



Malmö högskola

Hälsa och samhälle

POLICY OF CRIME –

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PUNITIVE TURN´S INFLUENCE ON THE GREEN PARTY AND THE SWEDEN DEMOCRATS

BIRK ANDERSSON

Magister Thesis in Criminology

15 p

Criminology degree course

August, 2014

Malmö högskola

Hälsa och samhälle

205 06 Malmö

POLICY OF CRIME – AN ANALYSIS OF THE PUNITIVE TURN’S INFLUENCE ON THE GREEN PARTY AND THE SWEDEN DEMOCRATS

BIRK ANDERSSON

Andersson, B. Policy of crime – An analysis of the punitive turn’s influence on the Green party and the Sweden democrats, *Master thesis in Criminology 15 p.* Malmö högskola: Hälsa och Samhälle, Institutionen för Kriminologi, August, 2014.

Abstract: This thesis has analyzed the relationship between the punitive turn and the crime policies of the Green party (Miljöpartiet de Gröna) and the Sweden democrats (Sverigedemokraterna) to answer the research question; what influence the punitive turn has had on the parties policies. The choice of method has fallen on a quantitative content-analysis with a qualitative complementarity and qualitative facilitation. From an account of the punitive turn has a word-list with recording units been created, of those recording units has a computer-search been made of the two parties most recent official documents which accounts for the parties holistic politics; MP’s Partyprogramme from 2013, and SD’s Principleprogramme from 2011. The result of the qualitative complementarity shows; a greater frequency of recording units for MP than for SD. The analysis of the qualitative facilitation-result shows; a lesser direct influence of the punitive turn for MP than for SD. The result and analysis are discussed regarding whether the research question has been answered, and no such conclusion is considered to be made by the researcher, instead are the result and analysis open for interpretation of the reader.

Keywords: crime policy, content-analysis, extreme-right, green-movement, the Green party (Miljöpartiet), the Sweden democrats (Sverigedemokraterna), punitive turn

Preface

”The word theory has the same Greek root as theatre. Both are concerned with putting on a show. A theory in science is no more than what seems to its author a plausible way of dressing up the facts and presenting them to the audience. Like plays, theories are judged according to several different, and barely connected, criteria...It matters little whether the view of the theorizer is right or wrong: investigations and research are stimulated, new facts discovered, and new theories composed.” – Lovelock (1988: 41)

Malmö högskola, August 2014

Birk Andersson

Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 6 |
| 1.1 | Problematization of reality..... | 6 |
| 1.2 | Aim and research-question | 7 |
| 1.3 | Definitions of key concepts | 8 |
| 1.3.1 | Criminology..... | 8 |
| 1.3.2 | Crime | 8 |
| 1.3.3 | Crime policy..... | 8 |
| 1.4 | Background..... | 9 |
| 1.4.1 | MP and SD | 9 |
| 1.4.2 | The movements..... | 13 |
| 2 | Knowledge background..... | 16 |
| 2.1 | The punitive turn: Internationally | 16 |
| 2.1.1 | Main characteristics | 16 |
| 2.1.2 | Crime policy..... | 17 |
| 2.1.3 | Criminological theories..... | 19 |
| 2.2 | The punitive turn: Sweden | 21 |
| 2.2.1 | Main characteristics | 21 |
| 2.2.2 | Crime policy..... | 21 |
| 2.2.3 | Criminology..... | 22 |
| 3 | Method | 23 |
| 3.1 | Design | 23 |
| 3.2 | Wordlist of recording units..... | 25 |
| 3.3 | Selection | 25 |
| 3.4 | Reliability and validity | 26 |
| 3.5 | Ethical considerations | 27 |
| 4. | Result..... | 27 |
| 4.1 | MP | 28 |
| 4.1.1 | Qualitative complementarity | 28 |
| 4.2 | SD..... | 29 |
| 4.2.1 | Qualitative complementarity | 29 |
| 4.3 | Comparison | 30 |
| 4.3.1 | Qualitative complementarity | 30 |
| 5 | Analysis and Discussion..... | 32 |
| 5.1 | Analysis..... | 32 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| 5.1.1 The punitive turn | 32 |
| 5.1.2 The anti-punitive turn..... | 38 |
| 5.1.3 Summary..... | 39 |
| 5.2 Discussion | 40 |
| 5.3 Conclusion | 42 |
| 6. References | 43 |
| 6.1 Sources | 43 |
| Appendix 1 | 51 |
| Appendix 2 | 52 |
| Appendix 3 | 54 |
| Appendix 4 | 57 |

1 Introduction

With inspiration from the problem-oriented, often empirical focused, Anglo-Saxon writing-tradition (see Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 67-69) a chosen “hard topic” here is being problematized right at the beginning (ibid: 131) of this thesis with the intention of persuading the reader that the thesis is needful since it is addressing an important relevant problem (that has not been studied before). “To problematize the reality is the first step on the way to knowledge; it is a step which cannot possibly be skipped” (Asplund, 1983: 117, own translation).

A thesis is therefore like politics, which, according to Edelman (1988, chapter 2), is about establishing problems because its legibility is won by the ability to solve those problems. Both in politics and in a thesis the problematization is done by, for example, statistics and quotation, but those elements are just parts of the main tool; arguing – a good thesis should after all be (built as) an argument (Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 58). One important thing does however differ between a thesis and politics: “In the work with a thesis or research project it is substantially to differ between what is a scientific problem and what is a problem for politicians” (Danermark et al, 2003: 260, own translation).

This thesis is not investigating a political problem, but a problem is in fact being investigated, and that problem is being described – a problematized reality is being argued for. This, because the writing in this introduction is done in the Anglo-Saxon tradition (which is dominating in the disciplines that primarily are based on concrete subjects, such as medicine-, natural- and social science (Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 67-69)).

1.1 Problematization of reality

Politics have probably never been such a hot topic in Sweden as in this super-election year of 2014 (both UE-Parliament-election and National election). The results of the UE-election show that the political landscape is being reshaped; the two dominating parties in Swedish politics; Moderaterna (M) and Arbetarpartiet - Socialdemokraterna (S) got historically poor results, while the Green Party (Miljöpartiet de Gröna = MP) and the Sweden democrats (Sverigedemokraterna = SD) got historically good results, and became the second (15,4 % for MP) and fifth (9,7 % for SD) largest parties in Sweden (val.se). And this election-result is not a single event but an extensive trend, in which MP and SD have, for example, continuously improved their national election results since the mid-1990s (scb.se), and are attracting an increasing amount of members (Partisekreterarbrev februari 2014; Appendix 1). With a macro-perspective is this trend even clearer; MP and SD are namely parts of new global movements: the green and the extreme right (see 1.4 The Movements). The end of ideologies, the deideologization of politics (see e.g. Bell 1960; Lewin, 2002: 87), was thus maybe declared too soon, instead we might witness a comeback of ideologies both internationally and in Sweden, and a more extreme Swedish politic (e.g. Brå, 2009).

While politics is going through current major changes (whose effects the future will have to account for) a specific political area; crime policy, has recently been through a major shift – a “punitive turn”. It was in the 1970s that a more punitive and hard approach to crime developed, first internationally and then nationally (e.g. Tham 2001; Demker & Duus-Otterström, 2008). This view of harder punishment has been shared by political parties, mass-media, interest groups and criminological theories (see 2 Background), and crime policy has become “a populist political approach” (Radzinowicz, 1999: 469). A “populist punitiveness” has been created (Bottoms, 1995), in which expert-knowledge has been replaced with

”common sense” (e g Inzunza & Svensson, 2010: 186), and a policy of punishment which is based on “the common consensus” (e g Andersson & Nilsson, 2009) – this although the Swedish public’s interest in crime policy is decreasing (e g Demker et al, 2008), and that the demand for (harder) punishment is not supported by an informed and perceptive public (Jerre & Tham, 2010). Radzinowicz claims that the punitive turn has divided criminology from crime policy; “What I find profoundly disturbing is the gap between “criminology” and “criminal policy”, between the study of crime and punishment and the actual mode of controlling crime.” (Radzinowicz, 1999: 469).

For politicians criminalization and legislative changes have however become an important tool for party-political purposes (e g Ericson, 2007), and “crime and punishment” are therefore “now among the most topical, urgent and contentious questions of our times” (Garland & Sparks, 2000: 202). In Sweden crime policy does stand as a strategically important area for the political parties (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009), this is shown by the increase of crime policy reports/manifestos (Demker & Duus-Otterström, 2008).

But is the punitive turn present in the politics of two parties that were not even founded when the punitive turn begun in the 1970s? Is the punitive turn present, a current phenomenon, of also these new political forces? This issue will be investigated by a text-analysis of the two parties each most recent official documents of the parties holistic politic. Thus will not “just” the parties’ crime-policies be analyzed, but their whole politic because crime-policy affects (and is affected by) other areas of society/politics (see 1.3.3 Crime policy). By an account of the punitive turn will first key word, and then recording units be selected, those units will be used in an quantitative-qualitative content-analysis. According to Edelman (1988: 7) a content analysis is “one of the most important research techniques in the social sciences”.

This research has, to the author’s knowledge, never been done before, therefore this study is explorative, since it exists little knowledge in the area and this thesis/research can provide a basic understanding (see Björklund & Paulsson, 2003: 58) and solve the problematized reality, which is: whether the punitive turn is found in two rising political movements (MP and SD). Whether it is found or not may give some clue to the future development of the punitive turn.

1.2 Aim and research-question

This thesis contains of several subsidiary aims, such as: to write a conscious thesis with methodological considerations in every part, an inclusion of the three main approaches to study in a content analysis; patterns, trends and differences (Krippendorff, 1980: 35-38), and to provide some sort of increasing knowledge for every reader, whoever she/he may be. Also the punitive turn is meant to be accounted for, and from it will a unique method-design with recording units (which will be used in a content analysis) be produced.

The main aim is however to investigate MP’s and SD’s crime policies in relation to the punitive turn – what influence exist, how can the policies be compared to the punitive turn? By such an analysis, the aim is to answer the following research-question:

- What is the influence of the punitive turn on the crime policies of MP and SD – what is the relation between the punitive turn and MP and SD’s each most recent official documents that accounts for their holistic politics?

1.3 Definitions of key concepts

When writing a criminological thesis about crime policy, it should be obligatory to at least define criminology, crime and crime policy. Several other concepts which are in relevance to the topic (crime policy) are however not defined here; **1)** due to they are not used in this thesis, or **2)** because limitations must be made. Examples of these “not defined concepts” are; (political) party, language, rhetoric (ethos, logos), discourse, context, power, theory (explanandum, explanans), law, lawmaking, common consensus (public opinion), mass-media, ideology, lobbyism, neo-liberalism, and welfare state. Neither will information about the MP’s and SD’s origins, former and current party-leaders, the party-symbols (flowers) etc at all, or in any great extensions, be described in this thesis.

1.3.1 *Criminology*

There is not any general accepted definition or consensus (in the field) of how criminology and crime should be defined (e g Ekbohm et al, 2011). The most common used accepted definition of “criminology” is however (according to e g Sarnecki, 2009) that criminology should include “the process of making laws, of breaking laws, and of reacting toward the breaking of laws” (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978: 3). This definition could also be used to, not define, but explain, crime policy, and will be used in this thesis.

1.3.2 *Crime*

Regarding “crime”, is a universal accepted definition even more problematic to find. Henry (2001) accounts for five different crime-definitions; legal, moral, social, humanistic, and social constructional. A rougher classification can however be made based on two ideas of what a crime is; if a crime is an “illegality” (*malum prohibitum*), or a “serious harm” (*malum in se*). These two ideas can, just as roughly, be divided into mainstream criminology and critical criminology (e g Agnew, 2001). Mainstream criminology (strain, control, learning, disorganization, routine activities, rational choice, and life course theories) defines crime as illegality or law-breaking, while critical criminology (labeling, conflict, radical, peacemaking, and postmodern theories) defines crime as harm (Hagan, 2002: 173).

1.3.3 *Crime policy*

According to Tham (2001: 414) the development (the punitive turn) has been a “shift from crime policy to crime politics”. Demker & Duus-Otterström (2008: 275) uses “criminal policy”, and claim that it is “a concept that sometimes gets thrown around a bit carelessly”. Criminal policy is defined as “the policies – strategies or actions – which are taken with respect to law-breaking. This no doubt includes penal policy – the policy of punishment – and questions about when, why and how much to punish. But it also includes actions taken to address the causes and consequences of crime. Criminal policy, then, also includes ways to prevent recidivism and first-time offending, as well as attempts to redress victims and foster a sense of trust in the criminal justice system. A party’s criminal policy, in short, is its general strategy to deal with the problem of crime.” (Demker & Duus-Otterström, 2008: 275).

Other use the concept of “crime policy”, for example do Ekbohm and colleagues (2011) proposes that crime policy in its basis is what should be punishable and how severe the punishments will follow. Jareborg (2001: 20-21, own translation) defines crime policy as “policy addressing social debate and social decision making. A part of crime policy consists of criminal justice policy... Generally it can be said that modern criminal justice policy is based on finding an acceptable compromise between requirements of legal certainty and demands for efficiency. Crime policy can however also apply to how the society in large should be regulated to prevent crime. Crime policy will then coincident with parts of, for

example, education-, social-, housing-, environment-, economy-, labor, taxation-, sport-, health-, and the social planning policy”.

In this thesis the choice has been made to use “crime” (instead of “criminal”) and “policy” (instead of “politics”). Words are however just words, the definitions accounted for above are of more importance, and they propose that, apart from its basis, crime policy includes a holistic political agenda.

1.4 Background

The backgrounds of the two chosen parties and the movements in which they are included, are here accounted for in the Germanic-roman, or Continental, tradition which usually occurs in esthetics, philosophy, idea- and cultural-history (see Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 67-69). The Continental problematization has sources as its basis, and may include a mapping of what and who that have affected theorists and a historical development. The Continental approach must not be problem-oriented, nor theory or empiric-based (ibid). The sources have however been found by the chain-search method, which is a literature search in which references are chosen from one text to another, and to another (see Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 215), and thus (the determined method) the Anglo-Saxon tradition has been used in the data-selection.

1.4.1 MP and SD

The backgrounds of MP and SD, their history, development and politics, are accounted for in order to present basic information about the parties for a reader who is not familiar to the two study-objects. The backgrounds are based on publications (books) and informative texts from the parties’ official websites. Official party-documents (including party-programs) are not used here, but later in this thesis as data-material (see 4 Method). Other sources, such as interviews, documentaries, and news-paper articles are not used because of possible inaccessibility for the reader. With different views of the two parties, and also information regarding the authors and the sources, the reader can thus decide the validity of the chosen sources.

1.4.1.1 MP

Several books have been written by the party itself (party-members of MP). Sources, written by authors who are not, at least formally, representing MP, are fewer. “The story” of MP and the party’s policies are therefore for most part being told by MP itself. How this effect to background-accountancy of the party will however not be analyzed, and no conclusions will be drawn.

1.4.1.1.1 An account of MP by MP-sources

Nyberg: In an anthological book to mark the MP’s 20 year anniversary Mikael Nyberg (editor) (Nyberg, 2001) does account for the foundation of MP. In 1980 some specific events played important roles. First, the Swedish people did vote against a direct abolishment of the national nuclear power-programme. Due to this election-result Garthon wrote in June a newspaper article about the need for a new type of party. At the 30th September a meeting was held in Garthon’s apartment in Stockholm, in which sixteen of the participants signed a declaration to start a new political party. Almost one year later, at the 20th September 1981 Miljöpartiet de Gröna was formally established.

Garthon: Per Garthon, fil dr in sociology and former party-leader (the first) of MP, has written about his own career in MP and the formation and development of MP in Garthon (2011) in a narrative story. In another book (Garthon, 1988: 11) he does argue for a green change due to the fact that Beck’s risk society (see Beck, 1998), both ecologically and

socially, is becoming a reality. Garthon claims that the other governmental parties are more or less stuck in materialistic ideologies (socialism or liberalism) which assume the correlation between materialism and wellbeing of humans. The human being is seen as active and capable to be responsible for one's own situation, and want to affect the development of society. All people have positive development-possibilities and everyone has the right to develop these from one's own conditions.

Regarding "crime and punishment" Garthon (1988) does claim that individual offences are not as a great threat as environmentally destructive companies or authorities. The green ideology is not to strengthen the control from the society against the individual, but to strengthen the individual possibilities of controlling companies and agencies. Incarceration of troubled people is not a fundamental solution to their problems.

Miljöpartiet: The creation of MP and the party's basic policies are subjected in a book by MP (Miljöpartiet, 1982). From the beginning three cornerstones were declared; **1)** stop the environmental threat, **2)** create an alternative economy, and **3)** have different kinds of politicians (ibid: 18). The party should represent "ecopolitics" (which includes an opposition against capitalism), decentralized power and a local society self-rule, equality, and an ecological global balance and solidarity with regard of forthcoming generations (ibid). GDP-growth is not seen as a solution for social and environmental problems and Garthon is applying several social and philosophical ideas from, in particular, Durkheim, Merton and Habermas to answer the question; whether "MP has a social theory?" (ibid).

This anti-growth reasoning is less clear in more recent publications by MP and a rapprochement of liberal ideas have been taken (see e g Elander, 2011). Former party leader Maria Wetterstrand does however claim that "Freedom and rights in liberalism apply to now living people and not coming generations. Unborn have according to liberalism no rights. The green view of freedom is much broader than that." (Wetterstrand, 2011: 119, own translation).

Issues directly regarding crime in the first party-program (in Miljöpartiet, 1982) are placed under social policy (under equality) where, for example, affirmative actions, harsher laws and research should be applied to prevent rape and violence against women. Further, drug problems (alcohol, narcotics and tobacco) must be solved in several ways/levels – for example by a restrictive drug-policy, rehabilitation and prohibition in some places. Crime must also be fought and prevented simultaneously in different levels, from a societal change with a better community to a more human correctional with "a more proper rehabilitation of those that have committed crime" (Miljöpartiet, 1982: 159, own translation). The crime-types that are mentioned are economic, organized, environmental, and violent crimes.

Further are all sorts of discrimination against immigrants (the contradictions between immigrants and Swedish) unneedful and harmful. The solutions are, among others, that mass-media will start portraying the positive aspects of immigration in Sweden, and that segregation shall be countered; "the immigrants culture must be a natural part a one for all of us common culture" (Miljöpartiet, 1982: 163, own translation).

Mp.se: MP got elected into the Swedish Parliament (Riksdagen) in 1988 for the first time. After become outvoted in 1991, the party has been in the Parliament since 1994 (mp.se 1). In 1985 the party's current name ("Miljöpartiet De gröna") was established (ibid). Today MP wants to create a sustainable society which focus primarily on climate change, a new school-policy, and more jobs (mp.se 3). Current party leaders are Åsa Romson and Gustav Fridolin (mp.se 2).

1.4.1.1.2 An account of MP by non-MP Sources

Carlström and Lundström: Two journalists; Ville Carlström and Stefan Lundström have written a book about MP and Green Peace in particular, and the green movement in general (Carlström & Lundström, 1988). They claim that MP often been accused for being an "one-issue party" but that the party claim itself to promote a holistic and ecological world-view that counters the traditional mechanic pluralistic view.

