecting benefits to survive, with no apparent ambitions in Sweden, be that considering integration or getting a job, education or other activities. Another similarity is that there seems to be an assumption that there is a limit to how many refugees Sweden can handle. Statements that suggests that we have taken on more than we can handle are frequent, be that about the housing situation, jobs or integration. What this limit is in actual numbers and what this limit is based upon, but that there is a limit is clear. It is claimed that with a too large number of refugees in the
country, integration will become harder and fail, that unemployment will rise and that it will be troublesome to find housing, not just for refugees but for the population at large. However, possible solutions to this, apart from cutting back on the intake of refugees, such as how to make integration more effective is not discussed.

There is one major difference that can be found between the two time periods; during the 90’s the solidarity towards the system is much stronger. The newspapers defend the system, says that it is working, and that it is not the fault of those working with questions surrounding immigration and integration that the situation is the way it is. Instead, no clear villain is seen to be at fault. Although not pleased with the politics that are being enforced, there is not an explicit mistrust or disliking of the political and national system at large.

During the 2010’s on the other hand, there is a widespread critique of the system, from many different directions who hold different ideas at heart. On the one hand, there is the idea that the politics of immigration is too generous, and that less immigrants and refugees should be allowed to come to Sweden, and that this is the fault of the politicians and the system that has been built surrounding this question. The notion of a shared idea of what it means to be a Swede is at the core in these arguments, and refugees pose a threat to this shared idea, as they do not inherently share it. On the other hand, there are those who say that the issue is not the immigrants and refugees themselves that are the core problem, but the way that integration is handled. This side, while also blaming the politicians and the system for the failure of integration, generally do not call for less generous politics towards immigration, but better integration methods. It is not unusual that this side of the political spectrum go so far as to claim that it is too difficult for refugees to get to Sweden and receive the help they need and have a right to. The solidarity in this case is quite strong towards refugees, and the notion of a shared idea of what it means to be a Swede is not as prevalent.

During the fall of 2015, there was a shift in the debate worth noting. As the number of refugees coming to Sweden increased, the idea of closing the borders to Sweden was put forth, and later implemented. This led to an apparent division in the debate between those in favour of closing the borders and those against it. The argument for closing the borders were that it was protecting Sweden, its institutions and society against a systemic collapse. On the other hand, those who argued against closing the borders claimed that this was not solving the problem, only handing the problem to someone else, and that it was an inhuman treatment of the refugees. This was not a debate that existed in the major, mainstream medias prior to the
fall of 2015, and therefore there was no discussion about what the implications of opened or closed borders could have, nor about why one would be better than the other. In the end, borders were closed, and as of today remain closed.

4. Analysis

4.1 Us vs Them

As has been stated above, the findings from the newspaper articles suggest that the newspapers report on the situation surrounding refugees by portraying refugees as a group that is not like Swedes, hence creating a feeling of us (Swedish citizens) and them (refugees). This is supported by the framework created by Cohen (2011). Refugees are reported about as one, homogenous group, that is also lumped together with asylum seekers and other immigrants, making no distinction between the different groups, and is instead based around race, race relations and ethnicity.

According to the Cohen, during the 90’s there was a hostile agenda, where governments and the media claimed that as many refugees as possible needed to be kept out, that those who do arrive are doing so under false pretence and that testing of the legitimacy of the refugees need to be thorough. Cohen, however, focuses on Great Britain in his study, which means that the situation is not altogether the same. Still, the framework provided is applicable to the articles from the 90’s in Sweden that have been collected for this study, as there is a focus on the problems surrounding the arrival of refugees, although their legitimacy is not frequently questioned, as suggested by Cohen, but instead focuses on the issues that are created in Sweden by taking in refugees. This is also applicable during the 2010’s, where the situation is similar to the one described in the 90’s.

Further, Cohen argues that there is a lack of nuances portrayed in the media, which holds true in the cases described above. A large part of what is understood about refugees and immigrants in general is based around deviant behaviour, and the consequences of this behaviour. There is then an assumption of what is acceptable behaviour and what is not, which an individual or a few individual do not follow, which then is seen as the norm for all of this group of people (Cohen, 2011: 12-13). Considering that a social understanding is created through what you see and how that is understood according to what you already know, and then that is added to a broader understanding of social life (Cohen, 2011: 47), if immigrants are always perceived as not following the norm, according to the media, this will create an understanding that immigrants do not fit into our social norms, and hence that leads
to a lack of understanding of a social group, which in turn can lead to nationalism, if not changed.

