

Swedishness in Swedish Integration Policy

A Thesis Regarding the Function of Contemporary Swedish
Integration Policy and the Articulation of a Hegemonic
Discourse on Swedishness



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Abstract

This thesis is about Swedish integration policy. The thesis suggests that integration policy inexorably leads to the question of who is to be integrated into what and in that way it holds an immanent categorizing practice. The theoretical points of departure in this thesis proposes that Swedish integration policy, through this categorizing practice, has a productive function as it articulates a discourse on swedishness. The thesis uses the theoretical concepts of hegemony and dislocations in order to understand how a normal swedishness is articulated while other possibilities are dislocated. The thesis suggests that a Swedish subject is produced and positioned through such a discourse. The aim of this thesis is to understand how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated and how a Swedish subject is positioned and produced within the limits of this discourse. To illustrate how swedishness and a Swedish subject is put in a seemingly self-evident position, the thesis looks at the articulations of the hegemonic discourse on swedishness comparing the periods 1975-1982 on the one hand and 1997-2003 on the other. The periods are identified from the point of departure in which goals and guidelines have been formulated in Swedish integration policy. Two legislative bills are actual in this respect, one from 1975 and one from 1997/98 and are the empirical foundation for this thesis. In order to nuance the analysis and look more practically on Swedish integration policy, an analysis of social introduction material issued by the Swedish Board of Immigration/Integration and directed to newly arrived immigrants are made. Concluding, the thesis suggests that a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated in a way that connects swedishness to a specific sort of responsibility and desired employment and that this has a disciplinary function in the reproduce of a class positioned Swedish subject.

Key words: Integration, Social introduction, Hegemony, Discourse, Swedishness

Table of Content

1	Integration Policy – An Introduction	1
1.1	Research Background	2
1.2	Aim and Questions	4
2	Theoretical Points of Departure	6
2.1	The Limits of Social Production	6
2.1.1	Interpellation	8
2.1.2	Experience and Fantasy	9
2.2	The Hegemony and Field of Discursivity of Swedishness	9
2.2.1	Discourse Analysis.....	11
2.2.2	Swedishness and a Swedish Subject.....	12
2.3	Legislative Bills and Social Introduction - Material Selection.....	13
2.3.1	Outlines	14
3	Initial Steps of Swedish Integration Policy 1975-1982	15
3.1	The Bill of 1975 and the Origin of Cultural Difference	15
3.1.1	Housing Issues	17
3.1.2	Organisations and Religious Communities.....	18
3.1.3	The Process of Cultural Differentiation.....	19
3.2	The Bill of 1975 - A Responsible and Regulated Struggling Labour Force.....	19
3.2.1	The Contours of a Hegemonic Discourse on Swedishness in 1975.....	22
3.3	The Social Introductions of Swedish Integration Policy 1978 & 1982	23
3.3.1	Regulated Struggle.....	25
3.4	Summarized Conclusions.....	26
4	A ”New Direction” of Swedish Integration Policy in 1997-2003	28
4.1	The Bill of 1997/98 - Goals Reformulated?.....	28
4.1.1	”Exposed Residential Areas”	30
4.1.2	”Participation and Influence”	32
4.2	”Labour and Earning a Living”	33
4.2.1	A Discourse on Swedishness – Hegemony Changed?.....	35
4.3	“Sweden – a pocket guide” – Social introduction issued in 2003	36
4.3.1	Responsibly Non-struggling	38
4.4	Summarized Conclusions.....	39
5	Summarized Conclusions	41
6	References	44

1 Integration Policy – An Introduction

“Almost every child in Sweden is born on hospital. Usually the father or a friend or family is present during the delivery. The father of the child, use to participate during most of the day. Women with a heavy work has the right to be transferred to easier work tasks during pregnancy.”
(Swedish Board of Integration 2003:180)

The excerpt could be an advice, taken from a brochure at an antenatal clinic, preventing or easing a fully understandable anxiety during pregnancy. To have a basic understanding and knowledge of rights and what is to be expected could with some certainty feel good as ones life situation is about to change. However, the excerpt is not from such a brochure. The excerpt comes from an integration policy project in 2003. The project was issued in accordance to governmental directives, initiated 1975, and resulted in four books of social introduction to the Swedish society. The books targeted newly arrived immigrants or those who had been permitted permanent residency in the country. The description of the pregnancy, the birth, the mother or the father, hardly constitute an ineffectual advice. I mean that specific swedishness understood as an effect of articulated norms that regulates the limits for true or real cultural specifics are reproduced. To be more precise, I mean that norms regarding gender and class are reproduced through articulation of swedishness in Swedish integration policy, and that is the point of departure of this thesis.

During the period from 1954 to 1966¹, immigration to Sweden was practically unregulated. Several researchers suggest that the general discourse, through which this unregulated immigration is understood, was in practice, to meet the increased demand on the labour market, in a heavily expanding economy of a country spared from the worst consequences of the World War II (Frank 2005, Arnstberg 2008). From 1945 and onwards, the immigration to Sweden accelerated, and apart from the early years of the 1970's, Sweden has had a positive immigration quota, with more people immigrating than emigrating (Dahlström 2004:49). The reason for why immigration to Sweden became restricted during the 1960's is, according to research on Swedish integration policy, mostly regarded as a consequence of the economic regression in the mid 1960's and of the global economical crisis in 1973 (Sarstrand 2007:18, Frank 2005:80). While the economical regression and the crisis might explain why immigration to Sweden was restricted it does not alone however, explain why a goal oriented generalized integration policy was put

¹ After negotiations between the Trade Unions (LO) the Swedish Employee Association (SAF) the Departments of Internal Affairs and the National Employment Office (AMS) in the 1960s, non-Nordic citizens had to have work and residence permit before entering Sweden. From the first of January 1966 this rule was put in affect. (Sarstrand 2007:18).

into place. Such a general policy was initiated as the Swedish Board of Immigration was initiated in 1968 and goals and guidelines were formulated in the legislative bill 1975:26 (Legislative bill 1975:26). Since then, these goals and guidelines have been reformulated once in 1998 (Legislative bill 1997/98:16). In this thesis I will discuss Swedish integration policy. I will focus empirically on two sets of documents. First I will analyse the goals and guidelines formulated in the bills 1975:26 and 1997/98:16. Second, I will look at the books of social introduction issued by the Swedish Board of Immigration/integration in 1978, 1982 and 2003. The two sets of material are studied together in order to understand the function of Swedish integration policy. The goals and guidelines of Swedish integration policy has throughout the years focused on providing equality and a common understanding but I mean that the policy has had the function of reproducing certain power relations.

I mean this on the basic understanding that talking about integration policy inexorably leads to the question of who is to be integrated in to what. This is the immanent categorizing practice through which integration policy is formulated, and it cannot be parted from the practice that defines who is what, what signifies her/him and which material and symbolic objects that belongs to whom. Ultimately, when Swedish integration policy defines who is what and what signifies her/him, this is a part of a normalizing practice that defines the limits of who is to be regarded as a Swede and who is not, what is to be regarded as swedishness and what is not and what is legitimate and acceptable within those limits and what is not. I would even argue that for the integration policy to function, it has to overcome any threatening similarities, even if it requires the invention and continued articulations of difference. This is in direct conflict with the goals of overcoming difference formulated in the Swedish integration policy since its initiation in the late 1960's. The origin of this thesis could be situated in the questions of *what function the Swedish integration policy have in terms of what is preserved, protected and reproduced, as the limits of the legitimate or acceptable are drawn through the categorizing and normalizing practice?* Following this, I will look at the production and positioning of a Swedish Subject, through articulations of norms regarding class, gender and ethnicity. Hence, this is a thesis on the articulations of norms through which the limits of swedishness and the positions are made available for a Swedish subject in terms of class and gender within those limits and how they are produced in the formulation of Swedish integration policy.

1.1 Research Background

The inspiration, leading up to this thesis, urge for a description of research background from two separate directions. First we have a tradition of research that aims to understand the production of subjects through institutionalized normalizing practices in society. Inspired mainly by Foucault these research projects submit to a critical analysis. In such analysis it is central to identify the

limits of the intelligible, the production of norms, how they have been formulated, modified and mobilized. Questions regarding what forces the norms exercise on the one hand and identify which specific conditions that has been central for their appearance and variations are constitutive of this particular tradition of research (Foucault 1993:42). Tina Mattson, for example, studies the normalizing function of social work as she tries to understand how gender is “represented, reproduced, fostered and formed” through the practices of social workers (Mattsson 2005:11-12). In her dissertation she studies the institutionalisation and reproduction of specific norms that reproduce gender through what is called the heterosexual matrix. The term is introduced by Judith Butler and describes the process through which a presumed coherence between sex, gender and desire is rearticulated or performatively imitated. In Mattssons case this is studied through state institution of treatment centres (Mattsson 2005:26). Mattson makes interviews in such state institutions but in this thesis I will look at legislative bills and social introduction directed to immigrants and Sara Edenheims dissertation (2005), which works within the same theoretical tradition, would describe a relevant research background better in relation to material selection of this thesis. Edenheim studies Governmental Official Reports (SOU) in order to understand from the point of which needs certain sexual related norms are reproduced (Edenheim 2005:13). She does this in order to provide a critique of a governmental policy that aims at including non-heterosexual practices or expectations in the normal while simultaneously reproducing dislocations, or to use her vocabulary, abjections, with a moralizing and limiting function (Edenheim 2005:232). Several such research projects have been done in recent years. Among these are Andres Brink Pinto, who analyse how norms regarding class was produced through the early Swedish “communist movements descriptions of sex and sexuality“ (Brink Pinto 2008:20). Nils Hammarén could also be mentioned here as he in his dissertation make interviews with “young men in a ‘multicultural’ context” in order to understand how they “construct gender and sexuality” (Hammarén 2008:45). This is the first part of research background that inspired this thesis.

Secondly, there is research projects that in different ways tries to understand Swedish integration policy. Among these are Hammars (1964) research project, who in his germinal dissertation in a field that tries to understand the effects of Immigration policy argues that the development of restricted immigration has gone from xenophobic, racist or anti-Semitic perceptions of protecting the Germanic race to a situation in which the Swedish labour market is to be protected during the period 1900-1932 (Hammar 1964:376). One of Hammars main conclusions are that “Even if the Swedish labour movement was internationalist in principle and advocated free immigration and emigration in its program, its representatives in Parliament as well as its press protested against the importation of foreign labour, used as a weapon in trade union conflicts.” (Hammar 1964:397). More recent research made in the empirical field of integration policy looks at changes in the discursive formations of the Swedish nation-state and migration discourses. Among these can Johansson (2005) and Borevi (2002) be mentioned as they both looks at how migrants are described in relation to what is perceived as Swedish. Johansson concludes that a discursive change has occurred

during the period 1960-1990 in which immigration first was seen both as a resource and a burden while in the end of that period they are mainly understood as an economical and social burden (Johansson 2005:259). Johansson and Borevi are working within a research tradition that looks at the intersection of welfare state construction and the discursive production of immigrants while others have focused more explicitly on the labour market. Denis Frank (2005) could be used as an example that describes this explicit focus on the labour market in relation to Swedish integration policy as he in his dissertation analyse immigration policy during the period 1960-1972 and the recruitment of foreign labour force. The dissertation takes its point of departure in an understanding of the formulation of Swedish integration policy as highly influenced by the Swedish trade union movement and the National Employment Office (AMS). In this way he tries to co-analyse governmental regulations and immigrants position on the labour market. Frank does, as I in this thesis, understand the formulation of Swedish integration policy as constituting a “extensive system of surveillance and control of the immigrants” (Frank 2005:210). Finally I find it relevant to mention the research made by Michael Azars (2001 & 2006) who explicitly investigates articulations of swedishness with a theoretical as well as analytical point of departure that bring research on the production of subjects and the research on Swedish integration policy together. What Azar does is to make a theoretical as well as analytical interventions with the aim to understand the discursive formation of swedishness as he asks questions like, which “interests finds the concept ‘true Swede’ strategically valuable in the struggle for different privileges” (Azar 2001:68). The origin of this thesis is situated a question regarding the function of Swedish integration policy. The research background presented in this section serves to show the diverse intersections of a theoretical tradition that looks at the production of subjects and a empirical/analytical tradition that looks at Swedish integration policy, discursive articulations and changes within the formulations of this policy and finally what strategic purpose the articulations of a certain swedishness in Swedish integration policy serves. On this basis, I will present and specify the aim and questions of this thesis in the following section.

1.2 Aim and Questions

In order to specify the aim through a presentation of the key questions I find it adequate to give a brief introduction to the theoretical points of departure of this thesis. Michael Foucault’s developments on power and the subject are the most important contributions to the theoretical framework of this thesis. First because Foucault presents an understanding of power not only as repressive but also as productive of social relations. This means that social relations are an effect of a specific system of disciplinary norms reproduced through articulations of institutionalised social acts (Foucault 2002:103). The effect of understanding social relations through power as productive is that social positions such as gender, class or ethnicity does not pre-exist the articulations of them but is the

effect of them. This leads to the second point in which Foucault questions meaning as hidden in an origin. This means that fatherhood or swedishness does not pre-exist the articulations of for example 'Usually the father or a friend or family is present during the delivery' but is the effect of the repetition of the articulations (Foucault 1981:93). This theoretical points of departure means that subjects does not pre-exist their strategic political invocation, even though they are articulated as if the categories are constant and only the historical circumstances vary over time (Scott 2001:285). By a presumed continuity between past and present for example, again returning to the quote introducing this chapter, by connecting the social introduction to the Swedish society with '*usually* the father... etcetera', the meaning, truth or reality of fatherhood, swedishness or its connection are reproduced. This means that what we perceive/accept as reality is contingent, as fatherhood or swedishness has no authentic ontological core, and that any political rationality at a specific time and place can choose parts of the past strategically (Edenheim 2005:15). In order to understand a social situation, one must therefore understand the history of the present, how that which we take for granted has become self-evident. It is now possible to specify the point of departure of this thesis, in an understanding in which the analysis of how production of social relations functions, enables us to critically scrutiny norms or seemingly fixed position.