Johansson: Mats Johansson, an author, has analyzed the position and the future outlooks of MP (Johansson, 1999). He claims that the policy of MP has strong philosophical and ideological influences, especially from "doomsayers" messages about a collapsing nature and development as a negative thing. MP's existence is depending on a negative belief in the future in the rich countries – that we now are worse off, and especially, that we will be worse off. The fear for an environmental apocalypse is based on a historical and, especially, a religious belief in sin and punishment regarding a nature in imbalance (Johansson, 1999).

Others: Several other (academically written) sources claim that MP has changed much of its original critical alternative ideology (more than the MP-sources claims) to a more "normal" political party when the party has been getting political power/been participating in government (see Ljunggren, 2010; Burchell, 2001). Ljunggren (2010) claims that MP has moved from an alternative exclusion to an included, and Berlin & Lundqvist (2012) proposes that the party sympathizers have changed in a similar direction.

1.4.1.2 SD

In contrast to the sources from the MP-background, the several sources about SD are written by authors who are not, at least formally, representing SD. But just as with the background of MP, will no analysis or any conclusions be drawn of how these sources might affect the background account.

1.4.1.2.1 An account of SD by SD-sources

Åkesson: Jimmy Åkesson writes in his book (Åkesson, 2013) that he himself and SD repeatedly have been unjust threatened and labeled as "racists and xenophobes" by the other political parties (especially "left- radicals") and mass-media, and specific politicians and journalists. Åkesson claims that he "and his party-friends do occasionally incorrectly get blamed to have series of unpleasant perceptions under the polish surface" (Åkesson, 2013: 7, own translation). This blaming and treatment is according to Åkesson because of SD's goal; to challenge the power-structure. Another main goal for SD is to restore the Swedish welfare state.

Regarding the party's history Åkesson does claim that a new era of SD took place in 1995 by a change of the party-leader and the party realized that "skinheads and extremists" must be removed from the party in the attempt to create a conventional political party. The false picture; that SD today is a racist party, is unjust and problematic. Since the mid-1990s he and the party have clearly expressed their opinion that they are not racists, but consider all races and people to have the same value and entitlement. However it is clear that a multi-cultural society is not good if one wish to achieve a peaceful and democratic development of the society. Since no other land has done this, there is no reason to think that Sweden could do it.

The "mass-immigration" of the recent decades has change Sweden from one of the most homogenous countries to a cultural heterogeneous, segregated immigration-country that has created conflicts, and destabilized the modern Sweden. According to Åkesson one cannot ignore the present social chaos that has occurred because of the multi-cultural societal-experiment. Mass-immigration leads inevitably to segregation and exclusion; "Sweden gets

torn apart, parallel societies are emerging, and in such a situation it is no longer possible to maintain a societal model that builds on consensus, trust and a strong social capital” (Åkesson, 2013: 144, own translation). “The problem is primarily the mass-immigration in combination with multiculturalism” (Åkesson, 2013:172, own translation) which in recent years has been caused by an “extreme immigration-policy” which M and MP agreed upon on in 2012.

Regarding crime, Åkesson does claim that foreign-born represent a clear over-representation of convicted rape-offenders and that there is in our day and age a clear value-conflict between the Muslim view of women and the Swedish equality legislation

Sd.se: SD was founded on the 6th February 1988, it grew steadily, and in the national election of 2010 the party did receive 5.7 % of the votes and thus entered the Swedish Parliament and is there represented by 20 mandates (sd.se 1). The party claims that they do not belong to either the right or the left-wing, but that they are pragmatic and judge different issues individually. To not be stuck in certain a traditional ideology SD claims to decrease the possibility of a god socially beneficial politics (sd.se 3). SD does however claim to be social-conservative. The three most important political questions/policies are: immigration, criminality and elderly-care (sd.se 2). Jimmy Åkesson has been the party leader of SD since 2005.

1.4.1.2.2 An account of SD by Non-SD sources

Hellström: Anders Hellström is a doctor in social science who has written a book (Hellström, 2010) about SD, which is based on academic research. He claims to have analyzed the politics of SD of what is said and how it is said. With this partial discourse analysis Hellström does claim that SD is not a deviant strange political force in a Swedish historical context but their political views have been developed in contrast to the other political parties and what they are communicating in the official debate against SD and their politics. The growing populism and xenophobia in others parts of Europe do also explain SD’s success as a logic understandable development. While the other traditional political parties radicalize SD, SD does radicalize their politic and rhetoric.

Hellström (2010) also claims that official debate about SD’s policy is about morality (good and evil) and does not fit in to the traditional scale of right and left. SD sees itself as “the good guys”, as moral nationalists who listen to the common citizen.

Ekman & Pohl: From a method of interviews and data content analysis of several types of sources do Mikael Ekman (producer and researcher) and Daniel Poohl (chief-editor) present a view of SD as a conspiratorially, pragmatic and comeback-craving party with big problems regarding the managing of their own history – a history of fascism, Nazism and white-power etc, which the party has successfully denied to that degree that many members are not aware of it (Ekman & Poohl, 2010).

According to Ekman & Poohl (2010) SD has not come to term with their history, instead they are lying about it. The party is focusing their attention on just two of the immigrants groups - Africans (especially Somali) and “Arabs/Muslims” (especially Iraqis) and not others, this makes SD, not just xenophobic, but racist. SD is interested in those particular crime-types that they easiest can connect to immigration and the multicultural society, “Especially rape has a special position in the party’s propaganda” (Ekman & Poohl, 2010: 183, own translation). The central point in their politics is that a country cannot function if its population is not ethnically homogeneous. SD claim that they have nothing against “non-swedes”, because they can become regular Swedish citizens if they assimilate to the Swedish culture, however, to be defined as Swedish can take longer time. SD is basing their ideology on an ideology of

differences, whether it is ethnicity, racism, culture. The common idea is that some people should be kept away from the community. The hate against immigration of certain groups is the party's most important driving force and permeates all their positions. The multicultural society is the blame for the disappearance of the common sense, which regarding crime/safety is an obvious mathematic calculation where more police and harder punishment leads to fewer criminals on the streets.

Mattsson: Pontus Mattsson is a political reporter at Sweden's national radio who has written a reportage-book (Mattsson, 2010) about SD's transformation from demonstrating Nazis in the beginning of the 1990's, to a different party with a different appearance and well-educated leaders, but with an irreconcilable resistance against immigration and the multi-cultural society.

Others: Several other books have been written about SD, mostly by "investigative journalists" who claim that they have done a mapping of racist, anti-semitic and immigrant-hostile organizations and parties in Sweden, and that SD is a part of that movement (see Arnstad, 2013; Bengtsson, 2009; Lodenius & Wikström, 1997; Larsson & Ekman, 2001; Ekman & Ekman, 2001; Hamrud & Qvarford, 2010). They also claim that SD's history has a deep-rooted history of Nazism, fascism, National Socialism, and that the party today is a xenophobic and racist party. SD has however, since the mid 90's worked to create a respectable image, they have openly dissociated themselves from Nazism and racism (see e.g. Lagerlöf, 2012; Widfeldt, 2008).

1.4.2 The movements

There are two parallel movements that represent competing forces in a value political confrontation in post-cold-war Europe (Appadurai, 2007). The one side collects the new social movements, which are based on issues such as environmental considerations, a limitation of the national borders and/or feminism (Wennerhag, 2008). As a reaction to these movements the other side mobilizes forces which mark the need for clear national borders instead of a multicultural society, protectionism instead of free trade, and stable gender-differences instead of new gender definitions (ibid). These two rival forces cannot easily be placed on the right-left political scale, and according to Appadurai (2007: 23) we can understand the value political strife of the two opposite movements by a widespread "anxiety about the incomplete".

Globally, but especially in Europe, these two movements have developed into important political powers (e.g. Dolezal, 2010), but no accounting for such parties in the European countries is being presented, not either a thorough historical development of the movements. Instead a short, but holistic, macro and chrono-,account of the most relevant features of the movements is given below.

1.4.2.1 Green

The (somewhat) different views of the background-sources of MP does not affect "the story" of the green movement, in which MP is not an unique example – other organizations, especially European parties advocate a similar world-view.

Environmentally concerned organizations (lobbying pressure groups) were first founded in the end of the 19th century (e.g. Goodin, 1992). During the 1960s the "green wave" began, which ideologically criticized the growth-society, environmental-destruction and commercialization (Ljunggren, 2010). During the 1970s the green political parties formed from the green social movements and organizations (e.g. Müller-Rommel, 1994; Carlström & Lundström, 1988). They were ideologically influenced by conservationism, environmentalism and/or ecologism but jointly defined as "green" (Burchell, 2002).

By “green” Carlström & Lundström (1988: 7) do mean not just organizations and political parties but “people who put the environment before the growth and who are willing to sacrifice a part of one’s material standard to protect the environment”. These people feel displaced on the traditional left-right political scale, and rather feel home in a scale that stretches from grey to green (ibid).

A green volunteer and the green movement in large is driven by both anxiety and hope. The anxiety lies in the belief that the world is facing a gigantic disaster and that it is soon too late to save the earth and its creatures. The issue of stopping the destruction of nature overshadows other problems, or rather; the issue is the basic-thinking that is applied in confronting other problems. Peace/disarmament, equality and decentralization are however also important issues. There is however hope that the green movement, or revolution, will grow enough along with the environmental problems and hopefully solve them. (Carlström & Lundström, 1988)

Regarding green political parties, they, just as MP, do claim to still have an ecological world-view, but, just as MP, the parties have developed a less critical ideology (e g Richardson & Rootes, 1995; O’Neill, 1997; Dobson, 2001). According to Poguntke (2010) the green parties have changed from having doubts to be associated with the political power to a view in which political power is a measure to the changes which the parties want to see. As new political movements in the 1970s and 1980s green parties challenged the existing models of party organization and activism (Burchell, 2002). They described themselves as standing outside the traditional political divisions (as being beyond left and right) and empathized on the survival of the environment and mankind (Dolezal, 2010). Green parties do however today belong to the left and often prefer state intervention to market processes (ibid), it is highly unlikely for them to side exclusively with the right (Poguntke, 2010). They have gone from “anti-political parties” to conforming to the political power structure, and this development is a normal one for when new parties develop and gain political power (Burchell, 2002). And the green parties have indeed, in contrary to some earlier prognoses, become stable forces in European politics (Dolezal, 2010).

Regarding Green voters of today, they do share a specific type of attitudes and several specific social characteristics: they are predominantly young, highly educated, students or white-collar employees in service sectors, urban-living and female voters are overrepresented, and they have environmental, libertarian and pro-immigration attitudes. Given their background Green voters therefore are seen as members of the “new middle-class”, and are the potential winners in the new societal divisions caused by processes of globalization. (Dolezal, 2010)

1.4.2.2 Extreme right

The background of SD gave opposite views in regarding of SD’s history, views and policy. In this argument the side of the non-SD sources will be taken. This view is also supported by several other sources, which see SD as a part of a bigger movement (e g Rydgren, 2004; Ministry of Justice, Sweden & Institute for Strategic Dialogue, 2012; Wilson & Hainsworth, 2012). SD is, just as MP, not a unique example in European politics, but similar politics is advocated by other parties; parties which just like SD receive even larger successes for every election.

There are several names for these parties such as “right-wing-extremism” (e g Merkel & Weinberg, 2003), “radical right-wing populism” (e g Betz & Immerfall, 1998), “RHP-parties” (e g Mudde, 2007), and “extreme right” (e g Hainsworth, 2000), and therefore also several definitions (for each concept). The chosen name/concept here is “extreme right” which key-

elements are nationalism, xenophobia, racism, anti-democracy, and support for a strong state (Hainsworth, 2000: 9). The extreme right's ideological personality consists of patriotism and a strong emphasis on law and order (and security), and ethnical identification and exclusion (ibid).

Several sources account for the rise of extreme right movements (in particular political parties) in one after another European country in the last decades of the 20th century (e.g. Merkel & Weinberg, 2003; Betz & Immerfall, 1998; Hainsworth, 2000; Mudde, 2002). During the 1980s and 1990s extreme right movement-parties developed into political powers due to a "new populism", in which political strategies were more developed (Betz & Immerfall, 1998). The extreme right-parties have been developed from different national traditions but they share a common aim – to oppose immigration and integration into the European Union, and to promote ethnic purity (Davies & Jackson, 2008). The common problem is immigration, which is viewed as an "invasion force from the Third World and Eastern Europe" to the prosperous (Western) Europe (Merkel & Weinberg, 2003: 28). In Western Europe (and USA) the dissatisfaction has developed against relatively poor immigrants and refugees, which are accused of taking away jobs from native workers, driving down wages and exploiting the welfare system (Betz & Immerfall, 1998). The principle of individual rights for all members of the community is not shared by the extreme-right, rights are instead based on ascribed characteristics, such as race, ethnicity and religion (Betz & Immerfall, 1998). In the very core of this view is the myth of a former homogeneous nation (Merkel & Weinberg, 2003). The extreme right parties are based on feelings of dissatisfaction against changes in society (in particular immigration) which create a (false) nostalgia of former "glory days" – therefore must one protect the nation's traditions and history, which the immigrants threaten (ibid).

Several theories try to explain the extreme right-movement, for example the movement may be caused by, or rather related to, the social breakdown of large-scale traditional national structures (especially class and religion) and the well-fare state. These socioeconomic and socio-structural changes have led to anomie, which in turn have led to feelings of insecurity and inefficacy. Individuals have developed strain, and lost a sense of belonging and are therefore attracted to nationalism, which may increase a sense of self-esteem and efficacy. To the supporter of the extreme right, nationalism is seen as a resistance/counter-force to a threatening development, which includes community of liberal individualization and universalism, untraditional roles, and a social/cultural heterogenic society. (Merkel & Weinberg, 2003)

The individuals, or rather groups, that are the biggest supporters of the right extreme, have also the most to lose from today's structural transformation and are the least prepared to adjust for these new circumstances (Betz & Immerfall, 1998). These groups are blue-collar workers who lack formal educational credentials, employees doing routine jobs or/and young unemployed, and they are likely to be anxious with respect of their professional and personal future (ibid). In many aspects, the extreme right movements can be seen as anti-parties, and the benefit from popular dissatisfactions with mainstream politics/parties, regarding anti-elitism, corruption and crisis of representation (Hainsworth, 2000). The extreme right-parties do also have, like mass-media, a tendency to exaggerate situations, and to enlarge popular myths (Bengtsson, 2009). The extreme right parties are therefore populists (Mudde 2007). Populism is defined by Betz & Immerfall (1998: 4) as "a structure of argumentation, a political style and strategy, and ideology". The core elements of the populism is "a pronounced faith in the common sense of the ordinary people; the belief that simple solutions exist for the most complex problems of the modern world; and the belief that the "common

people”, despite possessing moral superiority and innate wisdom, have been denied the opportunity to make themselves heard” (ibid).

2 Knowledge background

This knowledge background is meant to provide for key concepts, which in turn are meant to provide for a wordlist of recording units for this thesis’ method. It is also meant to prove the relevance of the chosen subject and therefore the importance of this thesis. This background knowledge is however neither consciously written for those purposes, nor either to criticize the development of the punitive turn, or to account for “empirical evidence” (testing results of theories) – this because it is not relevant (for this thesis) if the criminological theories can be falsified or verified. This knowledge background is instead an account of the punitive turn, which is proposed by several international and national sources, and includes development-levels of meso (national), macro (international), and crono (narrative) of crime policy.

Regarding the methodological considerations this knowledge background has been written in a combination of the Continental- and Anglo-Saxon-tradition, but the sources have been chosen by a chain-search. A possible weakness of a chain-search is that sources of other views could be missed (Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 215). This has been (aimed to be) prevented by an account of the theories and theorists of the punitive turn, and those theoretical account support several claims of the other sources.

2.1 The punitive turn: Internationally

Below is the international development of crime policy presented.

2.1.1 *Main characteristics*

Since the 1970s there has been a noticeable change by how western governments react to crime (e.g. O’Malley, 1999; Young, 1999; Wacquant, 2001; Taylor, 1999). This change is often described as the “punitive turn” (e.g. Estrada, 2004; Tham, 2001). According to Demker & Duus-Otterström (2008: 273) Garland is “The leading theorist of the punitive turn”. Also Feeley (2003: 113) regard Garland’s explanation to involve “just about all the features of late twentieth century [Anglo-American] culture one can think of”.

According to Garland (2001), high crime rates in the “late modernity” (since the 1960’s) have been seen as a normal social fact in a cultural formation. Many phenomenon have developed in this “crime complex”, most notable a; widespread fear of crime, routine avoidance behavior, generalized “crime consciousness”, focus of the victim, protection/safety of the public, reinvention of the prison, focus on deterrence and harder punishment, and a persuasive sensational mass-media (ibid).

Crime, especially high crime, and the respond to it, have become an integrated organized part/principle of everyday/modern life (Garland, 2001). Most significant is however that crime is seen as an everyday risk that everyone can and should protect oneself from (ibid). Simon (2007: 16) claims “a zero-risk environment is treated as a reasonable expectation, even a right”. With different risk-techniques such as situational (e.g. gated communities and CCTV), and policies (e.g. three-strike) the goal have been to remove risk from society. The environment, or the “criminogenic situation”, has become an important factor, which can be shaped in ways that reduced the risk of crime opportunities. This, because by the punitive turn the motivation is unimportant and replaced by the issue of control and harm-reduction. Also

the explanation of (disadvantages) backgrounds has been abandoned for opportunity-seeking. (O'Malley, 2010)

Estrada (2004) has identified five key factors of the punitive turn; **1)** a decline of the rehabilitation ideology, and a rise of punishment and retribution, **2)** a positive view of the prison, **3)** a victim-focus, which involves protection, safety, and risk-minimization, **4)** political populism, in which crime is viewed as a concrete problem to be solved with effective actions, and **5)** individualization – a focus on individual factors, and responsibility, and less on social mechanisms. Crime policy has therefore gone from rehabilitation, and causes-oriented, to a populist one that considers the consequences of a crime: the victim and the punishment (ibid).

From the welfare-goal of completely solving criminality the goal has changed to apply to strategies that can deal with the “crime-problem” (e.g. Feeley & Simon, 1992; Garland, 2001). According to Garland (2006) this change has formed a different responsibility for both the state and the individual. Garland calls this “responsibilization” and means that the individual is responsible for the avoidance of petty crimes, and the state is responsible for serious crimes. The concept of “responsibilization” is similar to Dean’s (2010) “advanced liberalism”, in which responsibility, initiative, competition, and risk-taking are the key-elements.

2.1.2 Crime policy

According to Garland & Sparks (2000) politics has changed dramatically during the punitive turn; criminality has become an urgent political priority, or else there will be electoral consequences. Crime prevention has become a challenge for politicians since many have a concern about not being seen as soft on crime, this, because they think that the citizens are punishment-oriented (Welsh & Farrington, 2012). Therefore do politicians in greater degree support law and order measures (than prevention). This view persists despite declining crime rates and increasing imprisonment rates (e.g. Tonry 2011: 139–140). To be tough on crime has become an electoral necessity, and politicians have, almost without exception, sought to exact political advantage from a fearful public (Windlesham, 1998). “Politicians of contrasting views cannot afford to allow their opponents to occupy the high ground unchallenged, so they joined in the chorus of rhetorical toughness” (ibid: 12). An important role in the politization/populization of crime have been slogans, such as “prison works”, “do crime, do time”, “three-strikes and you’re out”, “zero-tolerance”, and “tough on crime” (e.g. Garland, 2001; Andersson & Nilsson, 2009).