This could, in turn, also have an effect of the group who are portrayed as outside the norm. If a group is considered as an outsider, that group then in turn see themselves in relation to the established group. The outside group most likely have less power, and that in turn is seen as a sign that they are inferior to the established group (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 26). “Give a group a bad name and it is likely to live up to it” (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 28) would suggest that by the media portraying refugees as a problem for society, a passive group not taking part in society, they are more likely to become a passive group who do not actively take part in society. However, unlike Cohen (2011), Elias and Scotson (1994: 30) argue that the division of groups is not necessarily done by ethnicity or race, but more about access to power. This could be because of the setting of their study, which is different to the setting described by Cohen as well as the setting of this study, as explained in the theoretical framework.

Like Cohen, the notion of the norm and the other, or established and outsiders as Elias and Scotson phrase it, is in relation to another; in the case of this study, Swedes are seen as a superior class compared to immigrants who have lived in Sweden for a long time, and might even be citizens, who in turn is seen as superior to those who have recently moved to Sweden (1994: 1-2). When immigrants arrive to a new community, they form the lower-class (Elias and Scotson, 1994: 15-16). What makes the groups different in the way they act is that a group with less relative power are more likely to present a unified front (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 5). This would imply that refugees are more likely to present a unified front than Swedes, as they are deprived of relative power. This is, however, hard to prove in the context set in this study, as there are close to no interviews conducted with refugees themselves, and thus this is an idea and connection that cannot be explored closer in this study. According to the framework provided by Elias and Scotson, there are power relations within the groups as well, with some being more or less powerful or established. This will not be examined in this study either, since, again, that would need an insight into how refugees view themselves, and that has not been provided.

According to the framework provided, it would suggest that the way refugees are portrayed in the media, they are established as a group of others, that do not follow the norms, nor partake in society in a way that is considered the acceptable and average way. This in turn makes it difficult for those who see themselves as part of the norm to understand this group, if there
only insight into the group is the media, as is the case for many Swedes. With this lack of understanding of refugees, and the assumption that they do not follow the social codes that are seen as Swedish, they become an easy target for prejudice and disliking, which in turn can lead to a rise in nationalism, if those with political power through a democratic vote chooses to vote for a nationalist party. With the media providing a homogenous portrait of refugees as benefit collectors and passive members of society unable to adapt to our norms, an increase in xenophobic thought is likely to occur, which in turn could lead to increased support for nationalistic powers in society. However, if the media portrayed refugees in a more holistic, non-homogenous way, but instead as individuals with different driving forces and ambitions, as well as how they themselves see their part in the Swedish society, perhaps nationalism would not be as prevalent. Further, by presenting a more nuanced picture of refugees, where they are not seen as a cost and burden on society, but instead as individuals with something to offer, as well as with rights and responsibilities to take part of, the political situation might change.

4.2 Crisis in the world system

Migration, according to Massey et al (1993) is an effect of structures of the global world. It is driven by capitalists to enter poor countries to get higher profits, often motivated by the access to land, raw materials, labour and ideological links. This is done through the endorsement of the elites, which in turn creates neo-colonial structures. Following this logic, the more societies join the capitalist world system, the more migration will occur. With the world economy revolving around some urban areas where modern services are provided, there is a demand for unskilled service workers in these areas. This creates a demand of immigrant workers, as the uneducated natives avoid these kinds of service jobs.

However, arguably, the world system is going through a crisis. This is inevitable for any system, since after it is established, it will encounter problems that cannot be solved within the system, leading to crisis. This crisis in turn will change the system, usually by finding a solution from an old system. This then creates a new one, although the change is slow (Wallerstein, 2004). Right now, the current world system is going through a crisis, but those living within it have gotten used to the instabilities that this crisis brings. Still, it leads to anxiety and violence as people fight to keep their roles in the hierarchy.

By applying this crisis to the issues of refugees, one point becomes evident immediately. International migration is a part of the capitalist system, to maximize profit for companies. It
is a question of supply and demand; capitalist cooperation will range into areas where there is a supply of what they need to turn a profit, and there is a demand for unskilled workers to produce services sought after by the higher classes. However, refugees do not move based on supply and demand, but instead flee from a threat they are facing in one place to a place of safety, regardless of the demand for them in the receiving country. It instead becomes a moral responsibility to help refugees find a safe place to live. This then could create a lack of balance among workers in the receiving country. This lack of balance will then create a debate of who is supposed to be prioritized to get the jobs provided. On the one hand, it could be argued that getting a job will help integrate refugees into society. On the other hand, some might argue that the Swedish work force is better qualified to do the jobs at hand. This could then create hostility towards refugees, and ideas that they are taking 'our' jobs can be born, creating xenophobia, which in turn could create an increased support for nationalist parties.