A precondition for understanding this thesis' research questions is that swedishness is understood as an effect of articulated norms regulating limits for real cultural specificity, inside of which I will call hegemony. Likewise, a Swedish subject should be understood as the position a person embraces/receive within those limits. This means that swedishness and a Swedish subject are effects of a contemporary political rationality rather than a natural consequence of a mutual historical past or cultural heritage. *The aim of this thesis is to understand how swedishness is articulated and how a Swedish subject is positioned and produced through Swedish integration policy.* This implicates to identify norms that constitute swedishness, understand how a Swedish subject is produced and positioned within those limits and by doing that providing an understanding for the function of contemporary Swedish integration policy. In order to put norms or seemingly fixed position to critical scrutiny I will analyse the contemporary political rationality through which a Swedish integration policy is formulated. To illustrate how things we take for granted have been put in a seemingly self-evident or fixed position I will look at changes in this contemporary political rationality. Practically this means to identify how swedishness is and has been articulated in the Swedish integration policy. These preconditions and aim can be crystallized into three research questions:

- How is a hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in the Swedish integration policy?
- How does this hegemony position and produce a Swedish subject?
- What discursive changes in the hegemonic discourse on swedishness can be identified articulated in Swedish integration policy between 1975-1982 on the one hand and 1997-2003 on the other?

2 Theoretical Points of Departure

This chapter aims to set out the theoretical framework and methodological tools of this thesis. In the first section of this chapter I will describe my theoretical point of departure in a Foucaultian definition of power as productive. This will be important in order to understand how articulation constitutive of a discourse on Swedishness functions disciplinarily, producing and positioning subjects. In the second section of this chapter I will put this understanding of power in relation to the theoretical concept of hegemony and methodological tools developed by Laclau & Mouffe. Central in regard to the concept of hegemony is the concepts of dislocation and the field of discursivity as a way of understanding the production of a coherent subject. In order to systematically analyse these dislocations I will use the Laclau & Mouffian methodological tools of nodal point, element and logics of equivalence.

If Swedishness is regarded as authentic or coherent it is because it has the ability to be reinvented in every new historical situation. It must function so that every change in the political development of a society can be incorporated within its discursive limits. It must function so that it can adapt to new real political predicaments of the present and only through its flexibility can it be of use in legitimating truth claims upon which norms are reproduced. In order to withhold such a flexibility, ways to investigate, examine, and inspect is refined constructing a system of categorization and differentiation. Michael Azar argues that the differentiation functions so to externalize societal antagonisms threatening the fantasy of total unity constitutive of a social community through an assumed outside threat (Azar 2006:17). Hence, this chapter will describe the theoretical relationship between an “outside” constituting the “inside” in order to produce the hegemony of a discourse on Swedishness and the positions available for a Swedish subject.

2.1 The Limits of Social Production

Power is often understood as functioning between one point and another, the power over something, but in this thesis I will look at power as a question of the limits of intelligibility. What is a legitimate claim of knowledge and why, in a given historical moment? In relation to this thesis, power is understood as the production of limits regarding the ontological answer to the question of what a Swede really is. As described through the quote in the introduction, the Swedish integration policy is permeated by answers to this question, which produces such limits. In an articulation that describes the common way to do something, power

and knowledge is interwoven in a practice that categorizes hierarchical, signifying the Swede through a claim of knowledge. According to Foucault, power is omnipresent and “produces things, induces pleasures, forms knowledge, produces discourse... [and is] considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body...” (Foucault 1981:119). I will elaborate the definition of discourse used in this thesis later but I believe a brief description to be necessary. Continuing to use the signifying claim of knowledge of Swedes as persons who gives birth or participates in the delivery, a discourse is the structured totality enabling the articulatory practice of the mother who not only gives birth, but does it on the hospital, who works but are transferred to easier tasks, the father who participates and the explicit articulations of the normal about this situation, (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:105). This means that in order to understand the production of a Swedish subject one must understand the relationship between signifying knowledge claims, discourses and its material manifestation. In order to start describing how I use a foucaultian definition of power I will continue this theoretical discussion of how subjects are produced, by describing Foucault’s interpretation of panopticon.

In the book “Surveillance and Punishment” (2003) Foucault tries to understand the genealogy of institutionalized discipline in the production of subjects. His conclusions could be summarized as illustrating a development from physical punishment and concealment of what was regarded as deviate from contemporary claims of knowledge during the years 1600-1700 to a spiritual or mental process of disciplinary measures in which the illumination, inspection and correction was central (Foucault 2003 x & 137). The concept panopticon functions as an allegory to illustrate how the production of subjects functions. Panopticon is a prison with a watchtower in the middle of a circular construction with subdivided prison cells, enabling the inspector to see but not be seen. This positions the prisoners under the constant potential situation of being watched. In this position the prisoner becomes an object from which information is gathered. Foucault argues that as power makes progress and discovers new things to know in a field it develops the observation mechanisms, which makes power effective, with the ability to go deeper into the behaviour of humans (Foucault 2003:205). In the bill of 1975, substantial monetary means and guidelines, for gathering information and keep statistics of the immigrants, are decided upon and I will regard these measures both as a precondition for the production of social introductions which will be analyzed and also as a part of this foucaultian understanding of power as effective and productive of subjects (Legislative bill 1975:26:87-89 & 106). The prison functions as an allegory for society and the prisoner as the subject. Furthermore and centrally, it is in this way power functions automatically by making the subject aware of that one can see her, through a potential relation. In this relation, the subject becomes the principle for its own regulation i.e. it is regulating herself through awareness of norms and normality that governs her interpretations of intelligible positions and the “right” behaviour (Foucault 2003:201ff). Consequently or in the same way, the awareness or perceptions of norms is also governed. The social introduction is, in this thesis regarded as a compilation of norms with this productive function. I would argue

that it is in this way one can read articulations in the bills and social introductions as producer of intelligibilities with a purpose to produce new truths and disband old ones, through which patterns of behaviour can change or be corrected and in which individuals can be punished. It is, furthermore, through the panoptical systems design as a categorizing and correcting schedule that we can understand how norms can work as institutional practices concerning the production of gender, class and ethnic positions and vice versa. The communication of the panopticon “awareness” is what I will call interpellation.

2.1.1 Interpellation

The term interpellation describes the process of subjection, the process through which an individual becomes a subject through awareness of norms and was introduced by Louis Althusser (1971). He regards the norms (ideology) as mediated through what he called “the ideological state apparatus”, schools, religion, law systems etcetera, as hailing individuals through recognising and naming them (1971:143). The classical example of this process, given by Althusser, is the situation in which the police hails out “you there!” and the individual turns around which is subjection in its most crystallized expression (Althusser 1971:174). The individual is made a subject through the articulation of norms, which achieves a turn, a subjectivation. The critique on Althusser's interpretation of the term interpellation in relation to the previous sections discussions on panopticon would reside from a potential inconsequence in the practise of naming which Althusser does not regard. Butler argues that “the police” who hails can hail as he reiterates a institutionalised convention and the individual turns through the panopticon awareness, a “self-attribution of guilt” and acceptance of the interpellating demands for aligning with the law (Butler 1997b:107). Butler continues by arguing that “In this sense, the police *cite* the convention of hailing, participate in an utterance that is indifferent to the one who speaks it” (Butler 1997b:107). The act “works in part because of the citational dimension of the speech act, the historicity of convention that exceeds and enables the moment of its enunciation.” (Butler 1997a:33). This means, according to Butler, that the law is “broken” prior to having access to the law and that guilt is prior to the knowledge of the law which I argues means that an interpellation always runs the risk of being misinterpreted or fail to constitute the reality or truth that it claims to constitute (Butler 1997b:108 &129). With this theoretical point of departure a Swedish subject does not become an indicator of a cluster of experience but a normative ideal of an intelligible position i.e. with no authentic or original ontological foundation (Butler 1990:16). Furthermore does the failure of interpellations present a first step in understanding resistance or ruptures in the production of subjects. It means that a Swedish subject does not have the experience of being a Swede but is constituted as Swede through the act of for example giving birth on a hospital while the interpellation fails at the point in which women chooses not to give birth at all.

2.1.2 Experience and Fantasy

In the attempts to gain equality for all potential Swedish subjects, the 1975 and 1998 bills as well as the social introductions build on an understanding of a mutual division of cultural difference between immigrants and Swedes. Here we can return to the point made in the introductory chapter regarding how identities and subjects should not be understood as pre-existing their strategic political invocation. The feminist historian Joan Scott (1992, 1996 & 2001) discusses the production of subjects and connects it to the theoretical term of fantasy as she investigates the agency of feminist activists struggling for equal rights. In these discussions she develops the theoretical term fantasy, in order to show how subjects identify retrospectively through “imagined repetitions and repetitions of imagined resemblance” (Scott 2001:287-288). She argues that retrospective identification is enabled through a fantasy echo of a coherence between a subjects past and presence and as an echo constitutes an imperfect sound the repetition of the fantasy is not exact (Scott 2001:287). This means that an articulated mutual division of cultural difference between immigrant and Swedes in the bills or social introductions constitutes a fantasy of swedishness which functions as the settings for desire, enabling retrospective identification through the self regulative and effective productive power. It is not the experience of being a Swede that is interesting in this thesis but the production of a Swedish subject through an enabled retrospective identification with, for example, participation of the father during pregnancy in Sweden. The fantasy is the swedishness of those acts, the settings for a desire of the family as such and a certain responsibility connected to a common way to relate to the family and a common way to behave as a Swedish father. This is, at the same time not only a theoretical point of departure to explain how the Swedish subject is produced through interpellating norms regarding gender, how the empirical material is approach or how research questions are formulated. This constitutes an ontological critique that I explicitly wish to position in a tradition of research that was stringently captured by the historian Sara Edenheim who aimed, like this thesis does, at achieving “a future change that does not rearticulate historically retrospectively reproduced subject categories...” (Edenheim 2005:231). In relation to the production of a Swedish subject I believe this to be of absolute necessity if the Swedish integrations policy would aim at subverting inequality. The failure of interpellations and the imperfect sound of the fantasy echo are the first steps in understanding resistance and ruptures in the production of subjects.

2.2 The Hegemony and Field of Discursivity of Swedishness

Up until now I have described the theoretical points of departure for how to understand articulations of swedishness in the bills and social introductions with a

interpellating, self-regulative and productive power as what enables a retrospective identification with swedishness and thus produces and positions a Swedish subjects. Looking at how norms and articulations of normality in the Swedish integration policy constitutes specific needs and desires is not only a descriptive task but a concern through which it is potentially possible to understand how a Swedish subject is class and gender positioned. To look at discursive changes in the hegemony constitutive of a Swedish subject would then constitute a critique of how knowledge claims regarding cultural differentiation normalize specific class and gender positions of a Swedish subject. It provides the means by which the Swedish integration policy could be understood as an institutionalisation and mechanism of disciplinary power.

Using the prison or the panopticon as allegory for social production could, however, indicate a historical determinism, it could risk giving norms and power relations the status of self-evident facts, or give the impression that nothing is changeable unless it gains the power of a certain fixation of knowledge. What I mean is that in Foucault's discussion about the panopticon, resistance, i.e. a theoretical understanding of the situation in which power fails to produce the intelligibility it sets out to constitute, is not discussed in depth. Scott's discussions on the function and production of fantasy, or Butlers interpretation of interpellations, indicates a site of resistance or rupture in the retrospective identification that is not explicitly specified in Foucault's discussion. He simply concludes that wherever there is power, there will be resistance and that social change is due to struggles at the intersection of knowledge claims, discourses and power (Foucault 2002:105). Meanwhile, to suggest any objective outside to power, in this case in the production of a Swedish subject, a site from which it is possible to ignore the function of productive power would be to ignore the historicity, that is, the antagonisms in which the social is constituted.