The development is defined by Pratt (2007: 3) as “penal populism” which “consists of the pursuit of a set of penal policies to win votes rather than to reduce crime or to promote justice”. From the politicians view, crime and punishment have therefore become a too important issue to leave to criminologists (Tonry, 2011). But also other factors and groups play important roles, for example the process in which the “three strike law” became a serious preventive strategies included a single crime-events (the Polly Klaas-case), lobbyism by interest associations (in particular The California Correctional Peace Officers Association and The National Rifle Association), sensational mass-media, and a state-election (in California) (e.g. Zimring, Hawkins & Kamin, 2001; Kieso, 2005; Shichor & Sechrest, 1996). It was a popular-political process in which experts-opinions and scientific scrutiny was in large extent omitted (ibid). Regarding Zero Tolerance and Broken Windows, the strategies were enthusiastically deployed by politicians in the 1990s (Newburn & Jones, 2007). This was due to a promotion of “elite networking”, by, in particular, a number of free market think tanks that provided financial support to politicians and academics (Wacquant, 1999).

The punitive turn has thus been a change during the second half of the twentieth century, which has not directly been driven by criminological considerations, but by other forces (Garland 2001). In the western world, social economic and cultural changes took place, and in reaction to those changes and the crisis of the welfare state, a political transformation emerged in USA under the Reagan and Bush administrations (1981-92) and in Great Britain under Thatcher (1979-92) (ibid). Wacquant (2004) proposes that a “common sense-thinking“ of the punitive turn was established in USA in the period between 1975 to 1985 by a network of neo-conservative think-tanks, and then internationalized in the same way as the neoliberal ideology. According to O’Malley (2010) the “governance of crime” (police, prison and sentencing organization etc) by the mid-1980s turned from a focus on reforming offenders to an aim of crime prevention by predictive techniques to manage behaviors.

The combination of “neo-liberalism” (free-market privatization, competition and spending restraints which shaped the administrative reform) and “neo-conservatism” (which dictated the public face of penal policy) later spread to New Zealand, Canada and Australia (Garland, 2001). The change arrived then in (Western) Europe, which has been transformed from the ideal-type Scandinavian model of social welfare to market-oriented Anglo-American style-states, and from public- to individual responsibility (e g Gilbert, 2004). According to Stensson and Edwards (2001: 70) the neo-liberal macro-economic world-view (which includes less government spending, and that social welfare should be replaced with specific measures to handle specific problems) has been accepted by the (social) democracies in Europe. Also Andersson & Nilsson (2009: 153, own translation) do claim that “Since the mid-1980s the neoliberal economic politic formed all other politic”, and Wacquant (2004) proposes that the “neo-liberal punishment system” (harder punishment and an expansion of the prison-system) arrived to Europe from USA, by the UK, and that it fights increasingly petty crimes.

The ideological/political change has, in particular, in USA and UK, led to a “criminalization of justice”. Business management, monetary measurements and “effectiveness of resources” etc have spread over the whole of society. With this development the crime control has been privatized; commercial companies have been given contracts for specific criminal justice function from state-monopolies, for example company/private own prisons. There has overall been a change in reasoning from a social to an economic. Crime was before seen to have a social cause and a social problem, this has changed to a way of thinking where resources shape the policy; a “value-for-money” managerialism. (Garland, 2001)

Wacquant (2004) claims that the harder criminal justice policy combined with unemployment, lower wages, and cut-downs in the welfare systems, have led to a social insecurity that is controlled by increasingly effective surveillance systems. This control of the most exposed population, and the “cause and effect” of a normalized job insecurity and unemployment, have led to imprisonment, that have led to worsening poverty; a “criminalization of poverty” (ibid). The welfare-state have been transformed into a prison-state and USA has make clear that it will “criminalize poverty” and normalize the employment insecurity, this, since the “unwanted citizens” do as imprisoned better fill an economic function than as poor unemployed (ibid). Christie (2000) also does claims there is a clear connection that shows a high prison population can give a positive view of unemployment. This is not just the case for USA, but for every country with a high prison-population (ibid). It is also easier for politicians to fight crime than unemployment (Christie & Bruun, 1985).

A large part of the recent strategies and criminalization-tendencies (more laws and harder punishment) built on a desire for an impossible security, which paradoxically creates insecurity. It is a phenomenon constructed by a neo-liberal politization which assumes an

unsafe and insecure public, and is based on future-trends. The neo-liberal politics do not only produce a control-culture, but a suspicion-culture, which not only suspects those who have committed crime, but those who are just suspected for being suspected. Safety trumps justice and an unsafe society is revealed. An ever-elusive quest of freedom from fear and threat has become the new focus for individuals and organizations, and of policy and practice. The society abandons the individual and to cover up its failure is disproportionately punishment legitimized, by referring to insecurity in the future. To judge an individual by a prospective future, to punish in a preventive purpose, becomes an institutionalized ad hoc solution, in which the problems are pushed to the future. (Ericson, 2007)

2.1.3 *Criminological theories*

During the end of the 1970s new criminological theories developed, theories which did not try to explain or understand the underlying causes of crime, but focused on mapping of risks, by statistic correlations between situational factors and crime (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). It was a change from subject to situation, and meant that one did not have to consider the offenders; motive, state of mind, morality, criminal knowledge/understanding, risk assessment, and eventual intoxication (Clarke, 1980: 138). The new theories were thus not interested of “who” that commit a crime and/or “why”, the important question became “where”, and everyone could commit a crime if the circumstances were right (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Sutherland et al (1992: 19) complained that “the conception of *cause* is being abandoned in criminology” but according to Clarke (1980: 137) a general theory about the causes of crime is almost as primitive as a general theory of causes of disease.

The mainstream view in criminology changed from seeing crime as a deviation from the normal and a (moral) abnormality that needed to be explained. The new criminologies viewed crime as normal aspect of modern society, a generalized behavior, routinely produced by the normal patterns of social and economic life in contemporary society. To commit an illegal action requires no particular disposition or motivation of the offender. Crime is a routine risk that can be calculated for, or an accident to be avoided. The older criminology focused on the discipline of delinquent, the new approach identified recurring criminal opportunities and seeks to govern them by situational controls that will make them less tempting/vulnerable. The idea is that “opportunity creates the thief”, rather than the other way around. The view of the offender has become economic – the reasoning offender emphasizes rational choice and calculations. And the new criminological theories; Routine Activity Theory (RAT), Rational Choice Theory (RCT) and Broken Windows, have shaped/been shaped by the “criminologies of everyday life”. (Garland, 2001)

Broken Windows: Broken Windows was established from the conservative criminology (which advocated harder punishment) in the USA during the 1980s, and had a great impact as a police practice method, particularly, in New York since the 1990s (Lilly et al, 2007, s 233-263). According to the theory an area does develop a high criminality because that petty crimes and disorder are not addressed (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). A broken, and unrepeated, window in a house does soon lead to that the other windows, and the rest of the house gets vandalized (ibid). This leads to a loss of formal control by the law-abiding residents and an “invasion” of criminals (ibid).

The theory is not interested in individualistic background factors, motivation to commit crime, or the causes of an area's social disorder (Lilly et al, 2009 s 259-60). Broken Windows is instead a practical working-method with clear measures and goals, good results, and is easy to use for practitioners/decision-makers (Sousa & Kelling, 2006). Fighting crime should be done by the police, and the police should spend as much time to maintain order as (directly)

fighting crime (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The policing should be done by foot-patrolling police which do not necessarily reduce crime but increase the feeling of security (ibid). The police-method of formal control, arrests of all types of criminal deviation/disorder such as prostitution, graffiti-painting, loitering, and public urination and alcohol-drinking, have become known as zero tolerance (Harcourt, 2001; Lilly et al, 2007: 257-260).

Routine Activity Theory: RAT includes the concepts of rhythm, tempo and timing from the Human Ecological Theory (see e.g. Hawley, 1986; Felson & Cohen, 1980), and was originally developed to account for changes in crime rates over time (Cohen and Felson, 1979). In RAT crime rates are influenced by structural changes in routine activity patterns by the convergence in time and space of direct-contact predatory violations (ibid). The possibility of accomplish crimes requires three elements: **1)** an offender, **2)** a suitable target (for the offender), and **3)** an absence of guardians capable of preventing violations (ibid). This model is named the “Basic crime triangle” and portrayed as a simple triangle with each element at the triangle’s sides, but has been developed by Felson & Boba (2010) to the “Dynamic crime triangle” with an additional (larger) triangle containing; a handler (for the offender), a guardian (for the target) and a manager (for the place). This development contains influences by RCT regarding the offender’s decision-making and the nature of crime, but a strong focus in RAT continues to lay on routine activities of the possible victim (ibid). Individuals may live lives that increase their exposure to potential offenders, their lifestyles may influence how vulnerable/valuable they or their property are as targets, and individuals can therefore affect the capability of becoming victims by, for example, target-hardening and changes in their routine activities (e.g. Mustaine, 1997).

Rational Choice Theory: RCT originates from the neoclassical economic theory of; Friedman (1953), who claims that the goal of (economic) theory is not to explain, but to predict, and Becker (1964; 1968) who claims that all individuals make calculation about advantages and disadvantages about illegal activities and then a rational decision based on what maximizes the benefits (both monetary and not). Becker further proposes that potential criminals only discourage the risk of being detected; to prevent crime punishment must be seen as a deterrent, so the potential criminal does not see it profitable to commit a crime.

In RCT offending (as all other behavior) thus is seen as rational and egoistic in nature and the criminal is viewed as a reasoning decision-making individual with free will (Simon, 1978; Cornish & Clarke, 1986). According to Herrnstein (1990: 356) RCT “comes close to serving as the fundamental principle of the behavioral sciences. No other well-articulated theory of behavior commands so large a following in so wide range of disciplines”.

Deterrence: Deterrence is originated in the classical school of criminology and has a rational view of human behavior (see Beccaria, 1976), and offers a simple solution to crime – the choice to commit a crime is less attractive if the punishment for the action is hard, and the view of the potential offender is (therefore) that the action does not pay (e.g. Nagin, 1998). Deterrence advocates therefore a focus of longer/more severe legislation, and more effective police practices and prosecuting (e.g. Wilson & Boland, 1978). According to Trasler (1993) deterrence is the most effective measure for dealing with crime.

Deterrence is thus a punishment-oriented theory (effects of, and the legitimization of the punishment or sentencing) rather than a crime-preventive theory (how to reduce crime). Of the punishment-oriented theories three views can be distinguished; individual prevention, general prevention and retribution. Individual- and general prevention has a consequential ground (reduced criminality do morally and normatively legitimate punishment), while retribution is built on deontology (it is not the action, but the actor that is the basic of the

normative considerations). Future consequences regarding reduced crime are not important, instead are questions about responsibility, intention and blame central. (e.g. Andersson & Nilsson, 2009: 8-9)

2.2 The punitive turn: Sweden

Below is the national development of crime policy presented.

2.2.1 Main characteristics

In Sweden a similar development (to the international) has taken place (e.g. Estrada, 2004; Andersson & Nilsson, 2009; Demker & Duus-Otterström, 2008; Amilon & Edstedt, 1998). The change involves a positive view of: harder punishment, more police, and a focus on safety and security (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Although Sweden still stands out as something of a hold-out against so-called penal populism, Swedish public has become more punitive (Demker et al. 2008).

Crime has changed from being a social problem to a problem of order, and has become a threat to worry about for the individual citizen who is a consumer of security and safety provided by, firstly the state, but also private corporation. Also the overall view has changed; crime has gone from trends to a condition, and we live today in a mass-crime-society. Even if crime-statistics show that crime is not going up, in particular, politicians and mass-media, do claim the level to be too high. By a politization of crime policy, from a long-term idealistic to a short-term realistic, as well as a policy-reverse; crime policy is no longer for the law-breakers, but for the law abiding citizens. (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009)

Demker & Duus-Otterström (2008) claim the discourse on crime has become increasingly victim-centered and crime policy by the political parties play a central role. The individualization of society is however the key-factor behind the change (ibid). Individualization also has consequences for criminal policy – crime is no longer viewed as an offence against society, against communal interests, but seen as an aggression of one particular individual against another (ibid).



Figure 1: The casual chain (Demker, & Duus-Otterström, 2008: 290)

2.2.2 Crime policy

According Andersson & Nilsson (2009) the new crime policy is a short-term symbolic policy based on future analysis, threat scenarios, common sense, and moral judgment and action. It is not based on empirical support or effects of crime prevention (ibid). Tham (1995) proposes a possible simple explanation for the change of crime policy; an increasing and more severe criminality have logically led to more punitive restrictions. A more complex explanation can however be applied; an explanation of crime policy that do not directly have a connection to crime, but is created due to economically, political and cultural changes in society (ibid). New crime-types, such as narcotics, economic and gender-crimes have impacted the change (ibid).

Whatever explanation one chose, the changes must however come into existence by actors in crime policy, such as political parties, victim-organizations, employees of the justice system, experts, mass-media, and insurance- and security companies (Tham 1995). "Most important of these actors are the political parties" (Tham, 1995: 79, own translation) because in the end, it is they who propose legislative changes and make budget proposals.

According to Tham (1995, 2001) Swedish criminal policy has become more punitive, because of a shift in the parties' political platforms. The change, in particular, juridical and political, from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, is a change from less, shorter and gentler prison-sentences, to a demand for more, longer and harder prison sentences (Tham, 1995). A particular law-change especially effected the punitive turn in Sweden - the rehabilitation-principle that stressed counteraction against harmful effects of detention, was replaced by a law that focused on penal-principles (SOU 1993:76: 16; Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Individual prevention and rehabilitation was replaced by general-prevention with emphasize on retaliation (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009).

Estrada (2004) claims M was the first to exploit the problem of rising crime, then S adapted or modified a position towards the same direction. Tham (2002: 422) proposes "Traditional Social Democratic crime policy based on expertise and a Weberian means-end rationality is drifting towards a policy inspired by populism and a Durkheimian problem of order". In the national election of 1991 law and order become an important political issue, by the focus (on a harder policy) from M (ibid). S however still lacked a strategy for their crime policy, but this change for the next election (in 1994) where S again ceased governmental power (ibid).

Before the punitive turn, crime policy (despite an increase in criminality in the 1950s) was to the mid-1960s not a mayor political issue, especially not by the ruling S. The offender was viewed as a loser in society, or rather a victim of a bad upbringing and poor circumstances, and in need of care and rehabilitation. This view was consisted with the common politics of S, and the party's views of solidarity, equality, social engineering and the rehabilitation-ideology. In the late 1960s and early 1970s a liberal and radical deviant-friendly perspective led to decriminalization and a humane policy for prisoners. The criticism of the rehabilitation-perspective was however just a part against a larger critique against the welfare-state. The offender was soon begun to be viewed as a parasite who harms the common people due to self-interests, and is individually responsible for his/her actions and should be punished instead of rehabilitated. The offender became a rational and calculating actor on a market (no longer in a well-faire state) with a free will and must be punished if she/he chooses crime. Punishment was also now viewed as, not only a righteous view, but seen as crime-preventive due to the aspect of deterrence. (Tham, 1995)

Another change was politicians from the middle of the 1980s began refer to "the common consensus" (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Politicians thus had an own source of knowledge, and were not any longer dependent of "experts" for knowledge in crime (Andersson, 2002). Crime therefore begun to be viewed, from politicians, on a constant high level, and crime was considered as an obstacle for the common individual from living a safe life (ibid). The solutions to the "crime-problem" became the police, courts and punishment, not as earlier; social institutions (ibid).

2.2.3 Criminology

According to Andersson (2002: 92) the scientists at Brå (Swedish council of crime prevention) relatively fast picked up the explanation of crime-causation made by Cohen & Felson (1979). A type of "practical criminology" was promoted; values and the greater good

of society were no longer problematized – research in criminology, and especially crime-prevention, was in itself socially beneficially, due to the belief in rationality and objective science (Andersson, 2002: 92). A focus began towards certain crime-types, in particular, violent offences, drug offences, juvenile crimes, and financial crimes (ibid).

Crime prevention changed from having its basis in causation, social prevention and the criminal, to be about and criminogenic places and settings; situational prevention (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Focus shifted from the conductor to the act (Andersson, 2002), and from the causes of crime, to how crime is experienced (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). Risk-thinking became the main factor in crime-prevention and zero tolerance the strategy that became most applied in Sweden (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009).

According to Sahlin (2000) the 1960s and 1970s crime prevention is characterized of a model of "structural changing" based, not on individual characteristics, but on underlying (unjust) social and economic factors. This model was replaced during the 1980s and 1990s by the control-model, in which focus lays on opportunities, criminogenic situations and rational choices of the individual (ibid). This development/process is an "inverted prevention", in which economic cuts are being made to social prevention, while spending go to situational prevention. This development is not based on rational crime prevention, but has been created as an ideological view (ibid).

3 Method

Post-modernism, empiricism, objectivism, rationalism, idealistic subjectivism, humanism, essentialism, interpretativism, relativism, ethnomethodology, nominalism or realism? If realism, then empiric, critical or left? Grounded, deductive or inductive theory? Qualitative, quantitative, or hypothetic-deductive method? Methodological or collective individualism? Logical analysis? What to choose?

Sohlberg & Sohlberg (2013: 261-274) accounts for today's main scientific paradigms which includes other (then above) epistemologies; positivism, post-positivism, critical theory, hermeneutic, and constructivism. Sohlberg & Sohlberg further account for nine main scientific factors; ontology, epistemology, methodology, descriptions, definitions, classifications, conclusions, explanations, and theory. According to Burell & Morgan (1979) all social research takes place out of a background set of ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions. Björklund & Paulsson (2003: 59) proposes three knowledge-approaches; analytical, systems, or actor.

But the question remains; What to choose? What world-view does the author (have or want to) apply to the thesis? Well, the choice have been to not make any deliberately epistemological (questions regarding knowledge and the basics of knowing) or ontological (what is real and what that can assume to exist) choices, instead the reader should decide, because "Self-analysis has never been very productive for anybody, and I'm not going to do it now, this time." (Arnason, 2012: 60).

3.1 Design

Just as both the Anglo-Saxon and the Continental-tradition have been used, will the design of this thesis be, not a choice between two opposite methods; between qualitative and quantitative, but a combination of both. A single method-choice for this thesis have however

been made, namely; text analysis, and of its different “variants”, the choice has fallen on content analysis. By doing a text analysis expressed thoughts and ideas (and therefore a certain perception of reality) can be discovered (see Bergström & Boréus, 2000). Content analysis is defined as a “research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics within a text” (Stone et al., 1966: 5, in Krippendorff, 1980: 23). Krippendorff (1980: 21) explain content analysis as a “research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context. As a research technique, content analysis involves specialized procedures for processing scientific data. Like all research techniques, its purpose is to provide knowledge, new insights, a representation of “facts”, and a practical guide to action.”.

Regarding quantitative text analysis, it is used as an account of content-based categories in a text; the method is used to measure how frequently words or categories occurs in a text, or how big space a certain category receives (Esaiasson et al 2010: 223-224). In a computer-based quantitative content analysis advantageously a “wordlist” can be created, to tell the computer which words in a text should be noted (Bergström & Boréus, 2000). This wordlist includes recording units which is specific words, metaphors, themes or arguments that can be distinguished in a text (Krippendorff, 1980: 60-63). The recording units may also be known in the larger aspect of science as variables (Bergström & Boréus, 2000).