Another crisis that the current world system is going through is that while there is an agreement that one is allowed to travel or move across borders, and that refugees have a right to get help somewhere outside their own country, there is no consensus on what rights the refugees have to the welfare system. There is no global agreement on who has what rights of claim to the welfare state. Supposedly, it would either be something that is provided to citizens alone, or to refugees have a claim as well, as well as migrant workers. According to Marshall (1950) citizenship is made up out of three parts; civil rights, regarding liberties for a person such as speech, thought, faith, property and justice, political rights, regarding right to exercise power, and social rights, regarding economic welfare, social heritage, education and social services. As this paper focuses on social rights, this will be explored further. Originally, social rights were gained through membership of a local community. Social right is an absolute right to certain standards of civilization, which is decided by the general duties of citizenship alone, not by the economic value of the individual themselves (Marshall, 1950). If social rights are gained through belonging to a local community, and is absolute regardless of economic abilities, then refugees should perhaps also be included in this right, since they do belong to a local community, even though their access to capital and relative power is limited.

Taking these arguments further, by looking at the framework provided by Rawls (2003), he argues that each individual has a rights of justice that cannot be overridden by the welfare society as a whole. This then means that the loss of freedom for some cannot be defended through greater rights of others. This right through justice cannot be politically bargained or decided by social interests (Rawls, 2003: 3-4). According to this, a shared sense of what
justice means will be a ground for civic understanding and friendship. In reality, however, we do not agree on what this justice is, but most can agree that as long as everyone has the same rights and duties in social life, that is justice (Rawls, 2003: 5).

However, if justice was to be decided behind a veil of ignorance, where we do not know each other’s abilities, class, access to goods etc., it would be possible to ensure that no advantages or disadvantages be given based on the previous stated factors. If all are seen as equal, it is less likely that the right of some would be sacrificed for the idea of the greater good, since it would not be just that some should have less so that others can have more and prosper (Rawls, 2003: 11-13). According to this logic, arguments that claim that someone else is claiming a social right that is not theirs would become hollow, because if all are equal, who is to decide who has the right to claim certain rights, and who does not? Further, if refugees were seen as people with equal rights, their right to access the welfare system could not be denied based on the idea that it creates issues for the Swedish citizens, as the right of the greater good does not have a stronger emphasis than the individuals equal right.

The principle of justice in institutions is that all have equal right to extensive scheme of basic liberties that are compatible with the liberties of others, and inequalities are to be arranged to be to everyone’s advantage and used in a way that they are open to everyone. Hence, injustice is inequalities that are not benefitting for all (Rawls, 2003: 53-54). These inequalities could be through progressive taxing, where those who make more money pay more back into the system, as that is benefitting for the most people, creating justice. With the media using citizenship as an argument for who should be allowed to access the welfare system, that could arguably be seen as unjust, as that means that all are not equal, and that there is an added value that comes with being a citizen.

With the principle of justice in institutions in mind, the idea that refugees should not have a right to the welfare system becomes complicated. If all have equal liberties in relation to another, and inequalities should be used to benefit everyone, there is no reason why refugees should not be allowed proper access to the system, as them not partaking adds nothing to the greater good of all, and their inability to access creates inequality. It instead becomes a question of citizenship; if there is an assumption that only citizens should be allowed access to the welfare system, it is possible to defend why refugees do not have set access. However, by doing so, the original idea provided by Rawls, where our different abilities, class etc. are disregarded from when deciding our rights, has been left behind. As long as citizenship is
used as an argument for not including some in the access to rights, a value has been added to
the individual having citizenship, which then creates inequality. This is, however, the kind of
argument that is used by the media when problematizing refugees; that their access to the
welfare system is done wrongly, or on behalf of someone else, who, arguably, as a greater
right of access. Hence, the medial view is putting citizenship as a major decider of who has
certain rights and who does not.