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) engage in this particular problem in their book "Hegemony and Socialist Strategies" in which they try to understand the relationship between interiority/exteriority of power². Laclau and Mouffe introduces the terms "the field of discursivity" and "hegemony" in which the later is the strive for universality, omnipresence or total determination, and how this is done through dislocations in political processes. They do it, drawing upon the Lacanian concept of "the constitutive outside" which could be described as an intersection of a de Saussureian linguistic interpretation of the constitutive relation between language and reality on the one hand and the psychoanalytical trauma of fragmentation in subjectifying processes on the other (Laclau & Zac 1994:31 and Bergström & Boréus 2005:315). What they provide is an understanding of hegemony as a re-composition of an absent totality, dependent on the dislocation of diversity (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:7 & 93). This provides the preconditions for a

² What they do is to make a theoretical intervention and directs critique towards the discussion of the classical Marxist understanding of the exteriority of power as the proletariat's overtaking of economy through the Party. This is a theoretical point of departure enacted by for example radical feminism as well, who regard the exteriority of power as women overthrowing patriarchy through sisterhood.

post-structuralist interpretation of reality and truth in which things are structured in a relational system that due to the dislocations are in itself contingent and unstable (Winter Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:16-17 & 50). That means that if the dislocated signifier is presumed within any given naturalised totality it cannot be understood as total and stable but always potentially failing as a result of its own fragile foundation. The theoretical understanding of this contingency or instability has been discussed in the previous section as the failure of interpellation or the imperfect return of sound that the fantasy echo constitutes and my interpretation of these theoretical terms is the field of discursivity. The field of discursivity is the dislocation of particularities, which in turn subverts the very idea of origin, as what is not granted access in the universal is the very precondition for its universality (Winter Jørgensen & Philips 2000:36). To be more accurate, any universal claim, hegemonizing practice, is political, an active dislocation, and contingent, an inherent instability of the limit of the universal due to this dislocation. Any claims of universal truth regarding Swedishness such as the behaviour of the Swedish father and mother, is an active political dislocation of the immanent possibility of potential other ways to relate to fatherhood, motherhood, Swedishness and thus the positions available for a Swedish subject. This renders the hegemony constitutive of a Swedish subject contingent. I argue that Laclau and Mouffe's interpretation of the field of discursivity, that which is dislocated from the intelligible hence threaten the hegemony of a Swedish subject, is what gives the Foucaultian panopticon an outside, a potential site of resistance (Winter Jørgensen & Philips 2000:45). This is the theoretical explanation of the main methodological position of this thesis in which norms and seemingly fixed positions are critically scrutinized by showing how knowledge and power constitutes a more or less systematic way of ordering the world and to follow the potential failures which indicates its emergence i.e. where it fails to constitute the intelligibility it promises (Butler 2004:215). As mentioned above, the structured totality of articulatory practices, the systematic way of ordering the world, is what Laclau and Mouffe calls discourse and in what follows I will discuss and describe the understanding of discourse in this thesis and its purpose.

2.2.1 Discourse Analysis

In order to analyse a discourse Laclau and Mouffe introduces the analytical tools of nodal point, elements, and logics of equivalence in which elements are signs that constitutes the contingent fixation of meaning (Winter Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:34). Any discourse is constituted to dominate the field of discursivity through dislocations of differences and by doing so it construct a centre. It is this centre of a discourse that is called nodal point (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:112). The nodal point of a discourse is a privileged sign, in the sense that other signs (elements) are structured in relation to the nodal point of the discourse (Winter Jørgensen & Philips 2000:33). The nodal point of a discourse is the sign in relation to which all other elements within a certain fixation of meaning are structured, and the logics of equivalence is the very structure, the systematic

through which the world is ordered and given meaning, literally speaking (Winter Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:50). To answer the question of how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated in the Swedish integration policy would be to show how swedishness is articulated as nodal point and how different elements are structured in relation to the nodal point to give meaning to each others. Furthermore, to understand which potential situations or meanings that are dislocated would be a central step towards understanding the function of Swedish integration policy, the contemporary political rationality through which it is formulated and the social antagonisms that are active in its articulations. A way to specify the question of how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated would be to ask for the limits of meaning, truth and reality through which swedishness is reproduced. Central in this aspect is what is regarded and articulated as the normal or truly Swedish and what are dislocated in those statements, which possible or potential realities are dislocated in order to constitute a totality? This would be a matter of looking for sights upon which articulations such as “most Swedes does...”, “in Sweden its normal to...”, “in Sweden you will have the possibility to...” etcetera, are made. It is a matter of identifying the production of discursive limits. Methodologically speaking this is called a deconstruction of a discourse, it is the opposite to a hegemonizing practice and serves the purpose to identifying potential failures and showing the contingency of a hegemonic discourse. What I will do in the analysis to meet with the purpose and research questions of this thesis is to identify the limits of the intelligible, to understand the relation between the reproduction of hegemony and the ways in which the field of discursivity constantly threatens the hegemony.

2.2.2 Swedishness and a Swedish Subject

It is now possible to specify the usage of the central concepts of swedishness and a Swedish subject and connect them to the second question of how the hegemonic discourse on swedishness positions and produce a Swedish subject? I have defined swedishness as an effect of articulated norms regulating limits for true or real cultural specificity and a Swedish subject as the position a person embraces/receive within those limits. I will make no explicit difference between ethnic or cultural difference in this thesis. A specification of this definition would be to say that a Swedish subject is produced when swedishness functions as producing discursive limits that connects to a normative content of common Swedish interests, values or laws, elements organised in logics of equivalence. It is the normative content of articulated common Swedish interests, values, laws etcetera, as interpellations, that class positions a Swedish subject and reproduce gender relations within its limits. This means that a Swedish subject is produced when swedishness is articulated in a process of normalisation and becomes an object of desire that is shared with others regarded as being within the limits of its hegemonic expression. To identify and understand the discursive limits of swedishness should then be understood as the front line of social antagonism, the sight upon which norms and seemingly fixed positions could be shown not only

contingent but also as a part of the strive for different desires or a different future than what the contemporary political rationality promises. That is resistance in its basic form and, potentially, this thesis' contribution to a critical research tradition. Connecting to this thesis last question regarding discursive changes in the hegemonic discourse on swedishness would be to look at how the contemporary political rationality changes and provide an understanding of the function of Swedish integration policy. This would be a matter, not only about, showing the contingency of the discourse but also to understand which social antagonisms that are central in the contemporary Swedish society. Providing such an understanding would give the means by which norms and seemingly fixed positions could be scrutinized and potentially show how resistance works.

2.3 Legislative Bills and Social Introduction - Material Selection

Acknowledging that there will always be sites of gaps and failures in a researchers desire for control as well as in any claim of universality, is to look at ones claims as historical. This enables an understanding of knowledge as a condensed node in an antagonistic power field (Haraway 1988:577), and that the way in which one enters this field is crucial (Skeggs 2006:55-64). Collection of data should not be separated or perceived as a specific phase before the analysis begins. Rather it is a matter of identifying a field and after the initial collection exercise, carrying out the first analysis, finding indicators for particular constitutive elements of a discourse, systematically categorise them and collect further data (Tischer et al 2007:76). Similar to Beverley Skeggs definition of a valid research I let validity be understood as not only logical coherence but as a trustworthy and cogently performed research (Skeggs 2006). In order to meet the aim of this thesis I identified, what I consider to be key legislative bills. By key legislative bills I mean bills that have a constitutive impact on policy decisions through goal-oriented formulations which functions as guidelines in the Swedish integration bureaucracy. It served a double purpose as it simultaneously gives me the possibility to orientate chronologically in a diverse field and identify key points, which could serve as analytical points of departure. In this way I made analytical demarcations in time, literally speaking and in space, regarding the concrete articulations and their discursive expressions. Goals and guidelines have been formulated two times, since the initiating a Swedish integration policy. First through the legislative bill of 1975:26, the bill 1997/98:16 reformulated the goals and guidelines and those bills will serve as analytical demarcation in time. There are several reasons for why legislative bills that formulates goals and guidelines are chosen as empirical material. The most central reason is that the legislative bills are the sight where the Swedish government articulates how they want things to be. It is normative in the sense of intentions within a specific political rationality that will permeate the state institutions that will work practically with

integration. The identification of key legislative bills enables me to make material selection regarding the state institutions practical work with integration. From the points of 1975 and 1997 I will look at the how Swedish integration policy functions by analysing social introduction material, directed to newly arrived immigrants. The Swedish Board of Immigration/Integration has released four such books, in 1978, 1982, 1990 and 2003 (Swedish board of immigration 1975, 1982, 1990 & Swedish board of integration 2003). The social introduction of 1978 is a small brochure compared to the books of 1982, 1990 and 2003 and I have chosen to co-read the material from 1978 and 1982 even though changes might have occurred during the four years. Common to them all is that they aim is to give answers to questions of how to relate to the Swedish society in the process of integration and the social introductions constitute a clear position through which the goals and guidelines, outlined in the legislative bills, are implemented. I would argue that it is a sight upon which the integration policy starts in practice. The social introduction, thus serves the purpose to nuance the analysis of the legislative bills and give the study of how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is reproduced and how this hegemonic discourse positions a Swedish subject.

2.3.1 Outlines

The analysis is divided into two chapters. In the first chapter I will analyse the legislative bill of 1975:26 and the social introduction material of 1978 and 1982. I will start to look at how a process of cultural differentiation functions as a first hegemonizing practice. I will then proceed and look at the different political areas discussed in the bill in order to identify and show the limits of swedishness, its function and normative content. The political areas which will be presented is “the labour market”, “housing issues”, and “issues regarding organisations and religious communities”. The analysis will be nuanced by the social introduction material and provide the means by which integration policy in practice could be studied and a more in depth analysis could be made. The second chapter “A New Direction of Swedish Integration Policy in 1997-2003” will follow the outlines of the first analytical chapter in order to be able to look at discursive changes in the hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy.

3 Initial Steps of Swedish Integration Policy 1975-1982

The government holds a dual relation to the immigrant as the initial steps towards constituting a Swedish integration policy is taken in 1975. Adaptation of the immigrants into the Swedish society is the key and the reproduction of the immigrant as essentially culturally different proves important. This chapter takes its point of departure in a tension in Swedish integration policy, through which it will be possible to analyse norms, constitutive of a hegemonic Swedishness. The tension lies in the possibility to choose submission to what is regarded as “one’s own original cultural and linguistic identity” or that of “the Swedish”, on the one hand, and articulations of societal common interests on the other. In this chapter I will provide an understanding of this tension. To understand how a hegemonic discourse on Swedishness is reproduced I will look at articulations that constitute limits of Swedishness. I will analyse this tension, look at the limits of Swedishness, first through the bill 1975:26 “regarding guidelines for immigrant and minority policy” and then at books of social introduction, issued by the Swedish Board of Immigration, as a result of the guidelines formulated in the bill (Legislative bill 1975:26, Swedish Board of Immigration 1978 and 1982).

3.1 The Bill of 1975 and the Origin of Cultural Difference

The bill of 1975 formulates three primary goals to be met through the Swedish integration policy. The first goal is *equality*, which is defined as a situation in which the immigrant’s rights, possibilities and duties are the same as the majority society. In the bill it is argued that within the frames of a “societal common interest, omnipresent in the Swedish society”, the immigrants are to be given the possibility to withhold and create respect for their own cultural identity (Legislative bill 1975:26:15). This connects to the second goal of *freedom of choice*, which is defined as the immigrant’s possibility to choose in what degree they are to “withhold and develop their original cultural and linguistic identity” or submit to the Swedish (Ibid). This is articulated as a precondition to enable a potential reintegration into the country of origin but also as a goal to develop the cultural range, beneficiary for Swedish cultural life. The third and final goal of Swedish integration policy as formulated in the bill of 1975 is *solidarity*, which aims to “specify the common interests between immigrants- and minority groups and the general population.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:16). This third goal is

explicitly connected to the immigrants' participation in "the political and trade union work." (Ibid). The tension within those three goals stands at the point of where the freedom of choice, to withhold an original cultural and linguistic identity, or submit to a Swedish on the one hand and the societal common interests, articulated in the goals of equality and solidarity that constitutes it, on the other. This tension give rise to questions like; what are the limits of choice in relation to common interest? Which common interests are articulated in Swedish integration policy as not negotiable within a Swedish community? A remark could be done here, that the culturally and linguistically specific and original Swedish identity stands unquestioned in these goals, which could indicate the existence of such a non-negotiable limit of swedishness. It doesn't say much about what the common interests are, but it could be understood as the first step in the production of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness constitutive of a Swedish subject and defined in relation to what it is not – an immigrant. Azar argues that "swedishness [...] is given value through a process of exchange and sharing which ties subject to subject via object." (Azar 2006:85). This is what I will call a process of cultural differentiation, the process through which a Swedish subject is defined in relation to what it is not, via objects of desire, which leads to a defining practice of a specific and original swedishness. This process is to a large extent articulated in the following quote and permeates all of the three goals:

"The immigrant- and minority policy should be permeated by an ambition to create equality between immigrants and Swedes. The immigrants and the minorities should be given opportunity to choose in what degree they wish to submit to a Swedish cultural identity or maintain the original identity. The policy should focus on creating cooperation between Swedes and immigrants in order to increase the solidarity between them as well as the possibilities for the immigrants and minorities to influence decisions regarding their own situation." (Legislative bill 1975:26:1).

In accordance to Laclau and Mouffe's development of the constitutive outside, one could understand the articulations of "ambition to create equality between immigrants and Swedes", as the submission to either a Swedish or "once own" original cultural identity or "the cooperation between Swedes and immigrants" as the precondition for common interests to maintain intelligible limits and thus constitute itself hegemonically. What I mean is that it is possible to argue that these articulations are the first hegemonizing practise that constitutes swedishness as a frame for common interests and value in the production of a Swedish subject. Laclau and Lac (1994) argues in the text "Minding the Gap" that "identification presupposes a constitutive split of all social identity, between the *content* which provides the surface of identification and the *function* of identification as such – the later being independent of any content and linked to the former only in a contingent way." (Laclau & Lac 1994:35). I would argue that the process of cultural differentiation articulated through the goals and the quote above, illustrates the function of swedishness as such, the precondition for and the function of identification. It would provide the means by which a specific swedishness could facilitate the objects of desire, the norms to retrospectively identify with. If so, the process of cultural differentiation would constitute

swedishness as the nodal point. At this position it would be interesting to look first at what is negotiable in terms of content of identification and then at what is non-negotiable. It would help to clarify the limits of negotiability and perhaps show a continuity or discontinuity in the dislocating function of the process of cultural differentiation. It is my understanding that the bill of 1975 articulates little negotiable contents of identification.