Regarding qualitative text analysis, Esaiasson and colleagues (2010: 238-253) proposes that the data-material is thoroughly scrutinized with the aim to find an entirety, and the position of the message by which arguments and ideas that are expressed. After an interpretation is made of the text (ibid). With a qualitative content analysis nothing specific is measured or counted (Bergström & Boréus 2000). In many contexts the most important is, not how many times it is said, but how it is said, and some words/concepts can be a matter of language-differences, not policy/ideology-differences (ibid). A qualitative text-analysis also does often include prepared and defined categories (Bryman, 2009).

So how can these two methods be used in the same research design? Hammersley (1989) proposes a combination of qualitative and quantitative method in three gradually levels; **1**) triangulation (findings from both qualitative and quantitative techniques are compared to each other), **2**) facilitation (the main technique is facilitated/supported by the other), and **3**) complementarity (the quantitative technique of frequencies can be complemented by a more detailed relevance of information by the qualitative technique). Bryman (2009: chapter 20) also proposes several advantages with a multiple research-strategy, for example; a qualitative method can assist the quantitative in measuring.

For this thesis will a computer-search of the chosen recording units be conducted, but a strict result of the search will not be analyzed. Some of the recording units (in Swedish) can namely be parts of other words, for example ”risk” in ”frisk” (healthy), ”solidarisk” (solidarity) or ”historisk” (historical). By a qualitative complementarity will such “word-parts” be accounted for, but not focused further on in the result-part. Instead the meant words/the recording units will be accounted for. In a social scientific content analysis is it however seldom that only the words are of importance without their meanings (Bergström & Boréus, 2000). Therefore a qualitative facilitation will also be used in the result to address if the recording units are part of meanings (related to the punitive turn). A fully qualitative analysis will however not be made, and therefore will this thesis’ design not consist of a triangulation, this because the quantitative design not is fully used (because of the complement) and because of the facilitation of the qualitative method.

Similarities of this thesis' method can be found in Bergström & Boréus (2000) idea- and ideology analysis which focuses on the substance-aspects of a text. With such analysis one can examine the presence of specific types of ideas and ideologies in, for example, party-programmes (ibid). Bergström & Boréus (2000: 154-157) accounts for several different orientations within idea-and ideology-research, and the "analysis of the presence of certain ideas" fits this thesis' aim and research question, and the unique design since: "Any developed design for idea- and ideology-analysis do not exist, and the researcher thus has liberty in the creation of an analysis-instrument that do fit the study-aim and the research questions" (Bergström & Boréus, 2000: 176 own translation). No claims are however made for this thesis' method to be an idea- and ideology-analysis; instead it is a quantitative-qualitative content-analysis.

3.2 Wordlist of recording units

The recording units have been chosen, from the background knowledge of the punitive turn (see 2 Background knowledge), by a quantitative and qualitative content analysis, similar to the method of this thesis. The wordlist (see Appendix 2) consists thus not of the most common used words/concepts of the background knowledge, but the most important ones. Some specific words may not have been written as many times as others, due to, for example, the vocabularies of both the authors of the sources and the author of this thesis. The thesis author's limited English vocabulary may however actually be positive for this method because of the limited knowledge/usage of synonyms, several key-concepts of the punitive turn have been written over and over. In the background knowledge is, for example, not "harsh" or "treatment" (synonyms to "hard/er", and "rehabilitation") used.

Some of the recording units however, when translated into Swedish, are given synonyms, in order to not miss any content of the analyzed texts; one example is "rehabilitation" which is translated into "rehabilitering", "behandling", and "vård". It is however not many "whole words" which are used in the computer-search, but the main word stem. From the example above are "rehab", "behandl" and "vård" used as recording units, to not miss any bending of the words. Also the goal is to not have the recording units overlapping each other, in other words; the chosen recording units should not be double counted. By the qualitative facilitation can such claims however not be made due to the fact that, not just one word is being involved, but the nearby words, and possible whole sentences.

Below is the wordlist, or rather wordlists, with the 26 chosen key concepts and its 43 recording units, presented. The key concepts have first been translated into Swedish (since the data material is written in Swedish) and then been shortened to their word stems in order to account for bending of words. Some key concepts consist of several recording units, and in order to simplify, those recording are from now (in this thesis) mentioned as "under-units" to the main recording unit (the key concept).

The recording units have been classified into two categories – in order to account for the punitive turn have another category (of an anti-policy) been created to increase the validity with a measurement of recording units which are the opposite of those of the punitive turn.

3.3 Selection

In any content analysis it must be clear: 1) which data are analyzed, how they are defined, and which population they are drawn from, 2) that it is explicit that the context is relative to the analyzed data, and 3) the aim of the inferences must be clearly stated (Krippendorff, 1980: 25-28).

Since crime policy might include several different areas (see 1.3.6 Crime policy) will, not just parts of text which are directly considering crime policy be used as data materials, but whole documents of the parties' holistic politics. This because crime policy may include a societal view which intrudes on other policy-areas (see 1.3.6 Crime policy), and due to the fact that the punitive turn involved not just a change of views regarding crime and punishment, but a societal change (see 2 Background knowledge). Demker & Duus-Otterström (2008: 292) also claim; "The frontier between criminal policy and judicial policy is not always clear in policy documents.". A strict limitation to only include parts of the document's texts which directly addresses crime policy would therefore be problematic regarding several methodological areas, especially the validity.

As said, the selected data-material are; "the most recent party-documents which accounts for the parties whole/holistic politic". For MP that is the Partyprogramme from 2013 (mp.se 5): a 39 pages long programme which "describes that world MP want to create. From without our partyprogramme do we formulate to-date policy" (mp.se 4, own translation). For SD the chosen document is the Principleprogramme from 2011 (sd.se 4): a 48 pages long common ideological document which regards how the party principally views different questions (sd.se 3). In comparison to MP's Partyprogramme, is SD's Principleprogramme, in pages, somewhat larger, but consists of more text-free space (including several pictures). The two parties' documents are therefore considered to be quite similar in size, comparisons regarding more factors have however not been made.

Bryman (2009: 203) claims a limit with a content-analysis is that it can only be as good as the documents it is built upon, and Scott (1990) proposes one should judge the relevance/importance of a document based on following criteria: **1) authenticity, 2) credibility, and 3) representativeness**. For the chosen documents are these criteria considered to be high, however their relevance can somewhat be questioned, it might have been the most (methodologically) appropriate if the data-sources both were from the same year, and, in particular, from 2014. The parties however have not (at the time of writing) published any newer official document of those same criteria, and the issue whether anything have change, regarding their policies, since they were publicized, will not be discussed in any more extension.

Regarding other types of data-sources, other texts/documents (with single individuals as authors) could be alternatives to the chosen sample. However such texts could question whether the writing of single politicians fully represent the views of the party. For the same reason have interviews not been chosen, with interviews there is, according to Esaiasson (2007: 299), a risk that the answers of the interviewees are subjectively affected by opinions which are not consistent with the party line. Interview-answers might also in greater degree, not be as planned, and include spontaneous personal statements, than a text of an official document. Thus the choice has fallen on official document, which are considered to provide high reliability and validity.

3.4 Reliability and validity

"Interpretation is included in basically every text analysis. Regardless how one chose to analyze a text...must the text be interpreted." (Bergström & Boréus, 2000: 25, own translation). If one uses a strict qualitative content-analysis, it might however be possible to avoid the issue of interpretation, and therefore have a minimal subjective impact from one researcher on the data material. But the validity might be negatively affected; one could just present amounts of words written in a text, but not their meanings, and therefore not answer the thesis' research question.

According to Bryman (2009: 203) a content analysis is an “open” research-method, in which it is easy to concretely describe the selections and measures, and thus make it easy for (eventual) replications to be made. Therefore content analysis is also often an objective analysis-method (ibid). Despite methodological considerations for every part of this thesis, no claims for objectivity are made, this because the criteria for objectivity should not lay on production, but rather how the individual researcher should relate to himself/herself, in regard how the consequences of inevitable lack of objectivity should not be too negative (Myrdal, 1968). The only way to strive for “objectivity” is for the researcher to identify, highlight and specify his/hers values, and to clarify how they determines the scientific results (ibid). However is a self-analysis not a very objective thing, and will therefore not be made.

As said, are objective claims neither made for the recording units to accounts for, or rather represent, the punitive turn. But do the recording units, the measures of this thesis, provide a high concepts-validity? Can the result of a content analysis based of those recording units answer the thesis’ research question? Well, since a suitable design and measures with advantage are created for the specific aim in a text/content-analysis (Bergström & Boréus, 2000) can the researcher apply the most suitable design and measures (in her/his views). And by thoroughly accounting for, especially, the recording units, is a high reliability aimed to have been produced.

Regarding internal, external and ecological validity (see e g Bryman, 2009: 43-45) have no such generalizations been aimed to be produced. Bergström & Boréus (2000) proposes when using a word-list method, a possibility that specific words, their ideological signification, have been changed, and such possible changes must therefore be taken under consideration. Since this is not a study of changes over time – a comparison of former and current crime policies, is this (possible) methodological disadvantage not relevant. The sources of the punitive turn, have also, not been written in the 1970s when the punitive turn began, instead they have been produced more recently (to account for a change while it has not been fully development is problematic).

3.5 Ethical considerations

“Political and ethical questions are impossible to avoid in any type of research” (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000: 3). The choice of data-material however provide for a limited exposure of single individuals. Due to, not only methodological considerations, but also ethical considerations, have neither texts/documents with single individuals as authors been chosen, and neither personal documents, such as letters, diaries, interviews and biographies, or mass-media productions, such as news-papers, television-programs, and movies (see e g Bryman, 2009: chapter 17). The data-material instead completely consists of official documents which are not produced/written by any named person, also are not any individuals (in particular politicians) mentioned in the chosen official documents. Single politicians are neither mentioned in either the background knowledge (of the punitive turn), in the result, or in the analysis and discussion. During the whole research-process have also the ethical principles of research set by the National Swedish Research committee (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) been applied.

4. Result

This part of the thesis is written in the Anglo-Saxon tradition (see Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2006: 67-69), and is thus claimed, by a determined method (the quantitative content-analysis with the qualitative complementarity and facilitation) to produce (new) data. The qualitative

complementarity is here presented in simplified tables while complete tables are found in Appendix 3. The qualitative facilitation is presented in Appendix 4, and then analyzed (in 5 Analysis and Discussion). Explanations of the presentations of the two qualitative techniques are however given below.

Regarding the reading of the result the recording units have been shortened to their word stems, those have in turn also been shortened (first two/three/four letters) with the intention to simplify (se Appendix 3). The qualitative complementarity result is presented in Swedish, all well the different variants of the found words/recording units. The frequencies of each word-variant are however not accounted for here and not either the frequency of the shortfall from the quantitative frequency to the qualitative. The focus is hence not to produce more frequencies than a quantitative and the qualitative complementarity. Those results are however compared and summarized in new frequency-tables with the intention for an easier comparison between MP and SD.

By the qualitative complementarity is only the specific recording unit analyzed, by the qualitative facilitation are the words which surrounds (the recording unit) also presented (in Appendix 4) as result (and written in English). In the qualitative facilitation the recording units often overlap each other (when they exists in the same sentences). They are however not accounted several times as results of different recording units but only in the first recording unit, when they are first seen. For example the very last recording unit (welfare) could be spotted in the text of the prior accounted recording units. In such cases (when recording units can be found in the account of other recording units), are they not “regular words”, but recording units.

4.1 MP

Below the result of the computer-search of MP’s Partyprogramme is presented.

4.1.1 Qualitative complementarity

| Recording units of the punitive turn | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| “rättsuppfattning” = RÄ | 0 | 0 |
| “rättsmedvetande” = RÄT | 0 | 0 |
| “förnuft” = FÖ | 0 | 0 |
| “kontroll” = KO | 10 | 10 |
| “avskräck” = AV | 0 | 0 |
| “räd” RÄD | 4 | 1 |
| “hår” = HÅ | 9 | 8 |
| “tuff” = TU | 0 | 0 |
| “straff” = ST | 3 | 3 |
| “påföljd” = PÅ | 1 | 1 |
| “lag” = LA | 43 | 20 |
| “individ” = IN | 26 | 26 |
| “brottsling” = BR | 0 | 0 |
| “förövare” = FÖR | 0 | 0 |
| “kriminell” = KR | 0 | 0 |
| “tillfälle” = TI | 1 | 1 |
| “ordning” = OR | 4 | 3 |
| “polis” = PO | 4 | 4 |
| “prevent” = PR | 1 | 1 |
| “förebygg” = FÖRE | 10 | 10 |

| | | |
|------------------|----|----|
| “fängelse” = FÄ | 0 | 0 |
| “anstalt” = AN | 0 | 0 |
| “skydd” = SK | 35 | 35 |
| “trygg” = TR | 49 | 49 |
| “säk” = SÄ | 48 | 44 |
| “ration” = RA | 13 | 0 |
| “val” = VA | 64 | 9 |
| “välj” = VÄ | 12 | 12 |
| “risk” = RI | 33 | 13 |
| “ansvar” = ANS | 26 | 26 |
| “rutin” = RU | 0 | 0 |
| “aktivitet” = AK | 3 | 3 |
| “situation” = SI | 6 | 6 |
| “hot” = HO | 20 | 20 |
| “off” = OF | 36 | 2 |
| “toler” = TO | 1 | 1 |

| Recording units of an ”anti-punitive turn” | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| “orsak” = ORS | 9 | 9 |
| “motiv” = MO | 1 | 1 |
| “rehab” = RE | 2 | 2 |
| “behandl” = BE | 14 | 14 |
| “vård” = VÅ | 72 | 72 |
| “social” = SO | 23 | 23 |
| “välfärd” = VÄL | 37 | 37 |

4.2 SD

Below the result of the computer-search of SD’s Principleprogramme is presented.

4.2.1 Qualitative complementarity

| Recording units of the punitive turn | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| “rättsuppfattning” = RÄ | 1 | 1 |
| “rättsmedvetande” = RÄT | 0 | 0 |
| “förnuft” = FÖ | 8 | 8 |
| “kontroll” = KO | 4 | 4 |
| “avskräck” = AV | 4 | 0 |
| “räd” RÄD | 4 | 0 |
| “hår” = HÅ | 1 | 1 |
| “tuff” = TU | 0 | 0 |
| “straff” = ST | 5 | 5 |
| “påföljd” = PÅ | 0 | 0 |
| “lag” = LA | 37 | 28 |
| “individ” = IN | 33 | 33 |
| “brottsling” = BR | 1 | 1 |
| “förövare” = FÖR | 0 | 0 |

| | | |
|-------------------|----|----|
| “kriminell” = KR | 0 | 0 |
| “tillfälle” = TI | 3 | 3 |
| “ordning” = OR | 5 | 5 |
| “polis” = PO | 1 | 1 |
| “prevent” = PR | 0 | 0 |
| “förebygg” = FÖRE | 1 | 1 |
| “fängelse” = FÄ | 0 | 0 |
| “anstalt” = AN | 0 | 0 |
| “skydd” = SK | 7 | 7 |
| “trygg” = TR | 31 | 31 |
| “säk” = SÄ | 10 | 10 |
| “ration” = RA | 6 | 2 |
| “val” = VA | 21 | 9 |
| “välj” = VÄ | 6 | 6 |
| “risk” = RI | 28 | 9 |
| “ansvar” = ANS | 15 | 15 |
| “rutin” = RU | 0 | 0 |
| “aktivitet” = AK | 1 | 1 |
| “situation” = SI | 4 | 4 |
| “hot” = HO | 7 | 7 |
| “off” = OF | 18 | 3 |
| “toler” = TO | 0 | 0 |

| Recording units of an ”anti-punitive turn” | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| “orsak” = ORS | 5 | 5 |
| “motiv” = MO | 0 | 0 |
| “rehab” = RE | 0 | 0 |
| “behandl” = BE | 6 | 6 |
| “vård” = VÅ | 18 | 18 |
| “social” = SO | 42 | 42 |
| “välfärd” = VÄL | 20 | 20 |

4.3 Comparison

According to Bergström & Boréus, (2000) lie the strength of the content analysis in creating an overview of a larger amount of material, and to the ability, from that data, to do comparisons. The comparison of the results for the qualitative facilitation is however placed in the analysis (5 Analysis and discussion) because that part of the thesis gives an opportunity for, not just a strict account, but a more analytical-written text, and to compare the recording units of MP’s and SD’s documents with the ones of the punitive turn. But the result of the qualitative complementarity of both MP and SD is below presented in tables. The results are summarized and then calculated (punitive turn minus anti-punitive turn) into a final result for the qualitative complementarity-technique.

4.3.1 Qualitative complementarity

| Punitive turn: complementarity | MP | SD |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| “rättsuppfattning” = RÄ | 0 | 1 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|
| “rättsmedvetande” = RÄT | 0 | 0 |
| “förnuft” = FÖ | 0 | 8 |
| “kontroll” = KO | 10 | 4 |
| “avskräck” = AV | 0 | 0 |
| “räd” RÄD | 1 | 0 |
| “hår” = HÅ | 8 | 1 |
| “tuff” = TU | 0 | 0 |
| “straff” = ST | 3 | 5 |
| “påföljd” = PÅ | 1 | 0 |
| “lag” = LA | 20 | 28 |
| “individ” = IN | 26 | 33 |
| “brottsling” = BR | 0 | 1 |
| “förövare” = FÖ | 0 | 0 |
| “kriminell” = KR | 0 | 0 |
| “tillfälle” = TI | 1 | 3 |
| “ordning” = OR | 3 | 5 |
| “polis” = PO | 4 | 1 |
| “prevent” = PR | 1 | 0 |
| “förebygg” = FÖ | 10 | 1 |
| “fängelse” = FÄ | 0 | 0 |
| “anstalt” = AN | 0 | 0 |
| “skydd” = SK | 35 | 7 |
| “trygg” = TR | 49 | 31 |
| “säk” = SÄ | 44 | 10 |
| “ration” = RA | 0 | 2 |
| “val” = VA | 9 | 9 |
| “välj” = VÄ | 12 | 6 |
| “risk” = RI | 13 | 9 |
| “ansvar” = AN | 26 | 15 |
| “rutin” = RU | 0 | 0 |
| “aktivitet” = AK | 3 | 1 |
| “situation” = SI | 6 | 4 |
| “hot” = HO | 20 | 20 |
| “off” = OF | 2 | 3 |
| “toler” = TO | 1 | 0 |
| SUMMARY | 308 | 208 |

| Anti-Punitive turn: complementarity | MP | SD |
|--|------------|-----------|
| “orsak” = ORS | 9 | 5 |
| “motiv” = MO | 11 | 0 |
| “rehab” = RE | 2 | 0 |
| “behandl” = BE | 14 | 6 |
| “vård” = VÅ | 72 | 18 |
| “social” = SO | 23 | 42 |
| “välfärd” = VÄ | 37 | 20 |
| SUMMARY | 168 | 91 |

| Punitive turn minus anti-punitive turn | MP | SD |
|---|------------|------------|
| Punitive turn | 308 | 208 |
| Anti-punitive turn | 168 | 91 |
| FINAL RESULT | 140 | 117 |

5 Analysis and Discussion

With the new-produced data from the result the research question is meant to be answered, and thus the problematized reality is supposed to be solved – this since the writing here is done in the Anglo-Saxon tradition. The writing is however also done in the Continental tradition, because: “as criminology has evolved into an increasingly interdisciplinary and independent field with its own scholars and practitioners, the role of philosophical speculations, arguments, analysis, and critique in matters of criminological import has withered into veritable nonexistence.” (Arrigo & Williams, 2003: 2).