This can be tied back to the lack consensus about welfare systems in the world system. With
the lack of consensus on how the welfare system should adapt to the world system that exists
today, it is possible for the media to claim that refugees are taking advantage of a welfare
system that is not theirs, as they are not citizens and therefore do not have a right to partake in
this system. With the kind of portrait that is made by the media, it influences the viewer, and
we see how they are unlike the citizens, as they lack something the fundamental thing to be
considered entitled to equal rights; citizenship. This then creates a framework and base to
argue why refugees should not be taken into Sweden, and if it they are why they should not be
allowed to use the welfare system; Because their lack of citizenship means that they are not
like us, and are not contributing to the society to the same extent as a Swede would. By
creating this idea, where refugees are seen as inferior to a person with Swedish citizenship
while being in Sweden, it becomes acceptable to treat them differently. However, if Rawls
idea that what we are able to contribute to society is irrelevant in relation to what rights we
have, this would not be an argument that would hold true. So, even if there is no consensus on
the details of how the welfare state should work in the global world system, as long as there
was an agreement that all are to be treated equally based on the welfare system in place at
their place of residency, a part of the discussion could be avoided, and could then instead
focus on how the welfare system should work, rather than for whom by whom. The issue is
that there is no such consensus, as citizenship in itself puts a person in a superior position to
those without when it comes to claiming social rights. While in theory, most would probably
argue that they think that everyone is equal and have the same rights, in practice when it
comes down to using set rights, the idea that all have the same rights only holds true as long
as it does not affect us. By focusing on solemnly ourselves, and being unable to see to the
needs of others we are willing to sacrifice what was originally considered to be a right of all
in order to not threaten our own position. This can be done without evidence that it in fact
would affect our position, as long as there is a believed threat.
Part of the issue in the media is the lack of debate surrounding the welfare system. While it is used as an argument as to why refugees and other outsiders place a strain on society, there is no discussion on how it could be changed. It is evident that there are limitations, real or imagined, to what the welfare system can handle, but no alternatives are presented, nor what the limitations mean in reality and what would happen if they were breached. So long as there is no debate about the welfare system and the need for a consensus regarding it, a consensus is unlikely to occur.

The idea of solidarity seems to work in a similar way; solidarity can be found, so long as it does not affect our own way of life and leads to changes in our experienced existence. Further, when there is an outsider, it is easier to have solidarity to the group one experiences oneself as a part of, and using that as an argument as to why the others should not be a part. With the media having a large influence in how we perceive the world, them arguing that with more refugees getting benefits, someone else gets less, people feel a stronger sense of solidarity towards those who will get less, not realizing that by doing so, a sacrifice is made, where a person who we originally considered equal do not have the same rights as another. So long as there is no consensus that agrees that we all are equals, regardless of citizenship and individual qualities, and therefore all have the same right to take part of social rights, nationalism can, and most likely will, continue and be reinforced through the media.

5. Conclusion

This study has looked into the way that the media portrays refugees and how that in turn can help us understand the reoccurrence of nationalism. The study shows that the media, during both the time periods used for analysis, paint a picture of refugees as its own, homogenous group that is unlike the homogenous group that is considered the norm – Swedes. Refugees are seen as a passive group, seemingly without interest in partaking in society, while the Swedish government, institutions and citizens are doing what they can to make life as pleasant as possible for the refugees. What is prevalent throughout the portrait painted by the media is that refugees have nothing, or little, in common with the average Swede, which creates a problem for the Swedish society as it attempts to integrate refugees. Further, as, according to the media, the refugees themselves have very little interest in being integrated, the challenge becomes even greater.

While the portrayal of refugees in the media might not be the creator of nationalism in itself, it is a possible creator of xenophobia. With an increase in xenophobia, where people feel that
there are major differences between themselves and another group of people, that could in turn lead to a stronger support for nationalist parties, as the nationalist parties are likely to highlight the issues surrounding multiculturalism and a supposed threat towards the nation, its values and traditions. However, this is not certain, and other factors need to be taken into consideration when trying to understand nationalism.

If nationalism is something which power we wish to limit, a change may need to occur. As the media has the power to influence how its receiver sees an issue, it has a great responsibility in how it portrays certain issues. As long as refugees are portrayed as outsiders, not fitting into the norm and seemingly without an interest to interact with other members of society, the media is reinforcing the notion of a division between us and them. If the media where to instead portray a picture of refugees as individuals with their own stories and motivations, and not just of stories of when refugees are an issue, a larger understanding for refugees might be possible. Further, it could make the receiver see refugees not just based on that branding, but as human beings with rights, feelings and personal histories that are to be valued equally to their own.

The idea of these two different, homogenous groups with little in common creates a discussion about who has the rights to certain institutions, particularly those within the welfare system. The notion that refugees are coming to Sweden and using our welfare system is not uncommon, which further creates a difference between us and them, the norm and the outsider. As refugees are seen as not contributing to the national welfare system of Sweden, their right to access this system is questioned. Hence, rights become tied to citizenship.