Ten political areas, in which the goals of the Swedish integration policy are to be implemented, are defined in the bill of 1975. The most important area is the “labour market”, which will be discussed more thoroughly in the next section of this thesis, as it is precisely the site at which the explicit content of non-negotiable limits of choice are articulated in the bill. Of the other nine areas I will now give examples from two; “housing issues” and “issues of organisations and religious communities”. The remaining seven areas are either similar to the areas presented in this section or related to the development of Swedish integration policy bureaucracy and does not provide any explicit function in showing negotiable content of identification in Swedish integration policy.

3.1.1 Housing Issues

In relation to housing issues, the bill of 1975 discusses topics such as the importance of continuity of general housing measures in order to provide equal standards of living, how a comprehensive composition of the population is determined by the possibility to equalize the differences of standards of different residential areas and the responsibility of municipal bodies and property owners in those processes (Legislative bill 1975:26:64). At no point does the bill articulate which specific cultural interests that are free to choose submission to. The bill of 1975 explains that:

“[...] adaption to the new environment, especially during the first period of time, could be eased if the immigrants were given the opportunity to live amongst their compatriots.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:64).

What is articulated in this quote is a presumed attachment between compatriots, a belief that a person from the same country could facilitate the process of adaption for the newly arrived. It is hard draw any conclusions regarding this when looking at the text, but my point is that the freedom of choice is limited to an obscure otherness, held by the non-Swedish compatriots. If any content of identification were to be seen in the bill regarding housing issues it would be in the interest to choose where to live while this interest is not regarded as different from any other person who lives in Sweden. The process of cultural differentiation in relation to the goal of freedom of choosing submission to any of the two original cultural or ethical identities discussed in the bill, would be understandable if immigrants demand for large collective housing was articulated, resulting in a integration policy urging for the rapid increased production of collective housing. Then an immigrant would have the possibility to choose

between apartments, villas or what would be articulated as the desires of a Swedish subject on the one hand and collective housing on the other. No such articulations are made and the policy relating to housing issues serves no other purpose other than providing the function of identification with compatriots in a process of cultural differentiation, which continues the hegemonizing practice in the production of a discourse on Swedishness. Swedishness defined in relation to what it is not.

3.1.2 Organisations and Religious Communities

In relation to organisations and religious communities “built by immigrants and minorities”, the bill of 1975 makes explicit connections to the Swedish social movements and regards them as “a valuable element in the society.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:74). Furthermore, the bill of 1975 structures the direction of policy through budgetary means in which the Swedish Board of Immigration should administer 1.6 million SEK during 1975/76 to be distributed to organisations built by immigrants and minorities for “limited projects with the purpose to contribute to the adaption of immigrants etcetera.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:75). Such financial means are also to be distributed to the trade unions Landsorganisationen (LO) and Tjänstemännens centralorganisation (TCO) for the activities for immigrants provided by those organisations (Legislative bill 1975:26:75-76). Again a process of cultural differentiation facilitates a function of identification, which offers no understanding of what the freedom of choice to submit to either a Swedish or one's own original identity could contain. The organisations built by immigrants and minority groups are looked upon as a “valuable element” but exactly why it is considered as valuable other than as facilitator for adaption of the immigrants, it constitutes nothing but this process of cultural differentiation, is not articulated. The bill of 1975 makes this explicit:

“Organisations that build on ethnical or linguistic group membership satisfy a particular need for identity amongst their members and have simultaneously a valuable practical function. They can facilitate the adaption of the immigrants in the new environment and contribute to spread information about the conditions in the society.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:74).

Here the ethnical and linguistic group membership functions as an obscure otherness deprived from content and assigned with a “valuable practical function” which seems to be limited to the function of a process of cultural differentiation – “a need for an ethnical and linguistic membership to satisfy a need for identity” only to facilitate the relation to “the new environment”. It is not articulated as, for example the facilitator of a need to speak one's native language. I don't deny that the possibility to speak one's native language could facilitate a relief and satisfy a particular need or ease a process of adaption, as mentioned in the section of housing issues. My point is that, in the policy relating to organisations and religious communities, the ‘ethnical and linguistic identity’ of immigrants is deprived from any other content than as to facilitate the relation to “the new

environment". Again, a process of cultural differentiation continues a hegemonizing practice in the production of a discourse on swedishness, defined in relation to what it is not. An understanding of what the negotiable contents of identification could be is not articulated.

3.1.3 The Process of Cultural Differentiation

Trying to look at what is negotiable in terms of content of identification, swedishness can be identified only through its dislocating practice, which separates swedishness from non-swedishness and a Swedish subject from an immigrant subject. Swedishness as content and object of desire is non-negotiable. Through a process of cultural differentiation swedishness is both the settings for desire, and an object of desire. This would also be the way in which one could start to understand the process of cultural differentiation in Swedish integration policy as a hegemonizing practice in the production of a Swedish subject with swedishness as such functioning as a nodal point in which swedishness as an object of desire and non-negotiable content of identification, is one element. The tension between the freedom of choice, to withhold an original cultural and linguistic identity or submit to a Swedish and the societal common interests, is made permanent. It is made permanent at the point of which Swedish integration policy constructs swedishness as the settings of desire and at the point of which the process of cultural differentiation constructs swedishness as an object of desire enabling a retrospective identification with a naturalized and self-evident swedishness, producing and positioning a Swedish subject in relation to a non-Swedish subject. When it seems like the bill of 1975 articulates negotiable content of identification, when it tries to articulate some kind of freedom of choice of submission to a Swedish or "own original" identity, then swedishness is deprived from content. In any case a process of cultural differentiation functions to hegemonize swedishness as culturally specific. In the following section, I will look at the parts in which the bill of 1975 articulates explicit limits, when the freedom of choice is explicitly conditioned.

3.2 The Bill of 1975 - A Responsible and Regulated Struggling Labour Force

I will now start looking at what is explicitly articulated as non-negotiable content of identification. I will identify the limits of choice in relation to common interests in Swedish integration policy articulated as non-negotiable. The first and most important area in which the Swedish integration policy is formulated is the labour market which is a site at which the explicit content of non-negotiable limits of choice are articulated in the bill of 1975.

When looking at the discussions regarding the labour market in the bill of 1975, initially, one has to analytically separate the otherwise intersecting articulations of economic regressive development on the one hand and the social partners of the labour market on the other. Regarding the economical development, the bill of 1975 discusses a regression of economical development in industrialised countries and argues for an adaption of the recruitment of foreign labour force to it (Legislative bill 1975:26:8). This leads to a formulation of policy stressing the need for “employment, accommodation and work permit, in order before immigration” and that granting the permit should stand in proportion to “the already available labour force, in the country” (Legislative bill 1975:26:16). Regarding the social partners of the labour market, the bill formulates a policy through which the trade unions are given a “substantial influence over the labour market review of immigration” (Legislative bill 1975:26:17). I argue that the trade unions influence over the labour market review is a way to facilitate a controlled immigration, and a way through which non-negotiable contents of identification of swedishness are articulated. This can be illustrated through the two following excerpts:

”The contemporary weak economical development and the great unemployment rate in most industrial countries, has further enhanced this restrictive stance towards the recruitment of foreign labour force. [...] Great parts of the immigration are outside the recruitment of foreign labour force. Sweden must count on a continued great mobility across the borders.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:8 & 13)

In the bill the government argues that:

“... the business company introduction is of the uttermost importance for immigrants. There are already, in accordance with provisions laid down, legislations imposing employers to inform all employees regarding certain risks of illness and accidents associated with the labour. [...] A continued investment to improve work environment is of essential importance if the immigrant’s situation on the work places is to be improved. [...] in order to increase immigrants participation in trade union activities, special measures are needed.” (Legislative bill 1975:26:61-63).

What we are dealing with here in regard of non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness is a particular responsibility articulated through the “restrictive stance” towards a “contemporary weak economical development” on the one hand and a particular regulated struggling labour force in relation to “certain risks of illness and accidents associated with labour”, the importance of “improved work environment” and the “participation in trade union activities” on the other. The process of cultural differentiation is present throughout the discussions in the bill of 1975, regarding the economical regression, the trade unions influence over the labour market review and the excerpts above. First, a potential situation of inability to responsibly relate to a “contemporary weak economical development”, dislocated from the same “already available labour force” is articulated constituting responsibility as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. Second, a potential situation of unemployment of

immigrants, dislocated from “the already available labour force” is articulated constituting desired employment as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. Third, a potential situation of ignorance of “improved work environment” as a legitimate demand on the labour market, dislocated from the ones already regarded as participating in “trade union activities” is articulated constituting the legitimacy of struggle for improved work environment as non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. Fourth, a potential situation of ignorance of “certain risks of illness and accidents”, dislocated from non-immigrants as the “business company introduction is of the uttermost importance for *immigrants*” is articulated constituting desired improved work environment as non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. Finally, and relating to the latter, a potential situation of ignorance of how to demand the legitimate improved work environment, dislocated from the ones who do not need “special measures” to know that it is done through “participation in trade union” is articulated constituting regulated struggles within the frames of trade union activities as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness.

These articulations constitutes non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness and functions as such as objects of desire, as self regulative and productive power it interpellates subjects through an enabled retrospective identification with a swedishness signified by responsibility, employment and regulated struggle. Swedishness is signified through someone who desires employment or is employed, is responsible in relation to economical regression, finds struggle for improved work environment legitimate, is self identifying with struggle for improved work environment and one who only does it within the frames of trade union activities. Through the process of cultural differentiation swedishness continues to function as a nodal point in relation to which the contours of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness could be illustrated. Through the explicit articulations of non-negotiable content of identification, responsibility, employment, regulated struggling labour force through participation in the struggle for and desire of improved work environment and the struggle performed through the trade union constitutes the logics of equivalence of elements. This chain constitutes the hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy. The process of cultural differentiation, continues its hegemonizing practice in the production of a Swedish subject, defined in relation to what it is not – unemployed or not desiring employment, irresponsible, unregulated struggling, not struggling within the frames of the trade union and for improved work environment or not struggling at all. This constitutes the field of discursivity of the hegemonic discourse on swedishness. In order to show responsibility one has to be employed and employment requests a situation in which being in the country correspond with the economical development and “the already available labour force”. As responsibly employed the labour force is interpellated as regulated struggling in which improved work environment is regarded as both the legitimate desire and the way to “perform” swedishness.

3.2.1 The Contours of a Hegemonic Discourse on Swedishness in 1975

Let's return to basic, swedishness as a precondition and function of identification as such and as a content of identification, the common interests of swedishness. The process of cultural differentiation is the key to understand the disciplinary and productive power of what can now be understood as a hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy of 1975. I have discussed how swedishness functions as the settings for desire, the frame and nodal point for common interests, the frame for the content of identification, through a process of cultural differentiation. When the bill tries to articulate negotiable content, a site upon which a choice of submission could be made, it deprives swedishness from content, which makes swedishness as such a non-negotiable object of desire. When the bill articulates explicit non-negotiable content of identification through a process of cultural differentiation, swedishness still functions as the nodal point with the common interests organised as elements; responsibility, employment, regulated struggling labour force through participation in the struggle for and desire for a improved work environment and the struggle performed through the trade union which constitutes the logics of equivalence. Two aspects are central here. First, a class positioned Swedish subject in relation to and through a process of cultural differentiation is produced through the articulations that connect to responsibility. Desired wage labour etcetera constitutes labour as the hegemonic horizon, which depoliticize the Swedish subject and reproduces it as class positioned. Second, articulations that connects swedishness to a regulated struggling labour force partly disrupts this production and politicize the regulated struggling class positioned Swedish subject. The contingency in the hegemonic discourse on swedishness, the sight upon which social antagonisms can be seen, is the omnipresent risk of failures. The failure to be employment, of a subject who does not desire employment enough, who is not responsible enough, who does not submit to regulations regarding struggle enough, who might just desire something other than improved work environment or who does not have enough knowledge of risks of illness and accidents, who does not organise democratically enough – a subject who does not desire swedishness enough. This shows the contingency of the hegemonic discourse on swedishness and the instability of a class positioned Swedish subject.

These conclusions are schematic and rough and in order to nuance it another material is needed. In the bill of 1975 the policy made clear that "The Swedish Board of Immigration [...] should have the responsibility to coordinate information efforts regarding immigrants" (Legislative bill 1975:26:80). I will, in the remaining section of this chapter, analyse the books of social introduction released 1978 and 1982. In order to understand how a Swedish integration policy reproduces a hegemonic discourse on swedishness, I will look at its function and content i.e. the hegemonic discourse on swedishness and how it produces a Swedish subject.