From the result can several (different) political standpoint, opinions, and (world) views between MP and SD be found, the focus here is however the results’ relation to the punitive turn. The punitive turn is also being analyzed/summarized for each recording unit, in order to analyze whether an influence exist. To analyze whether the recording units have similar meanings or not, in relation, to the punitive turn. If the recording units directly can be related to the punitive turn or if they exist indirectly. If the influence of the punitive turn at the official documents of MP and SD is directly or indirectly. If, for example; “zero-tolerance” exists in contexts directly regarding crime, or if the concept exists in other contexts.

What bellow is analyzed is therefore not the qualitative complementarity and its final result, but the qualitative facilitation. In the discussion is however both the final result (if the frequencies of the recording units are low or high) and the analysis of the qualitative facilitation (if the punitive turn is found in the documents or not) discussed in order to answer the research question.

Regarding methodological considerations, they have continuously been applied to the different parts of this thesis, especially, the main method has been accounted for. Between the method-part and this part, has however a result been accounted for. For the author to discuss his chosen method from without the result, is however not very productive in a separate “method discussion”. Thereby all the recording units will below be discussed, both in relation to the punitive turn, and regarding their validity.

5.1 Analysis

Below are the recording units analyzed simultaneously for MP and SD analyzed.

5.1.1 *The punitive turn*

Common crime consciousness & common sense: In the ideal type of the punitive turn politicians often refer to the common crime consciousness and common sense: crime is not such a complex issue which criminologists and other experts propose it to be, instead the citizens know it is common sense that (harder) punishment deter potential criminals.

Due to the clarity what these recording units mean, would however the very existence of these concepts in the official documents show an influence of the punitive turn. An existence was

however not found in MP's Partyprogramme. The non-existence of these under-units is however not viewed as a design-flaw, but that the punitive turn (regarding this recording unit) has not influenced MP's policy.

In SD's Principleprogramme the concepts are used twice, once each, but only (common) crime consciousness is used in a similar context as that of the punitive turn. Thus cannot SD's policy considered to have a strong relation with the punitive turn.

Control: "Control" is a concept which opposes the punitive turns' disorder, and proposes safe, secure, and (off-course) controllable situations. The development of the punitive turn may have produced a "control-culture" in which formal control by the police is the way to deal with crime. These claims cannot directly be found in MP's writings – the context of "control" regards not control of the citizens, but, mostly, of organizations. SD's usage of control does in greater degree regard national/governmental control, but not (in a majority) against the citizens. The punitive turn's usage of control can thus not directly, but partly indirectly, consider to exist in either party document. And no other recording unit is considered to better account for the usage of the recently described phenomenon of control.

Deterrence: By the punitive turn the "theory of deterrence" has been reinvented. If the consequences, or rather the punishment, for a crime is high, the crime becomes less attractive to commit, and the potential criminal chooses to not commit the crime. Thus deterrence is considered to be a crime-preventive technique.

In the documents of MP and SD the recording unit was however not found. This may be because these two main reasons; either has this concept not at all influenced MP's and SD's policies, or the method, including choices of: data-material, design (the quantitative technique) and recording unit, is not valid. To answer which one of the reasons it is, is however not a possible task in this thesis (with the method-choice), and therefore can it only be noted that there is no relation between the punitive turn's deterrence and MP's and SD's documents.

Fear: In the punitive turn fear, especially "fear of crime", is a concept used by politicians to win votes from a fearful public. Crime is viewed as an unnatural thing, something to be frightening of, and freedom from fear has become an individualistic goal in life. A search for the word "fear" should thereby be the most relevant, in order to find out if this phenomenon can be found in the parties' documents.

The recording unit was however not written at all by SD, and only once written by MP, in a context which was about the individual who fears, but it is about undocumented people and thereby not for the general population. Thus "fear" is not a used concept of the parties in their description of their policies.

Hard/er punishment/laws: A focus of punishment, and especially harder punishment, by more and longer prison-sentences, is perhaps the most significant characteristic of the punitive turn. Punishment is seen as a righteous, deterrent, preventive measure to deal with crime. The law should be obeyed, or else follow consequences (punishment), and to account for this important concept four under-units were chosen.

MP's usages of "hard" are not regarding harder punishment against individuals, but mostly of hard effects on individuals by other elements than crime. Regarding legislation MP's views are overall positive, but more legislation is not so much target against individuals/criminals to protect the population, but more directed at the market and companies with the intention of protection and better conditions for, not all citizens, but; animals, the environment, parents, whistleblowers and employees.

SD's views on punishment can partly be related to the punitive turn's, but not fully since SD lacks the aspect of harder/increasing punishment/legislation. SD writes that law-breaking should result in the consequences of hard, quickly and consistent punishment. To obey and respect the Swedish laws is important, and the governments' task is to uphold the law.

Individual: The punitive turn proposes that an individualization of society has occurred; a development in which the main idea is that individuals have responsibility to not commit crime, and to protect one from being victimized. Meanwhile the individual background factors for offending have been abandoned for a view in which every individual can commit a crime in the right situation/circumstances. With this focus and usage of "individual" that word was the chosen recording unit, and not, for example: "person".

SD emphasizes in general on both individuality and (national) community, but the recording unit is used frequently, and regards both individual inherent indifferences, and responsibility and freedom. To claim a direct or indirect influence of the punitive turn is thus hard, but because of the ambiguous contexts "only" a partly indirect relation can be considered to exist. MP does also emphasize on both the individual and society, and proposes the importance of individual governmental support in several areas. A direct influence of the punitive turn is however not detected, and if an indirect relation exists, then it is weak.

Offender/Criminal: Even if the punitive turn has given an increased focus on the victim the offender/criminal is still of major importance. In the eyes of the punitive turn the offender is not a product of poor circumstances, but a rational decision-making individual who causes harm to the law-abiding citizens.

Despite three under-units does this recording unit not exist in MP's Partyprogramme, and in SD's Principleprogramme does it exist only once. SD's usage of the concept, that victims interests are more important than the criminals, can however directly be related to the punitive turn.

Opportunity: The punitive turn claims that criminogenic situations present an opportunity to commit crime. To deal with crime is to make those situations/places less attractive/vulnerable – with the intention to take away opportunity, or at least increase the difficulty for offending.

The few frequencies of the recording unit in the documents of MP and SD refer to work-opportunities, and the punitive turn is thus neither considered to have a direct or indirect influence. Any other recording unit than "opportunity" is neither considered to better account for this phenomenon of the punitive turn.

Order: By the punitive turn, and especially by the spread of Broken Windows, crime has become a problem of order. To obtain law and order, to decrease disorder and petty crimes in the neighborhoods, has become more important than (social) crime-prevention.

In SD's document "order" (a majority of the cases) does refer to "law and order". SD's usage of the concept however does not clearly include crime or disorder as a problem, and the punitive turn can therefore only be partly related to SD's policy. MP is once using the recording unit in a similar concept as the punitive turn – that the police should restrain order, but also work helpfully, supportive and preventive. Claims cannot thereby for an influence of this recording unit at MP's policy be made.

Police: Broken Windows have also here been a major influence on the punitive turn's focus on the police. To fight crime, or at least to maintain order and make the common citizen feel safe, (more) police is needed. "Police" is an effective solution in the eyes of the punitive turn, and an obvious choice of recording unit for this thesis.

MP's usage of this recording unit does not seem to be influenced by the punitive turn. Once it is claimed the police should counter drug dealing, which could be considered as order-disturbing petty crimes, but the police should also work with different methods (see Order above) than the punitive turn suggests. Regarding SD, the single usage of "police" does refer to the protection of the citizens, but together with the border protection and law enforcement agencies. Thus the punitive cannot turn be considered to have influenced SD.

Prevention: By the punitive turn the views of prevention have shifted, from social to situational, and from individual (rehabilitation) to general (deterrence & retaliation). Punishment, especially imprisonment, is viewed as deterrent, and therefore a crime-preventive strategy.

"Prevention" is used by MP, both directly in crime-prevention, and indirectly in counteractions against other problems such as diseases, conflicts and flooding's. MP's crime prevention does however differ from the punitive turns, by including social prevention. Thus can MP's "prevention" only indirectly be similar to the one of the punitive turn. Regarding SD, the recording unit is used once, maybe not exactly similar to the ideal type-prevention of the punitive turn which is described above, but in a context of high relation to the overall spirit of the punitive turn. SD claims namely that the constructional planning is crime-preventive and creates security. With this situational focus, SD's usage of prevention is at least partly considered to be influenced by the punitive turn.

Prison: The punitive turn has been a reinvention of the prison. Prison is viewed as a working crime deterrent and calls are made for more, longer and harder prison-sentences. To account for this phenomenon, two under-units were searched for in party's documents. However, no unit was found in either MP's or SD's texts. This may be due to several reasons, one example is that "prison" is a concept not as easily applied to other areas (as other recording units) and thereby not used in documents which consist of a holistic politics, with possible not enough space for a strict crime policy. What is clear is that the influence of the punitive turn's usage of prison cannot be claiming to exist in these documents of these two parties.

Protection, Safety & Security: Crime is something one should protect oneself from (it is however also the task of the state/ police to protect its citizens). To live a safe and secure life, to not feel unsafe and insecurity has become a right and an expectation.

Of the three under-units for this phenomenon were all found in MP's Partyprogramme, in relatively high frequencies (in comparisons to the other recording units). The found units do refer to several areas, regarding protection do MP mostly proposes for the importance of environment-protection (including animals). Regarding security and safety does MP claim a need to avoid insecurity and that there are risks of insecurity in several areas, some in a context related to crime. Thereby is MP here considered to directly be influenced by the punitive turn, even if the individual protection from crime is somewhat lacking.

Regarding SD, protection and security, but especially safety is mentioned in several different contexts. The majority of them do however refer to the protection of the nation and its citizen, and the importance of social safety and security for the nation's citizen. Thus SD's policy is not directly considered to be related to the punitive turn, but indirectly.

Rational Choice: By the punitive turn in general, and RCT in particular, the individual is considered to be egoistic in nature, and makes rational calculated decisions whether to commit a crime or not. Deterrence is thus viewed as the only working crime prevention-method.

“Rational Choice” is not found in the documents, but the under-units are. In SD’s Principleprogramme “rationality” is however used in an opposite context, while “choice” refers to different meanings, but the most of them refer to active individual decision-makings. Since the claim of an overall rationality is denied can however SD not be considered to be influenced by the punitive turn for this recording unit. MP’s writings cannot either be related to the punitive turn, since “choice” is often used in contexts in which individual freedom of choice is important, but people should in some cases be given the possibilities, or rather support, to make wise choices, for example by limited advertisements. Thereby MP does not believe in humans as fully rational creatures capable of deciding what is best for them.

Risk: The punitive turn proposes crime to be an everyday risk, and that the “crime-risk” should be removed by situational prevention and punishment. The risk of being victimized should be minimized and avoided because a risk-free environment is an entitlement. The recording unit for this phenomenon (“risk”) exists in several contexts in MP’s Partyprogramme. The text does however not directly refer to risks of crime (but environmental problems), neither are a majority of the “risks” claimed to be potentially avoided by individual responsibility. Threatening risks however exist, risks which lead to dangerous consequences if they are not minimized, and thereby it is considered that MP’s policy indirectly has been influenced.

SD’s Principleprogramme contains of somewhat less areas that are in the risk of being affected by negative consequences, a majority of the found “risks” refer to a mass-immigration which risks Sweden’s national culture and community. In one case is risk however written in a positive aspect, that risk-taking should pay in a growth-oriented and business-friendly society. This is however not considered to make the influence of the punitive turn lesser but instead larger because competition and risk-taking is part of the punitive turn, in general, and neo-liberalism, in particular. Thus is SD claimed to indirectly be influenced by the punitive turn’s usage of risk.

Responsibility: By the punitive turn the rational individual is responsible for his/her actions, and an individual who has committed a crime is thereby blamed for his/her choices of action. The law-abiding citizens are responsible for avoiding crime, at least petty crime because the government is still responsible for dealing with serious crime.

This phenomenon of responsabilization can directly be found in SD’s policy, since claims exists for governmental responsibility in dealing with serious problems and that regulations should be applied. A majority of the cases do however not refer to criminality but immigration, however should assimilation to the Swedish culture lie on the individual, and the individual is claimed to be responsible for his/her actions.

Regarding MP, the concept is used on both individual levels, and (especially) on societal/planetarian levels. Common social responsibility should exist for the past, present and future, by the state cooperation’s and individuals. Thus can MP’s policy not directly, but partly indirectly be considered to be influenced by the punitive turn.

Routine Activity: A main theoretical idea of the punitive turn is RAT, which proposes that individuals’ routine activity patterns expose themselves to victimization. Crime is a routine risk that can be avoided by changing one’s routine behavior. To find an influence of RAT in the documents two under-units were searched for. However “routine” was not found in the documents, while “activity” is referred, by MP, in contexts of more activities, and easier accessibility of them, for disadvantages groups. To participate in those examples of activities can be viewed as crime-preventive, however is this proposition not clearly stated by MP, and

therefore has the punitive turn only partly influenced MP. Regarding SD, not even a partial relation can be found.

Situation: By the punitive turn the focus has changed from social prevention of the subject, to a view in which place and setting is of central importance. Environments are regarded as criminogenic situations, and can be shaped in ways to reduce crime.

MP's usage of the concept is in contexts which (in a waste majority of the cases) refer to individual life-situations, and do thus not refer to the physical place of the punitive turn. Thus no relation is considered to exist.

The usage of the recording unit by SD is neither of same contexts as of the punitive turn – “situation” is not referred to crime or space/places, but, in most cases, to general conditions in national-levels. From another recording unit (Protection/Safety/Security) it is however clear that SD regards the cheapening of the physical environment as great importance of the citizens' security. That claim does however not include the recording unit analyzed here, and SD must thus consider to not have been influenced by the punitive turn's concept of “situation”. However the choice of recording unit (situation) can be accused for not accounting for the above described phenomenon of the punitive turn, and thus the method-design of this thesis, or at least this part of it, may be questioned, regarding the validity.

Threat: By the punitive turn is a threat, something to worry about and protect oneself from, and the individual has the attainable goal to be free from the threat of being victimized. “Threat” is thus a somewhat similar concept to “risk”, a difference between the two recording units however is that threat, just as crime, is something to fear, while a “fear of risk” is not (yet) claimed to have been developed by the sources which have accounted for the punitive turn.

MP's uses the concept of threat, especially, in contexts of threats against the environment (animals included). The recording unit is not, in particular, used on an individual level or in meanings of crime, and the same can be said about the contexts of SD. Thus this influence from the punitive turn of both MP and SD is considered to be indirect.

Victim: By the punitive turn has a focus of the victim occurred. The victim is seen as one of the main consequences of a crime (the other is the punishment of the offender). Also is the victim by hers/his actions and routine activities, maybe not responsible for a crime, but a central part of the possibilities of crime-events to occur.

SD use victim once in a crime-context, but the context do not include the main characteristics of the punitive turn, and thus is the influence considered to be partly. MP use “crime-victim” once in a context which is considered to be directly influenced by punitive turn – crime policy should have the victim and her/his exposure in the center. The word “exposure” was a thought-about alternative for an under-unit for this recording unit. The choice was however not to use it – only “victim” was chosen to be used because of a willingness to only investigate this main concept of the punitive turn. Also “exposure” was not used any time in the knowledge background of punitive turn.

Zero-tolerance: Zero-tolerance have had several key involvements of the punitive turn – as a slogan and working method for law enforcement and politicians, and as the most “distributed” strategy over the (western) world of the punitive turn. This, because it is both a simple solution against the crime problem and simple police working method – it basically includes no tolerance at all (for especially petty crimes).

The choosing recording unit for this phenomenon was “tolerance”, in case that “zero-tolerance” may be a too theoretical crime-concept for holistic policy documents. The recording unit was however not found in SD’s Principleprogramme. It was once found in MP’s document; in a context which however do not refer to law-breaking, but the message of “no tolerance” is clear. MP’s influence is therefore considered to be partly indirect.

5.1.2 *The anti-punitive turn*

Cause: By the punitive turn has the interest of the (social) causes of crime and the earlier causes-oriented prevention been abandoned, both in criminology and crime-policy. Background factors of the offender is no longer of importance, causation has been replaced with the crime-experience of victimization.

A majority of the SD’s usage of “cause” refers to other contexts than crime, while a minority possible indirectly can be related to crime-prevention. “The causes of crime”/“crime-causes” is however not written, neither does crime causation exist in any context. The lack of causation should however be greater in SD’s policy, in order to account for a direct non-influence of the punitive turn’s lack of causation.

MP’s contexts of recording unit are similar to SD’s, with the exception that cause is used in more areas (but especially environmental harm), and the lack of cause (in contexts of background factors) is neither for MP great enough for a non-relation with the punitive turn.

Motivation: The punitive turn proposes that the offenders’ motivation, just like other characteristics, is not of importance, and in the case of RAT; taken for granted. This, because it does not require any particular motivation to commit a crime, just a criminogenic situation.

In MP’s Partyprogramme is the recording unit used once in a context which refers to the importance of motivation in the welfare-sector, while SD’s Principleprogramme has no frequency of this recording unit. Since “motivation” is a lacking concept of SD’s whole policy, and MP is proposing a need for motivation, are the two parties considered to have a non-influence of the punitive turn.

Rehabilitation: The punitive turn ended the earlier rehabilitation-oriented paradigm. A need for a rehabilitation of the single offender was replaced by a view in which offenders should be punished in the sake of retribution. Three under-units were chosen to account for this phenomenon, and those units exist frequently in MP’s and SD’s documents. In a vast majority of the found recording units are the context; better healthcare and treatment. MP do however in a couple of cases refer to rehabilitation of offenders, the same thing cannot be said about SD. The under-unit “rehabilitation” is not found in SD’s document and therefore is SD considered to not be non-influenced by the punitive turn, while MP is direct non-influenced.

Social: “Social” is an ambiguous concept, it regards to social crime prevention, social factors of offenders, social institutions, socially beneficially measures, and social welfare. Those elements do however have a common denominator; the disregard from the punitive turn for anything social.

MP’s and SD’s documents includes some of the above mentioned contexts of “social”, and that should be enough in a claim that the parties policies are not influenced by the punitive turn’s disregard of “social”. The parties do however also in even greater extent include other concepts which involves the word “social”, and are thus non-influenced by the punitive turn.

Welfare: The welfare state is an institution which has been dismantled by the punitive turn. Instead of a social welfare system have a turn towards a market-orientation society (and crime

policy) occurred. Crime-committing and victimization are thus both individual responsibilities to avoid.

The existence of a secure, well-functioning, solidary financed welfare-institution for everyone is however of importance for both parties and thus is a non-influence considered to exist between the punitive turn's disregard of welfare and MP's and SD's regard for it.