With rights being tied to citizenship, the argument that refugees are reaping the benefits of something that is not theirs can be, and is, used. As this is an argument used by nationalists to argue that refugees should not be welcomed to Sweden, and if they are, it is with limited rights, nationalism can continue as long as there is no consensus on how the right of access to a welfare system is to be decided. This consensus needs to be drawn in such a way that the question of citizenship becomes invalid in the discussion, in order to remove the argument from the nationalist agenda. If all people are considered equal, in their importance and rights, the idea that citizenship should be what decides who has the right to take part in the welfare system becomes obsolete, as that would mean that citizenship is something that puts a person higher in the hierarchy.
In order to achieve a consensus on how the welfare system is supposed to work, and for whom, the debate needs to be brought up. While the media tends to use the access to welfare as an argument when debating the issues surrounding refugees, there is limited debate on how the welfare system works and how it should work. To get a debate going, it is not enough to say that refugees are using a welfare system that some would argue is not theirs, but also highlight what the implications of this is, as well as what can be done to change it. No system is perfect, but by not raising the question of why the system has the limits that it has, there is little chance for change or improvement.

How this consensus is to be drawn, and by whom, is unclear. In order for it to be as effective as possible, it needs to be drawn in such a way that it is applicable to all participants of the global world. While this study has not come up with a solution for how to solve the problem of lack of consensus in the welfare system, hopefully it can be used as a stepping stone for research aiming to answer just that. By raising the awareness of the lack of debate about how the welfare system should work and for whom, leading to a lack of consensus, something can be done to change it, which is the hope for this study; to raise the awareness, which in the long run will create change.
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Attacks on refugees in Bulgaria

Turkey moves Syrian refugees

More benefitting to take in refugees

Palestinian refugees gets put in separate camps

Refugees in flip-flops upsetting

Few refugees despite low unemployment rate

Billström wants the EU to take in more Syrians

Refugees from Syria travelling to Sweden via USA

Refugees from Syria travelling to Sweden via the US


Refugees does not want to live in Varberg


Around 29,000 refugees in Swedish facilities

Egyptian refugees refused leaving Iraq.

Refugees in Poland take the route over East Germany to Sweden.

Albanian refugees broke out of the stadium.

Lack of refugees problem for northern municipalities.

Denmark wants to make a difference between refugees and immigrants.

Too many refugees, according to every other Swede.

Iraqi refugees testify about massacre.

Manifestation for refugees in Sjöbo.
Moderat förslag: Låt flyktingar städa stränder.

Moderate suggestion: Let refugees clean beaches.

Tjugofem miljoner barn flyktingar.

25 million children refugees.

Ungdomar för hårdare politik mot flyktingar.

Youth in favor of harsher politics towards refugees.

70 somaliska flyktingar mördade.

70 Somali refugees murdered.

Flyktingar från forna Jugoslavien fick nödfallsvisum i Ystad.

Refugees from former Yugoslavia got emergency visa in Ystad.

Flyktingar utbildas i ämnet svensk sex och kvinnosyn.

Refugees educated in the subject Swedish sex and view of women.

Få flyktingar flyttar.

Danmark ska ta emot tusentals flyktingar.

Denmark to take in thousands of refugees.
AB05FFDB4D91732D99E48BD85FA7E5B&serviceId=2 (accessed 2016-01-10) [translated from Swedish: Few refugees move]


Municipalities tightens to more refugees

The church gives legal help to refugees

Malmö takes in fewer refugees

Many available apartments – but not for refugees

Norwegian refugees protect more refugees

The police did not want to enter church – deportation of refugees cancelled

SIFO-survey about refugees: contradictory results

Fight between Swedes and refugees in Tranemo

Tortured refugees sent home to torturing regime

Amnesty anklagar Turkiet: politiska flyktingar tvingas till hemlandet


Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå (2014) *Hundratals flyktingar räddade*, available at: 

Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå (2014) *Kenya stänger in flyktingar i läger*, available at: 


Ullenhag, E. (2012) *"Flyktingar ska tvingas flytta till erbjudet arbete"*, Dagens Nyheter, available at: 
http://web.retriever-info.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/services/archive/displayDocument?documentId=05091520120902165593&serviceId=2 (accessed 2016-01-12) [translated from Swedish: *"Refugees will be forced to move to offered job*]


Became a millionaire of refugees. Smugglers own accounting could convict him.