3.3 The Social Introductions of Swedish Integration Policy 1978 & 1982

The social introductions of 1978 and 1982 are both diverse in content but with the common goals to facilitate the understanding of and distribute the common interests regarded as non-negotiable within the Swedish society, the non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. The usage of the social introduction of 1982 is elaborated and directed to the reader as a “primer” to be read as “advice regarding different questions, when they occur to you.” (Swedish board of Immigration 1982:3). In the research presented in the book *Imperial Leather* McClintock (1995) argues that during the Victorian rule of the 19th century “...sexual purity emerged as a controlling metaphor for racial, economic and political power...”(McClintock 1995:47). She argues that “state intervention in domestic life increased apace” and that “motherhood became rationalized by the weighing and measuring of babies, the regimentation of domestic schedules and the bureaucratic administration of domestic education.” (Ibid). In this section I will look at how the social introductions as such function to articulate the non-negotiable common interests of the Swedish society, constitutive of swedishness in a generally increasing bureaucratic administration, not only regarding domestic education but “social introduction” as a generalized social interpellating mechanism, of self regulative and productive power in a subjectifying process. The social introductions make it possible to nuance the analysis made in the previous sections as sexual desire and domestic life are central in descriptions of common interests that dislocates presumed differences through a process of cultural differentiation constitutive of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness.

In the descriptions of such common interests, the social introductions articulates responsibility towards the family through a process of cultural differentiation. Articulations such as “the typical family in Sweden, as in most industrialized countries, contain two generations” (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:81) and consisting of “mother and father, with one or two children.” (Swedish board of Immigration 1982:97) are central. In such articulations a potential situation of non-heterosexual desire dislocated from “the typical family in Sweden” is articulated constituting a heterosexual desire as a non-negotiable content of swedishness. A potential situation of social organisation deviant from the particular family “mother and father, with one or two children” constellation dislocated on the same premises constitutes the family as such as a non-negotiable content of swedishness. The common interests are continuously articulated throughout the books. The following excerpt is illustrative in this respect:

”Usually you don’t greet each other unexpectedly in Sweden – at least not in the cities. The Swedes do not wish to intrude, they have respect for each others private life. That’s why they don’t invite their neighbours – not for some time at least. You can try to invite your Swedish neighbours for a cup of coffee, offer them your national dish or invite them to your organisation. Some will say no because they’ll think them selves not able to behave in a situation of a foreign

language and different tradition. They will probably not say it straight, but find an excuse, not to hurt you. Don't persist in your effort, but try again, as they've got used to you. Don't be offended if they don't return the invitation. Regardless of all the talk about equality between men and women, Swedish women are in many ways just like old times housewives. They could not imagine having visitors without cleaning first. They have neither time nor energy, as most work outside the home. The result is social isolation. But don't lose faith! The youth are not so formal and they socialize freely. In order to get to know the Swede you have to meet him more than half ways. Don't give up after the first attempt, but don't try too much either. Then you'll scare him. Give him time! Usually you'll find a nice and friendly person behind an unfriendly face and grouchy tone. The Swede doesn't hug you to show his feelings. It's not his style. But the feelings are there inside of him and longs terrible to get out. If you are warm, spontaneous, open and comfortable, he is more likely to thaw. It's possible, he might be your friend for life. Good luck!" (Swedish board of Immigration 1982:13)

First of all, the articulation of "your national dish" and "foreign language" is to be regarded as the negotiable content, hard to find in the bill of 1975, giving the "free choice of submission" meaning. This indicates food and language to be content of identification that does not enable retrospective identification of a naturalized Swedishness. This should be regarded as a discontinuity in the dislocating function of the process of cultural differentiation in Swedish integration policy as it allows freedom of choice. The excerpt contains much though, in which a process of cultural differentiation permeates it with references to "the Swedes", "your Swedish neighbour", "Swedish women" and the common interests are articulated. Through articulations as an expected "greeting", "invitation", "offer", "persistence in effort", to "meet him half ways", the time given, the expected "warm, open and comfortable" approach and a suspected "intrusion", Swedishness as such is to be regarded as an articulated object of desire.

The excerpt articulates the limits of common interests as a matter of responsibility towards the family, which is to be regarded as a non-negotiable content of Swedishness. A potential situation in which the privacy and independence of domestic issues is not respected dislocated from "the Swedes", "the Swedes do not wish to intrude", constitutes a desired "impenetrability" of the family as a non-negotiable content of identification of Swedishness. The social introduction in it self constitutes such an "intrusion" and the articulation should be understood as an intended supremacy of the state to formulate common interests of domestic life and family composition in the Swedish society. The potential situation of ignorance of reproductive domestic labour and clean home of immigrants is dislocated through the "Swedish women" who "could not imagine having visitors without cleaning first". In the section 4.2 I showed how desired employment was articulated in the legislative bill of 1975 as a non-negotiable content of identification of Swedishness. Through the articulation of "most [Swedish women] work outside the home" the responsibility towards the family, the clean home and domestic labour, as objects of desire, is extended. The potential situation of ignorance of responsibility towards the family dislocated from Swedish men who is not regarded as the responsible subject in relation to

domestic issues constitutes Swedish women's responsibility towards the family as non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. The ignorance of reproductive domestic unpaid labour and clean home is dislocated under the same premises. The Swedish men, not articulated as the responsible subject in relation to domestic issues, naturalizes a position in which they are regarded as breadwinners. This means that a class positioned Swedish subject is production through the articulations in which responsibility and employment is connected to swedishness that reproduces and is reproduced through a specific division of labour. This gendering process produces a class positioned Swedish subjects as a productive and wage earning working Swedish man and a double working wage and unpaid, in the home working Swedish woman. My point is that specific gender norms are articulated through a swedishness constituted by the family as such, a particular responsibility towards it in terms of unpaid domestic labour, a desired clean home, desired employment, heterosexual desire and a desired swedishness as such as the objects of desire and non-negotiable content of identification. These are the elements which give nuance to the logics of equivalence, identified in the previous sections, organised with swedishness as nodal point in a hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy.

3.3.1 Regulated Struggle

To nuance the analysis of the regulated struggle labour force, I will briefly look at articulations focusing on the social introduction of 1978. The descriptions of common interests on the labour market takes its point of departure in a story in which "the Swedish labour movement suffered a great loss in 1909 while refusing pay cuts." (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:36). The social introduction of 1978 continues by connecting the economical regression during the 1930's with the agreement in Saltsjöbaden, which "resulted in a long period of industrial peace and consensus between the social partners of the labour market." (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:37). During the 1960s the industrial peace is articulated as potentially threatened by the "so called wildcat strikes³. [...] What had happened? Had the time of consensus passed?" (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:38). The story is ended by articulations in the social introduction that indicates the unions victory through the introduction of the law of codetermination, initiated in 1976. This gave "the union right of negotiation in almost every questions regarding the employed and the employees." (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:39). This is the point of departure from which a process of cultural differentiation through which swedishness is articulated. Articulations of a regulated struggle are repeated in both social introductory book, such as; "As long as the collective agreements are valid, industrial peace is applied." (Swedish board of Immigration 1982:70). The social introduction explicitly articulates

³ Unregulated strike outside measures sanctioned by the trade union.

solidarity and the specific common interest that follows by stressing, "both wages and general terms of employment are to the most part decided through collective agreement which the employers and wage earners organisations negotiate." (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:45) and that "most Swedish workers and officials are members of a trade union, and the colleagues sees it as a sign of solidarity if one joins the trade union." (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:48). What we are dealing with here in regard of non-negotiable content of identification is a specified and extended articulation of a regulated struggling labour force in a generally increasing bureaucratic administration. Through this construction a potential situation of ignorance to enrol in the trade union dislocated from "most Swedish workers" and "the colleagues" is articulated constituting regulated struggle within the frames of trade union rights of negotiation as a non-negotiable content of identification. This is specified through the explicit situation of ignorance of industrial peace and consensus on the labour market dislocated on the same premises constituting regulated struggle within the frames of trade union activities as a non negotiable content of identification. The dislocation is to be regarded as a disciplinary political action in order to make people work. This situation is repeatedly reiterated through the chapters concerned with the labour market and can be exemplified with further quotes such as "If a dispute occurs, it must be tried in court" (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:45) or "you must be prepared to take the job appointed to you through the job centre" (Swedish board of Immigration 1978:52). There is no discursive space in which one can say, "no, I don't want to work". This is the dislocation positioning the Swedish subject in an economical system that needs it working. The Swedish subject is positioned through a very specific production of class with mandatory adaption to central elements now made explicit, industrial peace and consensus on the labour market and the dislocations of other possible desires. It is the clear drive in the discourse towards the reproduction of subjects as a productive and wage earning Swedish man.

3.4 Summarized Conclusions

In this chapter I have discussed the political dislocations through which a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated in a Swedish integration policy, and how a Swedish subject is positioned and produced through this discourse during the period 1975-1982. Identifying and understanding the political dislocations has been central in the analysis, taking its point of departure in a tension in the formulation of goals in Swedish integration policy of 1975. The tension stands at the point in which the freedom of choice to submit to once own "original cultural and linguistic identity" or "the Swedish" on the one hand and "societal common interests" on the other constructs limits of what is regarded as true swedishness. This tension is made permanent when the Swedish integration policy constructs swedishness as the setting of desire that functions to facilitate its own constitutive norms. The process of cultural differentiation is immanent in the

articulation of “original cultural and linguistic identity” of immigrants and “the Swedish” and tends to deprive the swedishness of content at the moment of which freedom of submission is to be articulated. At the point of which swedishness as such is deprived from content, possible to identify only through its dislocating function it is to be regarded as a nodal point in Swedish integration policy discourse. As such it is non-negotiable. Any deviance is dislocated through the process of cultural differentiation and the deviant dislocates cultural difference from swedishness. This is the first step towards understanding how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated in Swedish integration policy. When the bill explicitly articulates non-negotiable content of identification swedishness still functions as the setting for desire through a process of cultural differentiation with the common interests organised as elements; responsibility, employment, regulated struggling labour force through participation in the struggle for and desire of improved work environment and the struggle performed through the trade union which constitutes the logics of equivalence. By looking at the articulations in the social introductions, the discourse is nuanced and we can add the following elements to the logics of equivalence; the family as such, the impenetrability of it, heterosexual desire, unpaid domestic labour, a desired clean home, industrial peace and consensus on the labour market. It is the non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness that interpellate the subjects in a self-regulative and productive power enabling retrospective identification with swedishness and its constitutive elements. The contingency of swedishness could be illustrated through the omnipresent risk of failure. This is swedishness’s field of discursivity, the possibility to not desire employment enough, not desire responsibility enough, not desire heterosexual relationships and the family as such enough, the clean home enough or not desiring swedishness enough. To not desire participation in the struggle for improved work environment or general terms through the trade union, industrial peace and consensus on the labour market is the omnipresent threat that “the Swedish community”. First, a class positioned Swedish subject is reproduced through the articulations connecting swedishness to responsibility, as it keeps people working, domestic and/or waged. Second, articulations connected to regulated struggling labour force partly disrupt this production and politicise the subject as it potentially at least could include a closure of work through for example a strike. The production of a class positioned Swedish subject is partly disrupted and politicized through the struggling class positioned Swedish subject as it partly point in a direction in which a Swedish subject could be something else than labour force. The class positioned subject is also reproduced through domestic labour, which genders a Swedish subject through a division of labour that dislocates a regulated struggling Swedish subject from the domestic domain. A class positioned Swedish subjects is regarded as a productive and wage earning working Swedish man and a double working wage and unpaid, in the home working Swedish woman. What the Swedish integration policy constitutes is an arbitrary swedishness through which anything could be dislocated that does not fit into the fantasy of the responsible Swede. This disilluminates social antagonisms and naturalize inequality possible to identify by looking at the dislocations made in Swedish integration policy.

4 A "New Direction" of Swedish Integration Policy in 1997-2003

The goals and guidelines of Swedish integration policy is specified in the bill of 1985/86:98 but apart from stating that freedom of choice is to be developed "within the frame of fundamental norms in our society" (Legislative bill 1985/86:98:18) no direct changes appeared in the direct formulation until 1998. The first substantial reformulations of the goals were made through the bill of 1997/98:16 "Sweden, the future and diversity – from immigration policy to integration policy". The last book of social introduction is released in 2003. In this chapter I will analyse eventual discursive changes in hegemony of swedishness, comparing the periods 1975-1982 and 1997-2003. The bill of 1997/98 is intended to initiate a new direction, from immigration policy to integration policy. The Swedish board of Immigration changed name to the Swedish board of Integration but in this chapter I will continue to exploit the tension within Swedish integration policy that enables an understand of what this "new direction" could imply in terms of articulations of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness and the positioning and production of a Swedish subject.

4.1 The Bill of 1997/98 - Goals Reformulated?

The bill of 1997/98 takes its point of departure in a direct critique of the goal formulated in the bill of 1975 regarding the freedom of choice. I have argued that tension considered in the previous chapter hegemonizes swedishness, that is, stabilises it by articulating limits of freedom of choice – political dislocations through a process of cultural differentiation. The new goals are articulated on the basis of an understanding in which "immigrated groups tends to be dissolved as coherent ethnical and linguistic groups within a couple of generations" and the bill of 1997/98 explicitly refers to the previous policy's goal regarding freedom of choice as "viewed upon as a threat to swedishness" (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:18). This means that the bill of 1997/98 argues that the freedom of choice does not pose a "threat to swedishness" as the immigrated groups tend to be dissolved while I argue that "the freedom of choice" does not pose a threat as it on the contrary facilitates the precondition for political dislocations through which a hegemonic interpellating swedishness can function self-regulative and productive. Failing to understand how the freedom of choice has functioned might be a reason why the reformulation of the goals constitutes a similar tension as in the bill of 1975. The goals formulated in the bill of 1997/98 could be categorized

in two, which is argued to constitute a “migration policy founded in the human rights” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:21). First, the goal of equality is formulated as in the bill of 1975, and is regarded as “well anchored in the Swedish democratic tradition” and the goal of freedom of choice is now implicated in the equality goal as a matter of “the right to be different” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:23). This is also regarded as a precondition for “developing a whole identity and being proud of ones background” (Ibid). The second goal of Swedish integration policy as formulated in the bill of 1997/98 is to “create a social community on the basis of the diversity of society characterized by mutual respect and tolerance” which makes “the contemporary belonging in Sweden and the agreement upon fundamental values of the society even more important [...]” (Ibid). The bill of 1997/98 continues by stating that “the ultimate limits in a society is always determined by the laws of the country, but different ways to live and think should be given wide outlet within those frames.” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:24). While immigrants as “coherent ethnical and linguistic groups” are described as dissolving, the “well anchored” “Swedish democratic traditions”, and the “agreement upon fundamental values”, are articulated as potentially threatened which shows the discursive limits to be set at the point in which Swedes as coherent ethnical and linguistic group could be threatened. It is articulated so the moment that fundamental values are articulated.