5.1.3 Summary

The above analyses of the recording units are summarized in the tables below. The influence of the punitive turn of is presented in the following variables: "yes", "partly", "no", together with either "direct" or "indirect" (not for "no"). In the table of the anti-punitive-turn are the same variables used to summarize a non-influence of the punitive turn, a "no" does therefore mean that there is an influence of the punitive turn. A final table is also presenting a final analysis-summary.

| Punitive turn | Influence of MP | | | Influence of SD | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Common crime consciousness/common sense | No | | | Partly, direct | | |
| Control | Partly, indirect | | | Partly, indirect | | |
| Deterrence | No | | | No | | |
| Fear | No | | | No | | |
| Hard/er punishment/laws | Yes, indirect | | | Partly, direct | | |
| Individual | Partly, indirect | | | Partly, indirect | | |
| Offender/Criminal | No | | | Yes, direct | | |
| Opportunity | No | | | No | | |
| Order | No | | | Partly, direct | | |
| Police | No | | | No | | |
| Prevention | Yes, indirect | | | Partly, direct | | |
| Prison | No | | | No | | |
| Protection/Safety/Security | Yes, direct | | | Yes, indirect | | |
| Rational Choice | No | | | No | | |
| Risk | Yes, indirect | | | Yes, indirect | | |
| Responsibility | Partly, indirect | | | Yes, direct | | |
| Routine Activity | Partly, direct | | | No | | |
| Situation | No | | | No | | |
| Threat | Yes, indirect | | | Yes, indirect | | |
| Victim | Yes, direct | | | Partly, direct | | |
| Zero-tolerance | Partly, indirect | | | No | | |
| SUMMARY | 10 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| | No | Partly | Yes | No | Partly | Yes |
| | 3 direct | | 8 indirect | 7 direct | | 5 indirect |

| Anti-Punitive turn | Non-influence of MP | Non-influence of SD |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Cause | Partly, indirect | Partly, indirect |
| Motivation | Yes, direct | Yes, direct |
| Rehabilitation | Yes, direct | No |
| Social | Yes, direct | Yes, direct |
| Welfare | Yes, direct | Yes, direct |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| SUMMARY | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | No | Partly | Yes | No | Partly | Yes |
| | 4 direct | | 1 indirect | 3 direct | | 1 indirect |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| FINAL ANALYSIS-SUMMARY (Punitive turn minus anti-punitive turn) | MP | | | SD | | |
| | 10 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| | No | Partly | Yes | No | Partly | Yes |
| | -1 direct | | 7 indirect | 4 direct | | 4 indirect |

5.2 Discussion

So, has the research question been answered? What is the relation between the punitive turn and the two parties' crime policy? What is the influence of the punitive turn on MP's Partyprogramme and SD's Principleprogramme? Well, from the comparison of this thesis result-part (see 4.3 Comparison) MP did get a "final result" of 140 recording units (308 units of the punitive turn minus 168 of the anti-punitive turn). Meanwhile SD did get a final result of 117 recording units (208 units of the punitive turn minus 91 of the anti-punitive turn). Is than the influence of the punitive turn greater on MP's policy than on SD's? Well, the influence of the anti-punitive turn of MP was also greater, than the one of SD. And in a comparison between the parties final result is the difference between MP's 140 and SD's 117 not considered to be a great enough difference (with 23 recording units) to make such a conclusion.

But, how about the analysis of the qualitative facilitation? Well, of the 21 recording units of the punitive turn was MP considered to have; a partly relation for five, and a positive relation for six of the recording units. In three cases the influence was considered to be direct, and for eight recording units; indirect. For ten recording unit was no influence detected. Regarding the anti-punitive turn were a vast majority of the recording unit directly non-influenced, and after the subtraction of the anti-punitive turn, did therefore the direct influence got a negative relation, and the "yes"-influence declined from a six to a two. For SD was the relation to the punitive turn considered to be; a positive relation for five recording units, and a partly for seven. No relation was detected for nine recording units. Considering the anti-punitive turn, was a majority of the recording units directly non-influenced by the punitive turn, but in the final summary is the number of direct influence still positive (with four).

The analysis of the qualitative facilitation-result, and especially the final analysis-summary show thus that MP is less influenced by the punitive turn, than SD. MP has both a higher non-existence of recording units, and a lesser direct influence, than SD. But is the difference between MP and SD large enough to make any conclusions? Is the influence of the punitive turn lesser for MP and greater for SD? Well, according to the complementarity-result, SD can in greater degree be considered to be less influenced by the punitive turn than MP. The question is than; how the qualitative complementarity-result compares to the qualitative facilitative analysis? And with no decided value for either a strong or weak influence, or an existing or non-existing relation, is another important question whether the results and analysis of MP and SD should be compared with each other to establish such limits/values? A comparison between MP and SD was however not an aim for this thesis. Should this question then be answered by the design of the thesis? A fixed value was, as said, however never developed, and with the qualitative support it is, as said earlier, not the amount of recording units which is of the most importance, but the meanings/contexts of in which the recording

units exist. On the other hand is the quantitative approach, and the data-search of the recording units, the main technique of this thesis. So is the answer to the research question that MP relation to the punitive turn is stronger for the qualitative complementarity, and weaker for the qualitative facilitation. And that it is the other way around for SD.

Maybe is a design flaw behind the fact that the research question is so troublesome to answer? This, because the method should be of such a standard that it can produce a valid result to answer the research question. Maybe should the design have been applied to a different data-material instead of, or in addition to, “the most recent official documents”? Maybe older documents should also be analyzed. MP’s and SD’s first/oldest official documents could be analyzed and compared to the most recent documents in order to investigate whether the parties, not just today are a part of the punitive turn, but how their (crime) policy have developed, and if they have developed in the same direction as the punitive turn. A policy content-analysis may after all include a description of a particular policy and how it developed in relation to other earlier policies, or it may be informed by a theoretical/value framework which seeks to offer a critique of policy (Parsons, 1995). Another alternative would be to analyze, not policy content, but policy determination, which is concerned with how policy is made, why, when and for whom (ibid). Also could this thesis’ method be used to analyze other political parties, by such research could a comparative value be established for the influence/relation of the punitive turn on a political document. Another alternative is to apply the chosen design to official documents which strictly address crime policy, for example, crime policy manifestos. MP has however not (do this day) produced such a manifesto – a completely qualitative content analysis of documents of MP and SD would therefore be a more realistic alternative. In such research the problem of values for the analysis would possibly not exist. For this thesis the problem does however exist, and since this research has already been done, the above examples should be regarded as possible alternatives of future research, and shall not be discussed here anymore.

So, back to the research question, or rather the question of how it can be answered? Or can the research question at all be answered? Well, since the research question is not a leading question, a “yes” or “no” is thus not looked for. And to present straight simple answers for concepts such as “influence” and “relation” (of the punitive turn) is not considered to be appropriate. Here can Mencken’s (1917) wisdom can be applied: to every complicated problem, there is a neat, believable and wrong answer.

But maybe does this difficulty to answer the research question not lay on the question itself, or the result and analysis. Maybe it lays on the design, or rather what is behind the design; maybe has this thesis put too much of “responsibility” on the background knowledge of the punitive turn? Well, the choices of recording units have already been analyzed, and defended, and could be defended and discussed in eternity. The recording units are namely not just significant, relevant, and important concept of the punitive turn, but in different scientific field, and in societal crono and macro-level explanations. And to measure their existence in recent official documents is considered to be a relevant technique in order to answer the research question. To give just some examples: Flanagan (1987: 232) proposes that: “Perhaps the clearest lesson to be learned from historical research on crime and deviance is that the approach to crime control that characterizes any given era in history is inexorably linked to the notion about crime causation.”. Further do Mellosi (2000) claims criminology (research and theory building) in high degree is affected by larger social, cultural and historical events – during economic problems is crime viewed as a (greater) problem, and the causes of crime are assigned to the offender (ibid). The opposite of this “excluding” criminology/society is the including condition in which the criminal is not considered to be that dangerous, and the causes are in social environment (ibid). The view of (harder) punishment is certainly a view

that changes over time and place, for example did Kinberg wrote in 1935: “In cases where punishment is regarded as doubtful – i.e. in the majority” Kinberg (1935: 59). Finally, regarding “risk” and insecurity, is risk not just a concept used in the punitive turn but a current global phenomenon (e.g. Beck, 1998; Bauman, 2007), while Hansson (2000) claims that the society is, not a risk-society, but an insecurity-society.

This discussion and defense could, as said, continue, but the account of the punitive turn and the choosing’s of the recording units are viewed as enough legitimized. The lack of some of the recording units, especially the theoretical one’s, in the documents can be explained in several ways, for example have these concepts simply not influenced the parties’ policy. Is it a design-flaw, are other concepts that mean the same thing being used by the parties? Or is it a sample-flaw; is it not surprising that such concepts do not exist in holistic policy-documents? In that case might the research question be answered, because it regarded whether the punitive turn has influenced holistic policy-documents.

But is this the conclusion of this thesis, that the most theoretical recording units have not influenced MP’s Partyprogramme and SD’s Principleprogramme? Together with that; SD’s relation with the punitive turn is stronger for the qualitative facilitation, while MP’s is weaker? And that SD’s relation is weaker for the qualitative complementarity, while MP’s is stronger?

5.3 Conclusion

“Rather than the researcher providing authoritative research results, the entire research approach should be clear about the complex and uncertain nature of the project, how “results” are dependent on the researcher’s more or less conscious preferences and situatedness within a particular political, paradigmatic and linguistic orientation. From this follows a downplaying of researcher authority and a reduction of the asymmetry between researcher and reader. Instead of passively consuming research results, the reader should be encouraged actively to consider various interpretations and ideas.” (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000: 135)

Maybe should a research question be troublesome to answer, in some times should it maybe even not be possible to answer? And maybe should the responsibility of the answering not lie fully on the researcher? Maybe is it a too risky and a too hard responsibility for an single individual to make a rational motivated choice of the influence of the punitive turn, just in order to answer a research question? It might not be common sense in the academic world to have this much problem with the answering of a research question, but maybe it should be?

Regarding this thesis’s research question the conclusion is maybe that (even) no conclusion should be made whether the research question has been answered or not – the used method, the produced result and given analysis have all been presented, and they are open for interpretations. Instead of a conclusion regarding the research question, could maybe a completely other conclusion be made. Maybe should it be concluded that the MP-sympathizers are the winners of the globalization, while SD-sympathizers are the losers. And (to apply Christie & Bruun’s (1985: 13) conclusion regarding narcotics) that one of the greatest problems of both criminality and criminology is crime policy. Crime itself may be a self-fulfilled problematized reality in which contra-productive solutions of ideological views transforms crime policy into a policy of crime.

6. References

“The one who tells the stories rule the world.” – Hopi proverb

6.1 Sources

- Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (2000): *Doing critical management research*, London: SAGE Publications
- Amilon, C. & Edstedt, E. (1998): *Kriminalvård – insikter och utblickar*, Stockholm: Nordstedts Juridik AB
- Andersson, R. & Nilsson, R. (2009): *Svensk Kriminalpolitik*, Malmö: Liber
- Andersson, R. (2002): *Kriminalpolitikens väsen*, Stockholm: Stockholms universitet
- Appadurai, A. (2007): *Vredens Geografi. Rädslan för de fåtaliga*. Stockholm: Tankekraft
- Arnason, R. E. (2012). In S. Lynch (director) *Free Angela Davies and all the political prisoners* (documentary), New York: Realside productions
- Arnstad, H. (2013): *Älskade fascism: de svartbruna rörelsernas ideologi och historia*, Norstedts, Stockholm 2013.
- Arrigo, B. A. & Williams, C. R. (2003): *Critical Perspectives in criminology: Philosophy, Crime, and Criminology*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press
- Asplund, J. (1983): *Om undran inför samhället*, Lund: Argos/Palmkrons förlag
- Bauman, Z. (2007): *Flytande rädsla*, Göteborg: Daidalos
- Beccaria, C. (1976): *On Crimes and Punishment*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill
- Beck, U. (1998): *Risksamhället. På väg mot en annan modernitet*, Göteborg: Daidalos
- Becker, G. S. (1964): *Human Capital: A theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*, Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Becker, G. S. (1968): Crime and punishment: An Economic Approach, *Journal of Political Economy*, 76 (2): 169-217
- Bell, D. (1960): *The end of ideology*. Glencoe: Free Press
- Bengtsson, H-A. (ed.) (2009): *Högerpopulismen – En antologi om Sverigedemokraterna*. Stockholm: Premiss förlag
- Bergström, B. & Boréus, K. (2000): *Textens mening och makt – Metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig textanalys*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Berlin, D. & Lundqvist, L. J. (2012): Do leopards ever change their spots? The development of political trust among Swedish Green Party sympathisers, *Environmental Politics*, 22 (1): 131-152
- Betz, H-G. & Immerfall, S. (eds.) (1998): *The New Politics of the Right – Neo-Populist Parties and Movements on Establishing Democracies*, London: MacMillan Press Ltd
- Björklund, M. & Paulsson, U. (2003): *Seminarieboken: Att skriva, presentera och opponera*, Lund: Studentlitteratur

- Brå (2009): Våldsamt politisk extremism. Antidemokratiska grupperingar på yttersta höger- och vänsterkanten. *Rapport 2009:15*, Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet
- Bryman, A. (2009): *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. Egypten: Sahara Printing
- Burchell, J. (2001): "Small Steps" or "Great Leaps" – How the Swedish Greens are Learning the Lessons of Government Participation". *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 24 (3): 239-54.
- Burchell, J. (2002): *The Evolution of Green Politics: development and change within European Green Parties*, London: Earthscan Publications.
- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979): *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*, Aldershot: Gower
- Carlström, V. & Lundström, S. (1988): *De gröna – Ett verkligt alternativ?*, Stockholm: Nordstedts Förlag
- Christie, N. & Bruun, K. (1985): *Den goda fienden – Narkotikapolitik i Norden*, Stockholm: Rabén och Sjögren
- Christie, N. (2000): *Crime control as industry towards Gulags, Western Style*. London: Routledge
- Clarke, R. V. (1980): Situational crime prevention: Theory and practice, *British Journal of Criminology*, 20: 136-147
- Cohen, L. E. & Felson, M. (1979): Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach, *American Sociological Review*, 44: 588-608
- Cornish D. B. & Clarke R. V. (1986): *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Perspectives on Offending*, New York: Springer verlag
- Danermark, B. et al. (2003): *Att förklara samhället*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Davies, P. & Jackson, P. (eds.) (2008): *The Far Right in Europe. An Encyclopedia*, Oxford: Greenwood World Publishing
- Dean, M. (2010): *Governmentality: power and rule in modern society*, London: Sage
- Demker, et al. (2008): Fear and punishment in Sweden: exploring penal attitudes, *Punishment and Society*, 10 (3): 319-332
- Demker, M. & Duus-Otterström, G. (2008): Realigning criminal policy. Offender and victim in the Swedish party system over time, *International Review of Sociology - Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, 19 (2): 273-296
- Dobson, A. (2001): *Green political thoughts*, London & New York: Routledge
- Dolezal, M. (2010): Exploring the Stabilization of a Political Force: The Social and Attitudinal Basis of Green Parties in the Age of Globalization, *West European Politics*, 33 (3): 534-552.
- Edelman, M. (1988): *Constructing the Political Spectacle*, London: The university of London Press
- Ekbohm, T., Engström, G., Göransson, B. (2011): *Människan, brottet, följderna. Kriminalitet och kriminalvård i Sverige*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur

- Ekman, M. & Poohl, D. (2010): *Ut ur skuggan – En kritisk granskning av Sverigedemokraterna*, Stockholm: Natur & Kultur
- Ekman, S. & Ekman, M. (2001): *Sverigedemokraterna – Den Nationella Rörelsen*, Stockholm: Ordfront Förlag
- Elander, S. (ed.) (2011): *Tänk Grönt – 21 texter om framtiden*, Stockholm: Premiss
- Ericson, R. V. (2007): *Crime in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity
- Esaiasson, P. et al, (2010): *Metodpraktikan*. Stockholm: Nordstedts Juridik
- Estrada, F. (2004): The Transformation of the Politics of Crime in High Crime Societies, *European journal of Criminology*, 1 (4): 419-443
- Feeley, M. M. & Simon, J. (1992): The new penology: Noes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications, *Criminology*, 30: 449-474
- Feeley, M. M. (2003): Crime, social order and the rise of neo-Conservative politics. *Theoretical criminology*, 7 (1), 111-130
- Felson M. & Boba, R. (2010): *Crime and Everyday Life*, Thousand Oaks: SAGE publications
- Felson, M. & Cohen, L. E. (1980): Human ecology and crime: A routine activity approach, *Human Ecology*, 8 (4)
- Flanagan, T. (1987): Change and influence in popular criminology: Public attributions of crime causation, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15: 231-243
- Friedman, M. (1953): The Methodology of Positive Economics. In *Essays in Positive Economics*, Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Garland, D. & Sparks, R. (2000): Criminology, Social Theory and the Challenge of Our Times, *Brittish Journal of Criminology*, 40: 189-204
- Garland, D. (1991): *Punishment and Modern Society – A Study in Social Theory*, Oxford: Clarendon press
- Garland, D. (1996): The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of crme control in contemorary society, *Brittish Journal of Criminology*, 36, : 445-471
- Garland, D. (2001): *The Culture of Control – Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Garthon, P. (1988): *Vad vill de gröna?*, Göteborg: Korpen
- Garthon, P. (2011): *Det gröna genombrottet – Mina första trettio år med Miljöpartiet*, Stockholm: Carlsson
- Gilbert, N. (2004): *Transformation of the welfare state – The Silent Surrender of Public Responsibility*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Goodin, R. E. (1992): *Green political theory*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Hainsworth, P. (ed.) (2000): *The Politics of the Extreme Right – From the margins to the mainstream*, London: Pinter
- Hammersley, M. (1996): The relationship between Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Paradigm Loyalty versus Methodological Eclectism. In J. T. E. Richardson (ed.)

Handbook of Research Methods for Psychology and the Social sciences, Leicester: PBS Books

- Hamrud, A. & Qvarford, E. (2010): *Svensk, svenskare... Ett reportage om Sverigedemokraterna*, Stockholm: Optimal förlag
- Hansson, S-O. (2002): Uncertainties in the knowledge society, *Social Science Journal*, 171: 39–46
- Harcourt, B. (2001): *Illusion of order, The false promise of broken windows policing*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hawley, A. H. (1986): *Human Ecology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Hellström, A. (2010): *Vi är de goda: Den offentliga debatten om Sverigedemokraterna och deras politik*, Hägersten: Tankekraft
- Henry, S. (2001): Crime. In E. McClaughlin and J. Muncie (eds) *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*, London: SAGE
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1990): Rational choice theory: Necessary but not sufficient, *American Psychologists*, 45: 356-67
- Inzunza, M. & Svensson F. (2010): Granskning av "Hårdare tag" – En inblick i den kriminalpolitiska utvecklingen. In Eduardo Naranjo (ed.) *Ett sociologiskt kalejdoskop: aktuell forskning om ett mångskiftande samhälle*, Kristianstad: Kristianstad University Press
- Jareborg, N. (2001): *Allmän Kriminalrätt*, Uppsala: Iustus Förlag
- Jerre, K. & Tham, H. (2010): *Svenskarnas syn på straff, Rapport 2010:1*, Stockholm: Stockholms universitet
- Johansson, M. (1999): *Miljöpartiet i det politiska kretsloppet*, Stockholm: Timbro
- Kieso, D. W. (2005): *Unjust sentencing and the California Three Strikes law*, New York: LFB Scholarly Pub
- Kinberg, O. (1935): *Basic problems of criminology*, Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard
- King, R. & Wincup, E. (2007): *Doing research on crime and justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Krippendorff, K. (1980): *Content Analysis – An Introduction to its Methodology*, London: SAGE Publication
- Lagerlöf, D. (2012): *Den rasideologiska miljön, Årsrapport 2011*. Stockholm: EXPO Research
- Larsson, S. & Ekman, M. (2001): *Sverigedemokraterna – den nationella rörelsen*, Stockholm: EXPO Research
- Lewin, L. (2002): *"Bråka inte!" - om vår tids demokratisyn*. Stockholm: SNS Förlag
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T. & Ball R. A. (2007): *Criminological Theory – Context and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ljunggren, S-B. (2010): Miljöpartiet De Gröna, Från miljömissnöjesparti till grön regeringspartner, *Statsvetenskaplig Tidsskrift*, 2: 177-188

- Lodeniuss, A-L. & Wingborg, M. (2009): *Slaget om svenskheten – Ta debatten med Sverigedemokraterna*, Stockholm: Premiss Förlag
- Lodeniuss, A-L. & Wikström, P. (1997): *Vit makt och blågula drömmar – Rasism och Nazism I dagens Sverige*, Stockholm: Natur och Kultur
- Lovelock, J. (1988): *The ages of Gaia – A biography of our living earth*, London/New York: W.W. Norton & Company
- Mattsson, P. (2010): *Sverigedemokraterna in på bara skinnet*, Stockholm: Natur & Kultur
- Mellosi, D. (2000): Changing representations of the criminal, *British Journal of Criminology*, 40: 296-320
- Mencken, H. L. (1917, November 16): The Divine Afflatus. In *New York Evening Mail*
- Merkel, P. H. & Weinberg, L. (eds.) (2003): *Right-Wing Extremism in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Frank Cass Publishers
- Miljöpartiet (1982): *Nu kommer miljöpartiet! Om miljöpartiets av Miljöpartister med det officiella partiprogrammet*, Stockholm: Timbro
- Ministry of Justice, Sweden & Institute for Strategic Dialogue (2012): *Preventing and Countering Far-Right Extremism: European Cooperation COUNTRY REPORTS*
- mp.se 1: Collected 2014-07-12 from <http://www.mp.se/om/historia>
- mp.se 2: Collected 2014-07-12 from <http://www.mp.se/om/historia/fakta>
- mp.se 3: Collected 2014-07-11 from <http://www.mp.se/politik>
- mp.se 4: Collected 2014-07-13 from <http://www.mp.se/om/partiprogram>
- mp.se 5: Collected 2014-07-01 from http://www.mp.se/sites/default/files/miljopartiets_partiprogram_lagupplöst_2013.pdf
- Mudde, C. (2002): *The ideology of the extreme right*, Manchester: University Press
- Mudde, C. (2007): *Populist radical rights parties in Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Müller-Rommel, F. (1994): *Green Parties under Comparative Perspective*, Barcelona: Institut de Ciències Polítiques i Socials
- Mustaine, E. E. (1997): Victimization risks and routine activities: A theoretical examination using a gender-specific and domain-specific model. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22 (1)
- Myrdal, G. (1968): *Objektivitesproblemet i samhällsvetenskapen*, Stockholm: Rabén och Sjögren
- Nagin, D. S. (1998): Criminal Deterrence Research at the Outset of the Twenty-First Century. In M. Tonry (ed.) *Crime and Justice: A review of Research*, 23 Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Newburn, T. & Jones, T. (2007): *Symbolizing crime control: Reflections on Zero tolerance*. London: Sage Publications
- Nyberg, M. H. (ed.) (2001): *Maskrosbarn – Miljöpartiets första tjugo år*, Lund: Gröna böcker

- O'Malley, P. (2010): *Crime and risk*, London: SAGE
- O'Malley, P. (1999): Volatile and contradictory punishment, *Theoretical Criminology* 3 (2): 175–196
- O'Neill, M. (1997): *Green parties and political change in contemporary Europe: new politics, old predicaments*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Parsons, W. (1995): *Public Policy – an introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
- Partisekreterarbrev februari 2014 (2014): *Sdkuriren*, April 25. Collected 2014-07-21 from <http://sdkuriren.se/partisekreterarbrev-februari-2014/>
- Poguntke, T. (2010): Green Parties in National Governments: From Protest to Acquiescence?, *Environmental Politics*, 11 (1): 133-145
- Pratt, J. (2007): *Penal Populism*, London: Routledge
- Radzinowicz, L. (1999): *Adventures in Criminology*, London: Routledge
- Richardson, D. & Rootes, C. (1995): *The Green Challenge – The development of Green parties in Europe*, London: Routledge
- Rienecker, L. & Jørgensen, P. S. (2006): *Att skriva en bra uppsats*, Malmö: Liber
- Rydgren, J. (2004): Vad är radikal högerpopulism? In R. J. Widfeldt, A. (eds.). *Från Le Pen till Pim Fortuyn. Populism och parlamentarisk högerextremism i dagens Europa*, Malmö: Liber
- Sahlin, I. (2000): *Brottsprevention som begrepp och samhällsfenomen*. Lund: Arkiv
- Scott, J. (1990): *A Matter of Record*, Cambridge: Polity
- sd.se 1: Collected 2014-07-21 from <https://sverigedemokraterna.se/historik/>
- sd.se 2: Collected 2014-07-21 <https://sverigedemokraterna.se/var-politik/vara-viktigaste-fragor-2/>
- sd.se 3: Collected 2014-07-20 <http://sverigedemokraterna.se/var-politik/principprogram/>
- sd.se 4: Collected 2014-07-01 from http://sverigedemokraterna.se/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/principprogrammet2014_webb.pdf
- Shichor, D. & Sechrest, D. K. (eds.) (1996): *Three strikes and you're out: vengeance as social policy*. London: SAG
- Simon, H. A. (1978): Rationality as a process and product of thought. *American Economic Review*, 8 (2): 1-11
- Simon, J. (2007): *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*, New York: Oxford University Press
- Sohlberg, P. & Sohlberg, B-M. (2013): *Kunskapens former – Vetenskapsteori och forskningsmetod*, Stockholm: Liber
- SOU (1993:76): *Verkställighet av fängelsestraff. Huvudbetänkande av Fängelseutredning*, Stockholm: Allmänna Förlaget

Sousa, W. H., & Kelling, G. L. (2006): Of “broken windows;” criminology, and criminal justice. In D. Weisburd & A. Braga (eds). *Police Innovation. Contrasting Perspectives. Cambridge Studies in Criminology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

scb.se: Collected 2014-06-28 from

http://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/sv/ssd/START_ME_ME0104_ME0104_C/ME0104T3/table/tableViewLayout1/?rxid=40993569-ec2d-4d22-b215-cf12cb1cdf76

Stenson, K. & Edwards, A. (2001): Crime control and liberal government: The “Third way” and the return to the local, In K. Stenson & R. Sullivan (red.). *Crime, risk and justice: The politics of crime control in liberal democracies*, Devon: Willan

Sutherland, E. H. & Cressey, D. R. (1977): *Criminology*, Philadelphia: J.B. Lillincott Company

Taylor, I. (1999): *Crime in Context: A Critical Criminology of Market Societies*, Cambridge: Policy Press

Tham, H. (1995): Från behandling till straffvärde – Kriminalpolitik i en förändrad välfärdsstat, In V. Dag (ed.). *Varning för straff. Om våndan av den nyttiga straffrätten*, Stockholm: Nordstedts juridik

Tham, H. (2001): Law and order as a leftist project? The case of Sweden. *Punishment and society*, 3 (3): 409-425

Tonry, M. (2001): Symbol, substance and severity in Western penal policies, *Punishment and society*, 3 (4): 517-536

Trasler G. (1993): Conscience, Opportunity, Rational Choice and Crime. In R. V. Clarke & M. Felson (eds) Routine Activity and Rational Choice, *Advances in Criminological Theory*, 5: 305-322

val.se: Collected 2014-07-02 from

<http://www.val.se/val/ep2014/slutresultat/E/rike/index.html>

Vetenskapsrådet (2002): *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Vällingby: Elanders Golab

Wacquant, L. (1999): How penal common sense comes to europeans – Notes on the transatlantic diffusion of the neoliberal doxa, *European Societies*, 1 (3): 319-352

Wacquant, L. (2001). The penalization of poverty and the rise of neo-liberalism. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 9: 401–12

Wacquant, L. (2004): *Fattigdomens fängelser*, Eslöv: Bokförlag Symposion

Welsh, B. C. & Farrington, F. D. (2012): Science, politics, and crime prevention: Toward a new crime policy, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40: 128-133

Wennerhag, M. (2008): *Global rörelse. Den globala rättviserörelsen och modernitetens omvandlingar*, Stockholm: Atlas

Wetterstrand, M. (2011): Frihetligt om inte liberalt, In S. Elander (ed.) *Tänk Grönt – 21 texter om framtiden*, Stockholm: Premiss

Widfeldt, A. (2008): Party change as a necessity – the case of the Sweden Democrats, *Representation*, 44 (3)

- Wilson, J. Q. & Boland, B. (1978): The Effect of the Police on Crime, *Law and Society Review*, 12: 367-390
- Wilson, J. Q. & Kelling, G. L. (1982): Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety, *Atlantic Monthly*, : 29-38
- Wilson, R. & Hainsworth, P. (2012): *FAR-RIGHT PARTIES AND DISCOURSE IN EUROPE: A challenge for our times*, Brussel: European Network Against Racism
- Windlesham, L. (1998): *Politics, punishment and populism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Young, J. (1999): *The exclusive society. Social exclusion, crime and difference in late modernity*. London: Sage
- Zimring, F. E., Hawkins, G. & Kamin, S. (2001): *Punishment and democracy three strikes and you're out in California*. Oxford:Oxford University Press
- Åkesson, J. (2013): *Satis polito*, Sölvesborg: Asp & Lycke

Appendix 1

Mail from MP

Siffrorna avser sista december respektive år. Fram till 1999 är det avrundade siffror.

| | |
|------|-------|
| 1995 | 5600 |
| 1996 | 6950 |
| 1997 | 7500 |
| 1998 | 7900 |
| 1999 | 7285 |
| 2000 | 6918 |
| 2001 | 6701 |
| 2002 | 8011 |
| 2003 | 7483 |
| 2004 | 7178 |
| 2005 | 7249 |
| 2006 | 9543 |
| 2007 | 9045 |
| 2008 | 9111 |
| 2009 | 10635 |
| 2010 | 15544 |
| 2011 | 14648 |
| 2012 | 13354 |
| 2013 | 13761 |

PARTIKANSLIET
Miljöpartiet de gröna

08-545 224 50 (vxl)
service@mp.se

Pustegränd 1-3, 118 20 STOCKHOLM
www.mp.se

Appendix 2

Wordlist of the punitive turn and the anti-punitive turn

Punitive turn

| From the background knowledge | | To use for the result | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Key concepts | Frequency | In Swedish | Recording units |
| Common crime consciousness/common sense | 1/2 | Allmänna rättsuppfattningen, rättsmedvetandet/Sunt förnuft | “rättsuppfattning” “rättsmedvetande” “förnuft” |
| Control | 9 | Kontrollera | “kontroll” |
| Deterrence | 8 | Avskräckning | “avskräck” |
| Fear | 3 | Rädsla | “räd” |
| Hard/er punishment/laws | 10/9 | Hårt, hårdare, tuffare straff/påföljd, lagstiftning | “hår”, “tuff”, “straff”, “påföljd”, “lag” |
| Individual | 24 | Individ/ulisering/ualistisk | “individ” |
| Offender/Criminal | 14/5 | Brottsling/Förövare/Kriminell | “brottsling”, “förövare” “kriminell” |
| Opportunity | 5 | Tillfälle | “tillfälle” |
| Order (disorder) | 8 | Ordning, oordning | “ordning” |
| Police | 9 | Polis | “polis” |
| Prevention | 27 | Prevention/brottsförebyggande | “prevent”, “förebygg” |
| Prison | 15 | Fängelse/anstalt | “fängelse”, “anstalt” |
| Protection/Safety (unsafety)/Security (insecurity) | 3/5/9 | Skydd, trygghet, otrygghet/ Säkerhet, osäkerhet | “skydd”, “trygg”, “säk” |
| Rational/Choice | 11/5 (acronym: RCT not included) | Rationella val | “ration”, “val”, “välj” |
| Risk | 12 | Risk | “risk” |
| Responsibility | 10 | Ansvar/ansvarig | “ansvar” |
| Routine/Activity | 8/7 (acronym: RAT not included) | Rutiner/aktiviteter | “rutin”, “aktivitet” |
| Situation | 9 | Situation/ell | “situation” |
| Threat | 2 | Hot | “hot” |
| Victim | 8 | Offer | “off” |
| Zero-tolerance | 4 | Nolltolerans | “toler” |

Anti-punitive turn

| From the background knowledge | | To use for the result | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Key concepts | Frequency | In Swedish | Recording units |
| Cause/s | 9 | Orsak/er | “orsak” |
| Motivation | 3 | Motivation | “motiv” |
| Rehabilitation | 8 | Rehabilitering, Behandling, Vård | “rehab”, “behandl”, “vård” |
| Social | 20 | Social | “social” |
| Welfare | 7 | Välfärd | “välfärd” |

Appendix 3

Qualitative complementarity of MP and SD

MP

| Recording units of the punitive turn | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| “rättsuppfattning” = RÄ | 0 | 0: RÄ |
| “rättsmedvetande” = RÄT | 0 | 0: RÄT |
| “förnuft” = FÖ | 0 | 0: FÖ |
| “kontroll” = KO | 10 | 10: KO/-en/-er/-era/-eras/-erna/-system |
| “avskräck” = AV | 0 | 0: AV |
| “räd” RÄD | 4 | 1: RÄD-sla |
| “hår” = HÅ | 9 | 8: HÅ-/t/-rda/-rdare/-rdast |
| “tuff” = TU | 0 | 0: TU |
| “straff” = ST | 3 | 3: ST/-bart |
| “påföljd” = PÅ | 1 | 1: brotts-PÅ-följder |
| “lag” = LA | 43 | 20: LA/-ar/ens/-liga/-stadgad/-stiftning, djurskydds-LA, djurskydds-LA-en, djurskydds-LA-stiftningen, upphovsrätts-LA-stiftningen |
| “individ” = IN | 26 | 26: IN/-er/-en/-s/-uell/-uella/-uellt |
| “brottsling” = BR | 0 | 0: BR |
| “förövare” = FÖR | 0 | 0: FÖR |
| “kriminell” = KR | 0 | 0: KR |
| “tillfälle” = TI | 1 | 1: arbets-TI-n |
| “ordning” = OR | 4 | 3: OR-shållande, makt-O-ar, könsmakts-O-en |
| “polis” = PO | 4 | 4: PO/-en/-ens |
| “prevent” = PR | 1 | 1: PR-ionsmedel |
| “förebygg” = FÖRE | 10 | 10: FÖRE-a/-ande, brotts-FÖRE-ande, sjukdoms-FÖRE-ande, konflikt-FÖRE-ande |
| “fängelse” = FÄ | 0 | 0: FÄ |
| “anstalt” = AN | 0 | 0: AN |
| “skydd” = SK | 35 | 35: SK/-a/-ar/-ade/-et/-s/-snät/-saspekter, arbets-S, meddelar-S, högkostnads-S, natur-S, miljö-SK-ande/t, djurSKs/-frågan/-mål/-krav/-organisationerna/-standard/-lagen/-lagstiftningen |
| “trygg” = TR | 49 | 49: TR/-a/-as/-at/-are/-ad TR-het/-heter/-heten, rätts-TR-het, TR-hetssystem/-hetsystemet, arbetslivs-TR-het, samhälls-TR-heten, |
| “säk” = SÄ | 48 | 44: SÄ-ra/-rar/-ert/-erhet/-erheten/-erställa/-erhetsrisker/-erhetsrådet/-erhetspolitik/-erhetspolitiken/-erhetspolitiska, rätts-SÄ-er, kvalitet-Sä-rad, trafik-SÄ-erhet, sjukför-SÄ-kring, för-SÄ-ring, för-SÄ-ringen, föräldraför-SÄ-ring, för-SÄ-ringskassa, patient-SÄ-er, patient-SÄ- |

| | | |
|------------------|----|--|
| | | erheten, rätts-SÄ-erhet, rätts-SÄ-erheten, tillför-SÄ-ra, o-SÄ-ra, o-SÄ-erhet |
| “ration” = RA | 13 | 0: RA |
| “val” = VA | 64 | 9: VA/-möjligheterna/-frihet/-frihetsreformer, livs- |
| “välj” = VÄ | 12 | 12: VÄ-a/-s |
| “risk” = RI | 33 | 13: RI/-er/-erar/-erna/-en/-tagande/-spridning/-zonen/-faktor, säkerhets-RI-er |
| “ansvar” = ANS | 26 | 26: ANS/-et/-sfullt/stagande, sjuklöne- |
| “rutin” = RU | 0 | 0: RU |
| “aktivitet” = AK | 3 | 3: AK-er, fritids-AK-er |
| “situation” = SI | 6 | 6: SI/-er, livs-, skol- |
| “hot” = HO | 20 | 20: HO/-a/-ar/-ade/-en/-bildsbedömningar, miljö-, klimat-, utrotnings-HO-ade |
| “off” = OF | 36 | 2: OF-er, brotts-OF-ret |
| “toler” = TO | 1 | 1: TO-eras |

| Recording units of an “anti-punitive turn” | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| “orsak” = ORS | 9 | 9: ORS-en/-ar/-ade/-erna/-at, sjukdoms- |
| “motiv” = MO | 1 | 1: MO |
| “rehab” = RE | 2 | 2: RE-ilatering/-ilaterande |
| “behandling” = BE | 14 | 14: BE-a/-as/-ande/-ing/-ingar/-ingsmetoder |
| “vård” = VÅ | 72 | 72: VÅ/-a/-as/-en/-plan/-tyngd/-former/-garantier/-inrättningar/-personalens/-nadshavare, frisk-VÅ, äldre-VÅ, tand-VÅ-en, kriminal-VÅ, om-VÅ-nad, rätts-VÅ-ande, primär-VÅ, primär-VÅ-en, sjuk-VÅ, sjuk-VÅ-en, sjuk-VÅ-ens, sjuk-VÅ-spersonal, kulturmiljö-VÅ, natur-VÅ-sfrågorna, natur-VÅ-sintressen |
| “social” = SO | 23 | 23: SO/-a/-t/-politik/-tjänst, psyko-SO |
| “välfärd” = VÄL | 37 | 37: VÄ/-en/-ens/-ssektor/-ssektorn/-sinstitutioner/-sstaten/-statens/-stjänster/-stjänsterna |