The tension in the bill of 1997/98, lies at the point in which, “Swedish democratic tradition”, “the mutual respect and tolerance”, “the fundamental values” or “the laws as the ultimate limits of a society” leads to the inevitable question of who is to be respected and tolerated, which “whole identity” is worthy to be proud of, who are the holders of Swedish democratic traditions and which are the limits that the articulations of fundamental values and laws of Sweden constitutes? It is possible to ask the same questions in relation to the bill of 1997/98 as to the bill of 1975. When does someone have the right to be different and what are the fundamental values regarded as non-negotiable within the Swedish society and articulated in the Swedish integration policy? The process of cultural differentiation is not as explicit in the formulations of the goals in the bill of 1997/98 as it was 22 years earlier but between the contemporary, diverse “belonging”, and the fundamental values articulated in the bill of 1997/98 there is a potential site upon which it could develop. While in the bill of 1975 the tension resembled around the freedom of choice to submit, the tension in 1997/98 articulates more explicitly the limits of “agreement upon fundamental values” through which a particular defining practice of the immigrants presumed deviance is enabled. This defining practice is articulated in the chapter “Goals and direction for a future integration policy” and it is possible to see how it is done so more forcefully than in the bill of 1975. The bill of 1997/98 states that

“Equality between the sexes is included in the fundamental values of the Swedish society... [and] to reach this goal, methods must be adapted and developed considering that everybody hasn’t been raised with the Swedish traditions regarding equality between the sexes.” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:24).

The dislocating practice through cultural differentiation continues its hegemonizing practice. Explicitly, in the formulations of goals and guidelines the excerpt illustrates the immanent ambivalence of the community through an integration policy that projects an immigrant as deviate. A deviance through which Swedishness then can be articulated as a self-evident and different – being the ones who has been raised with and knows of the Swedish traditions and fundamental values. It seems that despite the fact that the bill of 1997/98 has its explicit point of departure in an understanding of how “the immigrated groups tends to be dissolved as coherent ethnical and linguistic groups within a couple of generations”, it produces a Swedishness to function in the opposite direction. Regarding the function of Swedishness no direct discursive change seems to have occurred. On the one hand, the according to the bill of 1997/98 reassuring statement regarding a not present “threat to Swedishness” continues to enable political dislocations through a process of cultural differentiation. On the other hand, the explicit articulation of a “wide outlet within” the frames of the Swedish legal system, indicates that it should be possible to identify a clear discontinuity in the dislocating function of the process of cultural differentiation.

The bill of 1997/98 is in its contexture not very different from the bill of 1975 and is divided into eight political areas, in which the reformulated goals of Swedish integration policy are to be implemented. In the following sections, I will continue the analysis begun in the previous chapter and thus analyse areas that connects to the labour market, participation, housing and organisations and religious communities. In the bill of 1997/98 the areas are labelled “labour and earning a living”, “residential areas at risk” and “participation and influence” in which the same issues are discussed.

4.1.1 ”Exposed Residential Areas”

A fundamental opposite attitude towards housing issues compared to the bill of 1975, in which it was regarded as fruitful for immigrants to live among compatriots, is taken in the bill of 1997/98. The bill of 1997/98 argues that 50 residential areas are to be regarded as “exposed” to a “high level of unemployment, low income level, high rate of recipients of social service, high rate of ill health, greater sick leave rates etcetera [...]” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:69). The bill also states that this is “the reason for talking about exposed residential areas rather than a immigrant dense area” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:69). This is most certainly to be regarded as a discontinuity in the dislocating function of the process of cultural differentiation as it explicitly connects the ‘exposures’ and not for example the Swedes or non-Swedes to the area, but the bill of 1997/98 is ambivalent in its view and continues under the title “Special measures in immigrant dense area”:

”The general policy hasn’t, until now, been able to give sufficient support for a development that stops an increased housing segregation and ethnification [...] The negative development, seen from an international perspective, could bring about increased tensions and tendencies of violence

[...] The solution must build on a strong engagement from the residents if they are to function in a long term perspective” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:70).

While on the one hand stating that it is important to talk about “exposed residential areas” rather than “immigrant dense area” the bill of 1997/98 articulates a connection between ethnification, areas densely populated by immigrants and tensions and tendencies of violence. While the bill of 1975 tends to deprive swedishness from content in regard of housing issues and presume and encourage “attachment between compatriots”, the bill of 1997/98 connects immigrant segregation and tendencies of violence and articulates the very concrete situation of “tensions and tendencies of violence” of immigrants dislocated from being a subject of “the general policy” and areas that are not “immigrant dense”. This constitutes harmonious non-violence as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. Furthermore the solution is dislocated from areas regarded as non-immigrant dense, which enforces the non-negotiable content of identification and connects the responsibility for harmony and non-violence, to the immigrants. The solution that is regarded as having to be “built on strong engagement from the residents” is articulated throughout the chapter regarding “Exposed residential areas” relate to increased governmental financial support to the municipalities to develop “meeting places” with the purpose to “increase the labour force participation” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:71). The policy should

“deepen the experiences of how the development could be broken [...] and the measures should be characterised by a comprehensive view with increased labour force participation as overarching goal.” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:72).

The bill states that it is important to “develop citizen offices” (Medborgarkontor) in order to “stimulate employment and reduce unemployment.” (Ibid). It seems like the element of desired employment increasingly permeates the diverse range of political areas, in this case the political area of “exposed residential areas” in the Swedish integration policy of 1997/98 and connects it to the elements of responsibility in terms of social peace through harmony and non-violent behaviour. The potential situation of not desiring employment or “unemployment” of immigrants as such is dislocated from everybody who doesn’t need “citizen offices” and is constituted as a non-negotiable content of swedishness that in this case spreads into the political area of housing issues. This might be the first indication of a change in which responsibility is generalized and not explicitly connected to economic regression or for example industrial peace through regulated participation in trade union. It is hard to say if its so at this point, however it can be concluded that the political area of housing policy is a site upon which non-negotiable contents of identification with the elements: responsibility, employment, harmonious and non-violent behaviour connected to a swedishness that through the process of cultural differentiation is to be regarded as nodal point in the articulated hegemonic discourse on swedishness.

4.1.2 "Participation and Influence"

In the bill of 1997/98 the discussions regarding organisations and participation are more intertwined and immigrants' and minorities' organisations are not, as in the bill of 1975, explicitly connected to "the Swedish social movements", which takes an overall inconspicuous role in Swedish integration policy of 1997/98. The bill of 1997/98 follows the bill of 1975 in as much as it regards immigrant organisations as a place where "one can get help to orientate in the society. [...] and] meet other people who immigrated, which could be the start of participation in the new society" (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:37). In the discussions regarding participation, the bill of 1997/98 starts by arguing that "the fellowship on the workplace can increase the possibilities to give impulses for participation in social life" which I would argue reproduce a desired employment that continues to hegemonize swedishness through Swedish integration policy (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:30). This could, again, be understood as an indication of a discursive change in which responsibility is generalized and not explicitly connected to economic regression or industrial peace through regulated participation in trade union but rather, responsibility connected to a desired employment that permeates the political areas of Swedish integration policy.

Regarding participation the bill of 1997/98 discuss it as a matter of "taking part in the formal democracy, about power and responsibility in every day life." (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:30). Further, the overall focus is on what could be considered as "formal democracy" and the bill continues by concluding that:

"...the participation in elections, of persons who newly arrived, has decreased [...] which to some extent could be explained by age composition of the group and that many persons from this electoral group come from countries with social systems that divert substantially from the Swedish." (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:31)

This excerpt differs little from the articulations regarding "equality between the sexes" as "fundamental values of the Swedish society" made while elaborating the goals of the Swedish integration policy of 1997/98. It should be understood as a political dislocating practise through cultural differentiation that constitutes representative democracy as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. This is articulated as a situation in which the immigrants', and in this case not only potential but explicit undemocratic experiences and tradition as "many people from this electorate group comes from countries" is stressed. It is to be regarded as a process of cultural differentiation through which experiences of being brought up "with [a] social systems that divert substantially" is dislocated from a hegemonized swedishness. As such it indicates no discursive change in relation to a process of cultural differentiation articulated in the bill of 1975 other than that it is now explicitly enforced which makes the political dislocations more visible. The discursive change would instead lie in that the articulations of the importance of organisations and religious communities are disregarded to a larger extent on the behalf of participation in the formal democracy and wage labour.

4.2 ”Labour and Earning a Living”

As the bill of 1975 formulates a policy that regards the recruitment of foreign labour as in need of restrictive measures, the bill of 1997/98 takes another approach. Economic regression is not explicitly central as in 1975 and instead “a structural recomposition [of enterprise], generally increased demand for competence, increased demand for knowledge of the Swedish language” is discussed and connected to a variety of measures (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:13). In the previous sections of this chapter, I have shown how labour and employment permeates the political areas of “exposed residential areas” and “Participation and influence”. In the bill of 1997/98 labour is regarded as “central, from a social as well as economic perspective” but while it was necessary to separate articulations of economic regression and the social partners of the labour market in the bill of 1975, the bill of 1997/98 formulates differently (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:45). In the bill of 1997/98 the social partners of the labour market are not mentioned and instead state authorities are regarded as having a “great responsibility as norm giver” that should be visible in “recruitment behaviour, personal structure and increasing competence” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:46). “Good quality in employment agency work” (Ibid.), educational measures as the project “Boosting Knowledge” (Kunskapslyftet) (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:47), “computer education” (Ibid) etcetera are example of state authorities influence and it is generally stated that “immigrants requires more resources and more time than the measures for other job-seekers” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:48). I will argue that this change, from the social partners of the labour market and the trade unions in particular to state authorities constitutes a discursive change which could be identified by analysing the ways through which non-negotiable contents of identification of swedishness connected to responsibly desired employment and not regarding participation in trade union activities are articulated. The bill states that:

“The Swedish welfare depends on the entire potential working populations ability to contribute to the socioeconomic development. The welfare is undermined as many people today stand outside the labour market simultaneously as the social and economic inequalities increases in the society. This is waste of human recourses. There are many people among those who have immigrated to Sweden whose competence and knowledge is not exploited. These people could contribute to the economic growth if they participated in wage labour.” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:45)

What the bill of 1997/98 states here is that everybody must contribute to the Swedish welfare and that the immigrants do it to a small, but not enough extent. The bill continues by stating that:

”A lot of people with a foreign background live under the impression that they do not fit for all professions or that it is impossible to get into the Swedish labour market [...] contact with the

majority society could give signals regarding the possibilities on the labour market” (Legislative bill 1997/98:16:46).

The Swedish integration policy formulated in the bill of 1997/98 is to be regarded as a unifying stance towards employment. Responsibility towards a “structural recomposition” of enterprise and “increased demands” that follows is articulated. State authority is formulated as enforcing this policy, which constitutes responsibility as a single non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. The process of cultural differentiation is present regarding this structural recomposition as the inability of “those who have immigrated to Sweden” “to contribute to the socioeconomical development” is articulated. It is also articulated through the state authority enforcement of desired employment and as we have seen in the previous sections of this chapter it is more explicitly articulated than in the bill of 1975. The explicit situation of unemployment of immigrants, dislocated from those who do not require “more resources and more time” or is not “among those who has immigrated” is articulated constituting employment as a non-negotiable content of swedishness. Furthermore, the potential situation of immigrants being “under the impression that they do not fit for all professions” dislocated from “other job-seekers”, constitutes swedishness in which all professions fits, as non-negotiable content of identification. In regard of non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness, the potential inability to contribute to the socioeconomic development and inability to responsibility relate to the “structural recomposition [of enterprise]”, and “generally increased demand for competence” is dislocated through the immigrants who is explicitly articulate as not participating “in wage labour”. The logics of equivalence is substantially broken and the elements of desired employment and responsibly in terms of relating to structural recomposition of enterprise, increased demands and contribution to “the socioeconomic developments” connected to swedishness as nodal point is what is left of a chain that in 1975 articulated a regulated struggling labour force. Where the bill of 1975 articulated a regulated struggling labour force, its legitimate demands and the trade unions as constitutive frames for this struggle, the bill of 1997/98 articulates state authority such as work agencies and political measures of “Boosting Knowledge” and specific educational measures, which all functions in the direction of desired employment and responsibly relating to “economical recomposition” and “increased demands”. The hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy of 1997/98, in which swedishness reproduced as nodal point through a process of cultural differentiation that structures the elements of desired employment and desired responsibility and do not regard regulated struggling labour force, shows how a political rationality at a specific time and place choose parts of the past strategically. The economical recomposition seems to have forced Swedish integration policy into more intensive articulations of responsibility that is connected to labour, employment rather than any type of struggle, for better work environment or better general terms. Instead it articulates a swedishness connected to a situation in which any employment fits and state authority enforces the policy. The responsible Swedish subject is, like articulations in the bill of

1975 suggests produced and socially positioned through wage labour. The bill of 1997/98 introduces a new dimension, however as a Swedish subject is defined and interpellated as a non-struggling worker.

4.2.1 A Discourse on Swedishness – Hegemony Changed?

Briefly returning to the question of which fundamental values that are regarded as non-negotiable within the Swedish society and articulated in the Swedish integration policy of 1997/98, it can be concluded that a process of cultural differentiation through which political dislocations are articulated is more explicitly hegemonizing a discourse on swedishness. Direct references to inherently and from the Swedish deviate “fundamental values” of immigrants are articulated in the bill of 1997/98, while articulations that in the bill of 1975 deprived swedishness from content are more persistently signifying swedishness 22 years later. It can be concluded that despite the bill stating that immigrant groups tend to be dissolved as coherent ethnical and linguistic groups within a couple of generations, swedishness continues to function as the settings for desire, the frame and nodal point for fundamental values in the Swedish society. This far in the analysis I have shown how the bill of 1997/98 articulates swedishness through political dislocations that constitute desired responsibility and desired employment in a logic of equivalence in which non-violence and harmonious behaviour replace the trade unions facilitating function of regulation of struggle. The disciplinary role of trade unions is changed, which can be understood as a change from “industrial peace” to a more generalized “social peace” in which desired employment permeates the diverse range of political areas of Swedish integration policy as the solution of for example tensions and violent behaviour. This makes the nodal point of swedishness organize in a logic of equivalence in which desired responsibility is connected not only to desired employment but harmonious and non-violent behaviour and the workplace as facilitator of the community that enables participation. Like the bill of 1975, the articulations of the hegemonic discourse on swedishness expressed in the bill of 1997/98, interpellates and produces a class positioned Swedish subject. However, unlike the bill of 1975 this is a process that is not disrupted by a regulated struggling labour force that could politicise this subject. It is not, however, disrupted by anything pointing in the direction of the field of discursivity of swedishness. By combining the analysis made in chapter 3 with the one in this chapter it is now possible to understand the omnipresent potential failure of swedishness. On the one hand the failure to be employed, not desiring employment enough, not fitting for every profession and hence not respond responsibly enough, to the economical recomposition and increased demands on the labour market constitutes a discursive change that further dislocates social struggle through a process of cultural differentiation and in affect dislocates a struggling labour force. On the other hand the potential failure of harmonious and non-violent behaviour shows how it is impossible to dislocate social antagonisms entirely. Here Swedish

integration policy functions so to enable the position of violence and disharmony to immigrants rather than the labour force.

In the remaining section of this chapter I will return to the social introduction material and now analyse the “Sweden a Pocket Guide” (2003) published by the Swedish Board of Integration in 2003. I will do this in order to further understand the discursive changes in the hegemonic discourse on swedishness articulated in Swedish integration policy.

4.3 “Sweden – a pocket guide” – Social introduction issued in 2003

The social introduction of 2003 is the last introductory book for immigrants, published by Swedish institutions. In its contexture it differs little from the social introductions from 1978 and from 1982. The 2003 guide aims at giving “quick answers regarding everything from school, labour to taxes and the history of the country.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:3) and simultaneously argues that Swedish integration policy left a view on the Swedish society as homogenous. In the book it is stated that a situation in which everybody “talked the same language, had the same history, the same religion, the same traditions and view upon how a good society should look like” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:7) is left for the benefit of a country signified by diversity. This presumed progress through which the diversity of society is discovered, constructs a paradox as soon as the agreement upon fundamental values of the society gets important and articulated at the political fields of school, labour or traditions. While the coherent ethnical and linguistic groups of immigrants are regarded to dissolve the social introductions presents chapters such as “This is how we do it” in which a process of cultural differentiation is articulated. It forcefully continues the hegemonizing practice of swedishness through explicit formulations of a coherent group of Swedes. The following quotes illustrates this:

“If one should point out something specially Swedish one could choose the love to the nature.”, (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:45).

“The Swedish traditions has its foundation in the Christian religion...” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:48).

“For most Swedes, the midsummer is about celebrating summer with party and dance around the maypole.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:50).

Such articulations are continuously repeated: “In Sweden Lucia is celebrated...” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:53), “Birthdays are important in Sweden...” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:56) and while the foreign

language was regarded as negotiable content of identification in the social introduction of 1982 the articulations are different in 2003 where it is argued that:

“The language is the most important key to the Swedish society, to the labour market and to participation in school, the voluntary sector, sports, well everything.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:44).

While the preserving of “foreign language” gave meaning to the freedom of choice in the social introduction of 1982, the articulations of the Swedish language as essential deprive the “right to be different”, a goal of the Swedish integration policy as stated in the bill 1997/98, of meaning. It dislocates difference in language through a process of cultural differentiation, the Swedish language as precondition for participation, and constitutes it as non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. In the social introduction of 2003, the articulations regarding the family, is, as in the introductions of 1978 and 1982 central and connected to the articulations of traditions and fundamental values of the society:

“The most common family consists of mother, father and child. Many parents are married while others are not. There are also many families with just one parent and child or two adults without child. Now days, two adults of the same sex can live in registered partnership. [...] Most families spend Saturdays and Sundays together. The rest of the week the children go to school and childcare or day care and the parents are at their jobs. During the evenings, one or more members of the family practice activities. The children might engage in music or sports and the parents might get educated or participate in the voluntary sector. The weekends are for many families their day together. That’s when they can be out in the nature or meet friends and relatives. Many people who work full time during the weeks manage laundry and cleaning during the weekends.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:126-127).

In this quote we can see the effect of a discursive negotiation in which a non-negotiable heterosexual desire has been reformulated and submitted in a hegemonizing process of swedishness in which “Now days, two adults of the same sex can live in registered partnership” is articulated. This shows a rupture in the dislocated non-heterosexual desire, which is no longer dislocated from the swedishness of family composition. The family, on the other hand, is rearticulated with a thorough review of acceptable interests and activities such as sports activities, being out in the nature, music and participation in the voluntary sector. First a potential situation of different desires regarding the disposition of free time dislocated from “most families” constitutes the specific interests as acceptable within a hegemonized swedishness. Second, the social isolation of the Swedish women, articulated in the social introductions of 1982 is now disilluminated and dislocated is a potential situation in which “family members” cannot live up to washed laundry, sport activity during the weeks and family trips etcetera during the weekends. That is a specific responsibility towards the family constituted as a non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. I would also argue that the division of labour has been reformulated and is to be regarded as the effect of discursive negotiation in which the domestic duties are not articulated as a matter

of gender differentiation. This is, however, naturalized, and the social introduction perform a political rationality in which it is possible to choose parts of the past strategically, disregarding any social conflict leading up to this reformulation.

4.3.1 Responsibly Non-struggling

In the previous section I argued that the bill of 1997/98:16 reproduced Swedishness as the nodal point, structuring the elements of desired employment and responsibility and disregarded the regulated struggling labour force articulated in period 1975-1982 and I furthermore argued that state authority had taken the disciplinary role of the trade unions. In the social introductions a clear step is taken, away from trade unions role in formulating the desires and needs of a struggling labour force by articulations regarding state authority and the law to formulate desires and needs. The social introduction of 2003 argues that “the trade unions *has* been stronger in Sweden than in many other countries and *has*, during long periods *had* close ties to the government.” but no longer (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:93). References are now made to the law such as “according to law, the normal working hours are 40 hours per week... according to the law, everyone who works full time has the right to 25 days leave... the law says that they who perform the same duties should have the same salary.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:93). Further articulations are made in which calls to immigrants are made such as: “you should notify the employment agency as soon as you got your permanent residence permit” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:94). Further: “illicit work is cheaper for the employer... But it is risky. You will get no social security service if you are sick, no compensation if you get injured or unemployed and you will get no pension... you may have to pay fines and retrospectively pay tax.” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:100-101). State institutions and the law is central and instead of describing fundamental values on the labour market with the point of departure in the Swedish labour movements loss in 1909 as was in the social introduction of 1978, the social introduction of 2003 describe a relevant history with the point of departure in pre-historical ice age (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:18). The social introduction describes the Swedish society in evolutionary terms, “the hunters gradually settled” (Ibid), the Vikings went on “war or trade expeditions” “ice covered what is today called Sweden” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:19), “the Christian religion spread slowly” (Ibid) and the industrialization “picked up speed during” the 19th century as a result of peace and an increased population rate (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:24). Despite the Swedish Board of Integration’s explicit articulation in which the sameness of language, history, religion and traditions is understood as dissolved a substantial change has occurred regarding the reiteration of a history that was not regarded as relevant in the 1978 or 1982 social introduction. The sudden relevance of knowing about “Sweden” during the ice age, the Vikings, the introduction of Christian religion or the industrialisation must be understood as a practice in which a political rationality chooses parts of the past strategically. It was not relevant during the period 1975-1982. The trade

unions are described as an organisation that “may give you advice regarding salary, risks regarding work environment and different problems on your work place” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:100). It is not an articulation that constitutes regulated struggle within the frames of trade unions rights of negotiation as a non-negotiable content of identification. Rather and again, the logic of equivalence is broken and the class positioned Swedish subject is depoliticized through the ruptured discourse that connects employment and responsibility to swedishness and dislocates social struggle, regulated or non-regulated. The articulations of a coherent past, which all Swedes relate to, are to be understood as a dislocation of a struggling Swedish subject. It functions disciplinary and self-regulative in a foucaultian sense. The social introduction continues to describe a progressing industrialization and a Social Democratic Labourparty that:

“talked about creating a welfare state (folkhem), a society that should be as a home for the people, without great inequalities and economical differences between humans. That’s why rules regarding compensation for sickness, and unemployment were introduced. Later came the rules regarding payed holidays, social security services concerning family and child allowances, pensions etcetera. All this use to be called welfare, and is paid by everyone... read about taxes and welfare grants in the chapter regarding Money” (Swedish Board of Integration 2003:26-27).

The potential situation of not participating in the reproduction of the Swedish welfare state through which inequalities and economical differences should be countered, dislocated from “the home of the people”, the Swedish welfare state articulates the connection between employment, responsibility and taxed labour as non-negotiable content of identification of swedishness. The trade unions are reduced to a service organisation and the solidarity articulated as connected to enrolment in trade unions is now connected to the new logics of equivalence of employment and responsibly taxed labour. This constitutes different possibility of retrospective identification in which social struggle is dislocated from swedishness which functions so to depoliticize a class positioned Swedish subject.

4.4 Summarized Conclusions

Focusing on discursive changes in this chapter I identified a tension between “the right to be different” and articulations of “fundamental values” regarded as non-negotiable within the Swedish society. In the case of goals and guideline formulations, the bill of 1997/98 present no discursive changes as the fundamental values facilitates the precondition for political dislocations through which swedishness can function as an object of desire, interpellating individuals in a subjectifying process. It is rather so that the point of departure in “the right to be different” within the limits of “fundamental values of the Swedish society” result in a explicit political dislocations. It is made through a process of cultural differentiation that articulates swedishness as a “tradition” of gender equality or

by a system signified by participation in general elections, mutually different from non-swedishness articulated already in the formulations of goals and guidelines. The process of cultural differentiation is explicitly articulated, where the bill of 1975 articulated only a potential situation of cultural deviance, the bill of 1997/98 explicitly articulates the immigrant constituted as undemocratic and unequal. This disilluminates inequality within the Swedish society, projects the immigrants as unaware of inequality and further reproduce swedishness as self-evident and culturally different. The tension is, as in the formulation of Swedish integration policy of 1975 made permanent, constructing swedishness as the settings of desire that functions to facilitates its own constitutive norms and that is how it is possible to argue that no discursive changes has occurred in the formulation of the Swedish integration policy of 1997/98. It has, however, been possible to show how the elements of employment and responsibility decisively permeate political areas that in the bill of 1975 deprived swedishness from content. Instead of discussing for example solidarity as a matter of industrial peace and the function of the trade union, responsibility is connected to employment, participation in the society through labour, formal democracy and non-violent behaviour organised as elements in a logic of equivalence that constitute the hegemonic discourse on swedishness. It is through the process of cultural differentiation that the Swedish integration policy of 1997/98 constitutes swedishness as nodal point structures the elements responsibility, employment, non-violent behaviour and democratic participation in the society in a logic of equivalence. This is to be regarded as a change in articulation of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness, in which the formal democratic political participation gains on the behalf of social movements and trade unions with the potential function to generalize a previous particular industrial peace on the labour market to a social peace that is to work through out the social body, from the work place in general, down to the block of a residential area in particular. While looking at the articulations in the bill of 1997/98 regarding "labour and earning a living" this becomes clearer and the hegemonic discourse on swedishness is to be regarded as a substantially broken in its logics of equivalence. In those discussions responsibility as a matter of responsibly relating to a structural recomposition of enterprise, desired employment and a situation in which "all employment fits" is articulated. Looking at the social introductions of 2003 further shows how heterosexual desire I no longer dislocated from the swedishness of family composition. However, while division of labour has been reformulated and domestic duties are not articulated as a matter of gender differentiation, a specific responsibility towards the family as such continues to constitute a non-negotiable content of identification that hegemonize swedishness through a process of cultural differentiation. These changes constitute a situation that depoliticize the class positioned Swedish subject reproduced through the productive and wage labouring Swedish man. A Swedish subject is gendered in a way that constitutes women through the articulation of her never as a struggling, as during the period 1975-1982. The main conclusion, possible to make is that a class positioned Swedish subject is explicitly depoliticized during the period 1997-2003 as no articulations are made regarding a regulated or non-regulated struggling labour force.

5 Summarized Conclusions

With the point of departure in a desire to understand the function of Swedish integration policy, to understand what is preserved, protected and reproduced through the formulations of what or who is to be integrated in to what I have attempted to answer to the aim of this thesis. The aim of this thesis is to understand how swedishness is articulated and how a Swedish subject is positioned and produced through Swedish integration policy. In order to answer to this aim I have formulated three questions that focuses on articulations in Swedish integration policy, constitutive of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness. One that focuses on how this hegemony positions and produce a Swedish subject and finally a question focusing on eventual discursive changes between 1975-1982 on the one hand and 1997-2003 on the other. By looking at the formulations of goals and guidelines in the bills 1975:26 and 1997/98:16 I have shown how a process of cultural differentiation is reiterated throughout Swedish integration policy and should be understood as a hegemonizing practice that separates swedishness from non-swedishness and a Swedish subject from a non-Swedish subject. This process is on-going in 1975-1982 as well as in 1997-2003 and shows no discursive changes as such. In the formulations of goals and guidelines a tension between a cultural division between immigrants and Swedes on the one hand and the articulation of non-negotiable common interests or fundamental values is constituted during both periods. The cultural division and the non-negotiable common or fundamental interests or values are articulated simultaneously in both bills and have several effects upon the construction of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness. The first effect and in relation to the first question of this thesis most important is that it constructs swedishness as a nodal point in relation to which signifying elements are organised in a chain of equivalence, giving meaning to swedishness. It is done so when swedishness is articulated as the setting for desire i.e. when desires are articulated as Swedish and as such legitimate desires. Secondly, it is not only in it self that the process of cultural differentiation hegemonizes swedishness but it also facilitates a dislocating function through which the politically desired normality can work disciplinary. As I stated in chapter 3 the process of cultural differentiation dislocates what is regarded as deviant and cultural difference is dislocated from swedishness through the articulated deviant immigrant. Through this process, swedishness is either deprived from content, interpellating potential subject through a naturalized and self-evident cultural difference or it facilitates a dislocating function i.e. articulating norms to signify swedishness that also dislocates other potential desires or needs. It is as the process of cultural differentiation facilitates a dislocating function that an understanding can be given of how a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is articulated in Swedish integration policy.

During the period 1975-1982 a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is constituted through articulations, first of a process of cultural differentiation that constitutes swedishness as the nodal point of the discourse, in relation to which all other signifying elements organize. Second it is constituted through articulations of certain expectations upon common interests. In the bill and social introductions during the period of 1975-1982, a desired responsibility in relation to a week economical development and the family is articulated. In this way *responsibility* is constituted as an element with articulated desired *employment* and desired *family* as such, the *impenetrability* of it, *heterosexual* desire, *unpaid domestic labour* through a desired *clean home* organized as elements in a logics of equivalence in the articulation of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness. When these elements are organized in relation to the nodal point of the discourse, swedishness, and functions interpellating, the articulations of them produces a class positioned Swedish subject enabling the retrospective identification with a Swedish subject that is either employed, proving its responsibility to the week economical development or performing unpaid domestic labor. This process depoliticize both wage and domestic labor constructing a situation in which the division of labor not only positions the subject in relation to class but also in relation to gender. A class positioned Swedish subjects is articulated as either a productive and wage labouring Swedish man or in the domestic domain unpaid working Swedish woman. During the period of 1975-1982, however, responsibility is also articulated as a matter of *a regulated struggle* of the labour force through struggle *for improved work environment* and *improved general terms* and the desire towards these particular elements of the discourse. Furthermore, the struggle is articulated as performed through *participation in trade unions*, a desired *industrial peace* and *consensus* on the labour market organized as elements in a logics of equivalence in the articulation of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness. On the one hand, when these elements are organized in relation to swedishness, the nodal point, it produces a class positioned Swedish subject enabling the retrospective identification with a Swedish subject that is employed and responsibly (regulated and characterized by solidarity) participating in class struggle through the trade unions. For example through strikes or other trade union sanctioned measures. On the other hand it disrupts this production and politicise this position as it points in a direction in which a Swedish subject could be something else than waged labour force. Domestic unpaid labour is not regarded here and remains depoliticized. To understand the contingency of swedishness and hence the omnipresent potential failure to constitute the positions available within its limits could say something about the function of Swedish integration policy in terms of what is preserved, protected and reproduced. In the articulations of the Swedish labour force, struggling or non-struggling, the Swedish integration policy serves to dislocate from the fantasmatic responsible Swedish subject, the omnipresent possibility not to desire responsibility, employment, the heterosexual family, unpaid domestic labour, participation in the struggle for improved work environment or general terms through the trade union, industrial peace or consensus on the labour market enough. To speak plainly, the responsible Swedish subject always run the risk of not caring for a clean home,

inviting neighbours regardless, call in sick, work to rule, strike, and have lovers in plural, struggle not to work or to work less within or not within the frames of the trade union. Showing this process is to critically scrutinize seemingly fixed positions by providing an understanding, first of how knowledge and power constitute a more or less systematic way of ordering the world. That is to show how swedishness is articulated as a nodal point through the process of cultural differentiation and the constitution of the chain of equivalence that signifies it. Second, it would be to follow the potential failures that indicates its emergence i.e. where it fails to constitute the intelligibility it promises. That is to show what is dislocated, bringing the field of discursivity through the discursive limits.

During the period 1997-2003 a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is constituted in the same way as during the period 1975-1982, through articulations, first of a process of cultural differentiation that constitutes swedishness as the nodal point of the discourse. Second a hegemonic discourse on swedishness is constituted through articulations of certain expectations of fundamental values. Desired responsibility in relation to a weak economical development through employment and the family is articulated as elements organised in a logics of equivalence in relation to swedishness. It functions interpellating enabling a retrospective identification with a Swedish subject as labour force and as such it shows no discursive changes in relation to the period 1975-1982. However, in relation to responsibility, non-violence and harmonious behaviour is articulated and while the division of labour is no longer articulated as a matter of gender differentiation and a heterosexual desire is no longer dislocated from the Swedish family composition, desired employment permeates the political areas of Swedish integration policy. New elements of the hegemonic discourse on swedishness is non-violence and harmonious behaviour which through the process of cultural differentiation articulates immigrants as potentially violent and disharmonious rather than the labour force which is to be regarded as a political dislocation of disharmony on the labour market. It is on this basis I argue that a more generalized social peace is articulated rather than, as during the period 1975-1982, industrial peace or consensus on the labour market. This is to be seen also in the not present articulations of social movements during the period 1997-2003 which instead focuses on participation through the formal democracy. Comparing to the period of 1975-1982 the Swedish subject is explicitly depoliticized as all articulations points in the direction of a responsible and employed Swedish subject class positioned without potential ruptures that a regulated struggle could lead to. Simultaneously, the position from which actual violence, disharmony, inequality or undemocratic traditions could emerge is in Swedish integration policy articulated as designated for immigrants. When comparing the periods 1975-1982 and 1997-2003 it is possible to understand how the contemporary political rationality choose parts of the past strategically and in the specific case of Swedish integration policy in order to make everybody work. By illuminating the field of discursivity in the articulation of a hegemonic discourse on swedishness through Swedish integration policy I have shown how that is a matter of intense political dislocations of a situation in which people in Sweden just would not care to responsible participate in the production of themselves as class.

6 References

- Althusser, Louis; "Lenin and Philosophy", Monthly Review Press, New York, 1971.
- Arnstberg, Karl-Olov; "Sverige och invandringen", Studentlitteratur, Pozkal, 2008.
- Azar, Michael; "Den Koloniala Bumerangen – Från Schibbolet till Körkort I Svenska", Symposium, Stockholm, 2006.
- Azar, Michael; "Den äkta svenskheten och begärets dunkla objekt" p. 57-91 in *Identitetens omvandlingar – Back metal, magdans och hemlöshet* ed. Thomas Johansson, Daidalos, Uddevalla, 2001.
- Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina; "Textens mening och makt – Metodbok I Samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys", Studentlitteratur, 2005.
- Borevi, Karin; "Välfärdsstaten I det multikulturella samhället", Statsvetenskapliga föreningen i Uppsala, Uppsala, 2002.
- Brink Pinto, Andrés; "Med Lenin på Byrån – Normer kring klass, genus och sexualitet i den svenska kommunistiska rörelsen 1921-1939", Pluribus, Lund, 2008.
- Butler, Judith; "Gender Trouble – Feminism and the Subversion of Identity", Routledge, New York, 1990.
- Butler, Judith; "Undoing Gender", Routledge, New York, 2004.
- Butler, Judith; "Excitable speech – A Politics of the Performative", Routledge, New York, 1997a.
- Butler, Judith; "The psychic life of power: theories in subjection", Stanford University Press, California 1997b.
- Dahlström, Carl; "Nästan välkomna – Invandrapolitikens retorik och praktik", Statsvetenskapliga Institutionen Göteborgs Universitet, Göteborg, 2004.
- Edenheim, Sara; "Begärets Lagar – Moderna statliga utredningar och heteronormativitetens genealogi", Symposium, Stockholm/Stehag 2005.
- Foucault, Michel; "Övervakning och straff – Fängelsets födelse", Arkiv Förlag, Lund, 1993.
- Foucault, Michel; "Sexualitetens historia, band ett – Viljan att veta", Bokförlaget Daidalos AB, Uddevalla, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel; "Diskursens ordning – Installationsföreläsning vid Collège de France den 2 december 1970", Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposium, Stockholm, 1993.
- Foucault, Michel; "Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977", Pantheon Books, New York, 1981.
- Frank, Denis; "Staten, företagen och arbetskraftsinvandringen – en studie av invandringspolitiken i Sverige och rekryteringen av utländsk arbetskraft 1960-1972", Växjö University Press, 2005.

- Hammar, Tomas; "Sverige åt svenskarna – Invandrapolitik, utlänningskontroll och asylrätt 1900-1932", Carlsson Press Boktryckeri AB, Stockholm, 1964.
- Hammarén, Nils; "Förorten i huvudet – Unga män om kön och sexualitet i det nya Sverige", Atlas Akademi, Stockholm, 2008.
- Harraway, Donna; "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privileged of Partial Perspective" in *Feminist Studies*, vol 14. No. 3, pp. 575-599 1988.
- Johansson, Christina; "Välkommen till Sverige? – Svensk migrationspolitiska diskurser under 1900-talets andra hälft", Bokbox Förlag, Malmö, 2005.
- Laclau, Ernest & Mouffe, Chantal; "Hegemony and Socialist Strategy – Towards a Radical Democratic Politics", Verso, London, 2001.
- Laclau, Ernest & Zac, Lilian; "Minding the Gap: The Subject of Politics" p. 11-40 in *The Making of Political Identities* ed. Ernesto Laclau, Verso, London, 1994.
- Mattsson, Tina; "I viljan att göra det normala – En kritisk studie av genusperspektivet i missbrukarvården", Egalité, Malmö, 2005.
- McClintock, Anne; "Imperial Leather – Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest", Routledge, 1995.
- Sarstrand, Anna-Maria; "De första invandrarbyråerna. – Om invandrades inkorporering på kommunal nivå åren 1965-1984.", Växjö Universitet, Växjö, 2007.
- Scott, W Joan; "Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity" s. 284-304 in *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 27, nr. 2., 2001.
- Scott, W Joan; "Only Paradoxes to Offer – French Feminists and the Rights of Man", Harvard, USA, 1996.
- Scott, W Joan; "Experience" p. 22-40 in *Feminists Theorize the Political*. Judith Butler & Joan W Scott (red.), Routledge, New York, 1992.
- Skeggs, Beverley; "Formations of Class and gender – Becoming Respectable", Sage Publications, London, 1997.
- Tischer, Stefan & Meyer, Michael & Wodak, Ruth and Vetter, Eva; "Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis", Sage, London, 2007.
- Winter Jörgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise; "Diskursanalys som teori och metod", Studentlitteratur, Lund, 2000.

Printed Sources

- Swedish Board of Immigration; "Invandrare i Sverige", Swedish Board of Immigration, 1978.
- Swedish Board of Immigration; "Sverige – en samhällsintroduktion för invandrare", Swedish Board of Immigration, 1982.
- Swedish Board of Immigration; "Information About Sweden", Swedish Board of Immigration, 1990.
- Swedish Board of Integration; "Sverige - en pocketguide", Swedish Board of Integration, 2003.
- Legislative Bill of 1997/98; "Regeringens proposition 1997/98:16. Sverige, framtiden och mångfalden – från invandrapolitik till integrationspolitik".
- Legislative Bill of 1985/86; "Regeringens proposition 1985/86:98 om invandrapolitiken".

Legislative Bill of 1975; "Regeringens proposition nr 26 år 1975. Regeringens proposition om riktlinjer för invandrar- och minoritetspolitiken m.m."