SD

| Recording units of the punitive turn | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| “rättsuppfattning” = RÄ | 1 | 1: RÄ-en |
| “rättsmedvetande” = RÄT | 0 | 0: RÄT |
| “förnuft” = FÖ | 8 | 8: FÖ/-ig/-igt/-iga |
| “kontroll” = KO | 4 | 4 : KO/-eras, samhälls-KO |
| “avskräck” = AV | 4 | 0: AV |
| “räd” RÄD | 4 | 0: RÄD |
| “hår” = HÅ | 1 | 1: HÅ-t |
| “tuff” = TU | 0 | 0: TU |
| “straff” = ST | 5 | 5: ST, be-ST-as, be-ST-ande, be-ST-ningar |

| | | |
|---|-------------------|---|
| “påföljd” = PÅ “lag” = LA | 0 37 | 0: PÅ 28: LA/-en/-ar/-arnas/-överträdelser/-stiftning/-stiftningen, arbetsmiljö-LA-arna, råds-LA-en, landskaps-LA-en, tryckfrihets-LA |
| “individ” = IN | 33 | 33: IN/-en/-ens/-er/-ers/-nivå/-uell/-uella/-ualism |
| “brottsling” = BR “förövare” = FÖR “kriminell” = KR | 1 0 0 | 1: BR-ars 0: FÖR 0: KR |
| “tillfälle” = TI | 3 | 3: TI-n, arbets-TI, arbets-TI-n |
| “ordning” = OR | 5 | 5: OR, könsmakts-O |
| “polis” = PO | 1 | 1: PO-en |
| “prevent” = PR “förebygg” = FÖRE | 0 1 | 0: PR 1: brotts-FÖRE-ande |
| “fängelse” = FÄ “anstalt” = AN | 0 0 | 0: FÄ 0: AN |
| “skydd” = SK “trygg” = TR “säk” = SÄ | 7 31 10 | 7: SK-a/-as/-svärd/-skyddsnet, gräns-SK-et 31: TR/-a/-t/-het/-heten/-sboende/-hetsskapande/-hetssystem, rätts-TR-het, o-TR-het, o-TR-het, o-TR-hetens 10: SÄ-ra/-erhet/-erställa/-erställer/-erhetspolitisk/-säkerhetspolitiken, sjukför-SÄ-ring omställningsför-SÄ-ring, leverans-SÄ-erhet |
| “ration” = RA “val” = VA “välj” = VÄ | 6 21 6 | 2: RA-alitet 9: VA/-et/-frihet/-friheten, livs-VA 6: V-s/-a/-er |
| “risk” = RI | 28 | 9: RI-er/-erar/-erna |
| “ansvar” = ANS | 15 | 15: ANS/-et/-iga/stagande/-sfull/-sfullt, miljö- |
| “rutin” = RU “aktivitet” = AK | 0 1 | 0: RU 1: AK-er |
| “situation” = SI | 4 | 4: SI/-er, |
| “hot” = HO | 7 | 7: HO/-ar/-ande, livs-HO-ande, miljö- |
| “off” = OF | 18 | 3: OF-ren, brotts-OF-ers |
| “toler” = TO | 0 | 0: TO |

| Recording units of an ”anti-punitive turn” | Quantitative frequency | Qualitative Complementarity (frequency and variants of the recording units) |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| “orsak” = ORS | 5 | 5: ORS/-a/-en/-erna |
| “motiv” = MO | 0 | 0: MO |
| “rehab” = RE “behandling” = BE “vård” = VÅ | 0 6 18 | 0: RE 6: BE-as, sär-BE-as, sär-BE-ing, 18: VÅ/-en/-givare/-boende, hemsjuk-, sjuk-, sjuk-VÅ-en, sätts-VÅ-ande |
| “social” = SO | 42 | 42: SO/-a/-t/-ismen/-konservativ/-konservativa/-konservativt/-konservatism/-konservatismen/-konservatismens |
| “välfärd” = VÄL | 20 | 20: VÄ/-en/-snivå/-sområdet/-smodell/-stjänster/-sstat/-sstaten/-välfärdssystemens |

Appendix 4

Qualitative facilitation of MP and SD

MP

The following recording units are not written any time in MP's Partyprogramme; "AV" (deter), "RÄ" & "RÄT" (common crime consciousness) and "FÖ" (common sense), "FÄ" & "AN" (prison), and, "BR", "FÖR" & "KR" (offender/criminal). Thus no qualitative facilitation can be presented of those recording units.

Punitive turn

Control: "KO" is used in following meanings: in less control of students and school-practitioners but more for schools, in a hard controlled chemical-policy, in better controls of animal-treatment, in a control of "the unlimited global movement of capital" (mp.se 5: 33 own translation), in abilities for EU countries to control decisions by EU, and, in control-systems for organizations that promotes fair trade.

Fear: "RÄD" exist in following meaning: an undocumented person in Sweden lives an insecure and fearful life.

Hard/er punishment/laws: "HÅ" is used as claims for: demand on commercial fishing-companies, better working conditions, car-pollution affects children, negative effects for the countryside due to higher oil prices, poor people are being affected by natural disasters and conflicts, harder legislation for the protection of the environment and health, harder environmental standards, and, effects of climate change on food production. "TU" is not written any times, while "ST" is in following contexts: to take one's penalty for civil disobedience, a change of focus from punishment to treatment (regarding drug-abuse), and, "copying and file sharing for private use should not be punishable" (mp.se 5: 9, own translation). "PÅ" is in a claim that "criminal sanctions have both a crime preventive and rehabilitative proposes (mp.se 5: 6, own translation). "LA" is especially used to promote legislation that: protects whistleblowers, contributors of politicians and parties must be disclosed, UNs Rights of the Child should be a Swedish law, the quality of libraries should be guaranteed, achieves more efficient use of energy and materials and minimize negative environmental affects, promotes the transition to organic farming, and, encourages responsibility in ethical, social, and ecological considerations. Further should legislation: regulate the market, favor for statutory vacation, promote parental protection and work-safety before GDP-growth, create legal ways for emigration to EU, counteract discrimination and excessive ownership-concentration, and promote environmental-, and health friendly vehicles and fuels. Also should: the animal-legislation be fully applied and followed, and the copyright-legislation be "suited for today's society" (mp5: 9, own translation). Finally do MP "opposes all laws that disproportionate interference with integrity." (mp5: 3, own translation).

Individual: "IN" is written in several meanings, starting with students are creative and thinking individuals who should be given support and attention, and options for individually adopted study-technique. Further, has: every human the right to be who she/he wants to be, and the right to an individually suited (responsive) healthcare. Also should: the individual

have support by rehabilitation and education to be able to work, and a comprehensive insurance for a composed problem-picture, the individual variation not be reduced to only a part of a collective, the elderly-care be individually adopted, migration have positive effects on the individual, society and economy, the individual be involved in the welfare which leads to increased self-esteem, individual and socioeconomic risk by high private debt be countered, information be easy for the single person to find, societal structures not hinder the individual who is not a part of the norm, individual commitment exist together with societal responsibility, and, alcohol and drugs abuse, which causes great suffering for individuals and a high cost for society, be addressed by effective research methods. Furthermore: are all individuals different but each has several cultural references, free individuals are a part of the culture, historically political systems have made individuals unfree, discrimination affects the individual and society, and, changes of individual lifestyles with less consumption is required.

Opportunity: “TI” is used one time in: an appearance and disappearance of work-opportunities.

Order: “OR” is used in conditions for the police to both assist and support, and to restrain order and prevent and investigate crime. It is also used in a context of power- and gender power-structures.

Police: “PO” is used in contexts of: an importance of diversity within the police, a focus on the counteracting of drug dealing, and as a societal function which should be available over the whole country.

Prevention: “PR” & “FÖ” exists in meanings which regard: contraceptives, a preventive financial-policy of the state, disease preventive efforts, preventions of floodings, and, a conflict-preventive politics/diplomacy towards peace which may be replaced with military actions (only if the preventive measures have failed). Regarding crime prevention is it: the basis for a safe society with a low crime rate, and a decrease of marginalization and exposure in society is the most important crime prevention.

Protection, Safety & Security: “SK” include greater protection of: nature, biodiversity, key habitats, threatened species, humans, homes and community services, and, human rights. This protection is written to be done by: the precautionary principle, marine sanctionaries, sharp animal protection standards in public procurement, an increase possibility for organizations to plead causes, protecting agricultural land and forests from exploitation and logging, Sweden to be a pioneer in animal protection and work towards binding rules, not importing sheep food from countries with inferior animal protection, including animal protection in international trade agreements and hunting, protection of pristine waterways, supranational decisions, taxation, and, the power of the European Council. Also should there be: safety net for everyone – for students in case of illness, support for violated persons, greenery and open water against persistent rain, protection for consumers, a high cost dental care, and, “information-protection” to alert deficiencies. The meanings of “TR” and “SÄ” proposes that: many Swedish citizen live today in prosperity and economic security (which was historically not the case), the challenge is to build for security and freedom tomorrow, a safe childhood should be a right and strengthened by increased resources for the most deprived families, a family is built on love, respect and security, a secure working conditions and elderly-care should exist and should be trustworthily, security is needed together with freedom and democracy – a condition for a well functioned democracy is that people feel safe and secure, society must guarantee a secure welfare, economic security and a safe society to live in which gives support and help – probably by increased taxes (and higher taxation for more wealthy than less), one feel security over a functioning welfare which also brings life quality (these are

examples of better measures than GDP-growth), an equal society is safer for everyone, and, climate transition and a mixed urban structure provides security. Furthermore should safety and security be increased for: entrepreneurs, employees, unemployed, students, bike riders, and ill and disabled in especially insecure times. There should be: a more secure secondary housing market, an increasing economic security, social insurance for everyone, traffic safety, functional safe system of transport, a more equal parental insurance, safe levels of fossil fuels emissions, educational quality, a well-working health insurance, patient safety, quality secured healthcare, and, an ensured sexual health. “Childcare and school available for everyone, and social- and tax-policies ensures every child a good upbringing environment.” (mp.se 5: 10, own translation). A more secure world is built by: international actions to secure women’s safety, less threats from nations, new international regulations for security policies interests, a policy which puts human safety before territorial, a reformed Security Council of the UN, an independence of oil, coal and gas. The Swedish business-model is based on a well functioned safety system and Sweden should: have a preparedness of threats: be leading in ensuring globally food security, and actively participate in the international security policies, offer refugees legally secured asylum process.

Rational Choice: Of the under-units of rational choice is “RA” (rational) not written any time, while “VA” (choice) is written in following meanings: choices to live solidarity and environmentally conscious, that real choices requires information for consumers and city residents to make free enlightened and ecological sustainable choices but that adequate alternatives exists for people who do not make active choices, that environmental friendly choices should be cheaper, that gender- norms and inequality limit people, and, that the commercialization of the welfare threatens the freedom of choice. Concerning “VÄ” (choose) do the choices regard: types of pedagogy in school which is possible true diversity, how one would like to be taken care of as old, to strengthen people to make active welfare-choices, the possibilities to choose one’s way in life and occupation that fits them without any limitations of old gender stereotypes makes a strong society without segregation, that railroad should be favored instead of cars and trucks, for a greater options for different levels of participation for EU-countries, and, for people to choose where they want to live.

Risk: “RI” includes risk for: the frames of nature, different chemicals, GMO’s, the financial markets excessive risk-taking, global food production, economic exposure, residential segregation, children and young, and, for children’s health and students study-results. These risks exist because: a constant pursuit for economic growth, nuclear power, climate change, a financial systems which do not diversify risks, and, a dependence of oil, coal and gas.

Responsibility: “AN” is used in meanings off a higher responsibility towards: fishing, other people and generations, our historical emissions, our use of forests, water and land, the common challenges of society, that every action affects our world and future, and, limited resources. We should also be responsible: to replant forests, for good animals treatment, and, not to limit or restrict other people’s freedoms. Further should: regions and municipalities responsabilization increase by decentralization, participants in the economy to take ethic, social and ecologic considerations, the State and the municipalities to give arriving people a good start in life, politicians form market conditions to not overexploit resources, healthcare be less a responsibility for companies (instead a greater severally responsibility because patient – responsabilization have decreased), there be a societal responsibility for postal-service and communications, and, Sweden should take responsibility for the effects of our production and consumption. Also, EU takes greater responsibility for their decisions, and for the creation of a policy for an international climate agreement. Finally do “The human...want and can take responsibility” (mp.se: 5, own translation)

Routine Activity: “RU” (routine) is not written any time, while “AK” (activity) regards to sport-, leisure- and cultural activities, and proposed to include: an equal distribution of wealth between genders and to children in economically disadvantaged families, and the possibility of participation for elderly.

Situation: “SI” is written in following meanings: for students to deal with and affect their own life-, school-, and social situations, for a holistic view of a patient’s life situation, and, the importance of existing housings independently of socioeconomic situation.

Threat: by “HO” are several factors threatened: the right to privacy and integrity, democracy and freedom, our health and environment, the climate, endangered species, the biodiversity, and, ecosystems. These threats come from: governmental- and commercial actors, organized crime, environmental toxins, over-exploitation, poaching and trade, lacking scientific evidence, water and energy-shortages, military rearming, and, terrorism. Also do threats exists against IT- and communication systems.

Victim: “OF” is written in following meanings: victimization by racism, prejudices, stereotypes and norms affects everyone, and, the victim and her/his exposure should be in the center of crime policy.

Zero-tolerance: “TO” is written in this sentence: “Homo-, bi-, and transphobia and sexism shall not be tolerated in school or any other place.” (mp.se 5: 7, own translation).

Anti-punitive turn

Cause: “ORS” is written in following meanings: the greenhouse gas emissions are caused by us humans – by access of cheap energy, the causes for deforestation are many, we should not cause new environmental problems when trying to solve old ones, the goal should be to treat the disease and not the symptom, economic support regardless of the cause of the lack of income, the struggle for natural resources is causing wars and conflicts.

Motivation: “MO” is written in this meaning: the main motive for actors within welfare should be run a high-quality business with a social and societal commitment.

Rehabilitation: “RE”, “BE” & “VÅ” do the exist in meanings regarding an (health)care/treatment that is: modern, equal accessible, early, quick, responsive, good-quality, holistic, individual, coordinated, guaranteed, outreaching, developing, competent, professional, integrated, and, the best-possible. The treatment should be independent of gender differences and socioeconomically factors, that no one should be ashamed to seek care. The care regards: animals, women, and the involved in domestic violent, undocumented and asylum seekers, the violators, and, for drug-addiction and abuse. The healthcare should: encourage nonprofit care, listen the patients, include a long term-promotion on health be included (but not encourage unscientific methods), not hurt patients, involve a more accessible childcare, and prioritize chronically sick people, long-term focus on public health. Further should: everybody have right to wellness, there be options for healthcare personal with different language-skills (and guaranties for a qualified interpreter), dental care function the same as healthcare, the correctional system to be humane, the conditions be better for children which live in poverty (by better economic possibilities for their care-takers), culture-historical important buildings and environments be valued, and, there should be a good civic transparency in the administration of justice. The accessibility for healthcare is today unjust distributed, and healthcare is an important equality-issue since women do often work paid and/or unpaid with healthcare. It is important for doctors: to have a clear picture of the patient, and knowledge in complementarity treatment. Also of importance is questions regarding: nature conservation in Sweden and EU, that nature conservation is put in forward

of hunting, of patient's self-determination and participation, and "culture-environmental care" (mp.se 5: 25 own translation). Finally, ever fewer young take care of even more old in the future.

Social: "SO" is used in following in claims: we are social beings, "All culture is a social construction" (mp.se 5: 9, own translation), a rich life is characterized by social relations, the social anxiety increases in a unequal society, poor people's social rights should be respected, social boundaries limits peoples freedom, everybody have the right to a good psychosocial working environment, and, that value based organizations contributes to social sustainable societies. Further should: children in special need be given support from the social service regardless of the parents economic and social conditions, every child be given similar possibilities, and, social businesses be promoted. Furthermore: do a more complex structure exists than limited social constructed gender-norms, a constant pursuit for economic growth tend to lead to social problems, the transition demand technical and social innovations, new business forms is needed in the social economy, and there should be social demands on the welfare, in procurement, and trade-policy.

Welfare: "VÄ" is used in following claims: welfare is about life-quality, welfare includes a functioning collective transportation system, the history of the welfare-state is a story of freedom – freedom requires a functioning welfare, the welfare businesses cannot be managed as any other market – we are not consumers to the welfare, peoples dedication and unpaid efforts are off great importance for our common welfare, a functioning society builds on welfare, a god welfare counter segregation, and, the welfare is dependent on working competent people. Further is: clean environment a requirement for our welfare, an achievable welfare is for everyone, and, a constant pursuit for economic growth demolishes a long-term sustainable welfare (new measures should be applied on welfare). What is important is: the quality of the welfare, that the employers have good working conditions, to strengthen people's abilities to select a suitable welfare, and, to strengthen the empowerment and influence on the welfare.

SD

Punitive turn

The recording units of: "AV" (deter), "RÄD" (fear),"FÄ" & "AN" (prison), "TO" (zero-tolerance), and "MO" (motivation) is not written in SD's Principleprogramme, and thus can no qualitative facilitation be presented of those recording units.

Common crime consciousness & common sense: "RÄT" is not found, while "RÄ" is written in this meaning: the laws should be the same as the people's opinion. "FÖ" is used in following claims: the dominating ideologies of liberalism and socialism considers human as basically reasonable – we believe that our individual capacity of rationality is limited, and, that we also are controlled by feelings, instincts and impulses. Further do reason not always leads to reasonable decisions, one cannot trust single individuals' reason, and, earlier generation's reason and experience should be recognized. Also experience, research and common sense should determine different issues.

Control: "KO" is used in following meanings: the central social functions and sectors of strategically security-political importance should be under governmental control, that the laws of work-environment is controlled and followed, and, the importance that a nation ensures and controls its own energy-supply.

Hard/er punishment/laws: “TU” & “PÅ” are not written any time, while “HÅ” & “ST” are written in following meanings: hard punishment for harassment and persecution on the basis of sexual orientation, punishment shall be in proportion to the offence, offences shall be punished quickly and consistently, and, a more environmentally-friendly society should not singlehandedly punish single individual’s way of life but that punishable measures and legislation are sometimes necessary to counter environmentally destructive activities. “LA” is written in following meanings/claims: the importance/acceptance of law and order, the civilized conversation has ancestry to old Swedish laws, one of the definitions of a culture is its laws, and, to obtain Swedish citizenship must one respect Swedish laws and be given education in Swedish laws. Every citizen (no matter of gender and religious or non-religious views): is equal before the law and should feel safe, must accept Swedish laws, and have responsibility to obey the law. Historical social conservatism affirmed law and order, and rejected the Marxist disrespect for the law of ownership. The governments’ core task regards: the security of the nation, take care of weak and vulnerable individuals, and to uphold the laws. Also do incorrect views of mankind want to remove norms, morals, traditions, laws and structures.

Individual: “IN” is written in following claims: every individual has a free will, the room for individual differences is large, sexual orientation is an inherent attribute for most individuals, single individuals volunteering strengthens the social capital, it is entirely up to the individual to choose his/hers own way in life, the environment does often interact with the biological predisposition and the free will, different individuals have different inherent endowments – this is an example that all individuals are not born as identical copies, the adaptation to the Swedish society shall lay on the individual, it exists examples of single individuals who have adapted to the Swedish society, most individuals identify themselves with others that reminds them of themselves, most humans have a need of both individual freedom and collective community, to stay in a land in which one does not want to live is destructive for the individual, and, a multicultural society can exist of a small number of, not yet, assimilated individuals. Further should: individual justice be avoided, elderly’s individual requests be respected, and, society should encourage the individual, but at the same time make room for individual differences, regardless of support will not all individuals reach as far in all areas. The most important task of politics is not to try to tear down the structures that surround the individual, but to help the individuals to embrace its good and constructive features. SD’s politics combines freedom, security, individualism and community, while liberalism and socialism considers the individual to be a blank slate that is shaped by society and social context, and different structures inhibit the individuals’ freedom to choose his/hers own path in life. Furthermore is it important to defend all individuals’ basic human value and that individuals have right of freedom of religion. There also exists a buried essence in every individual.

Offender/criminal: “FÖR” & “KR” is not written any time, while “BR” is written in this meaning: “Crime-victims and potential crime-victims’ interests must at all times be put in front of criminals’ interests.” (sd.se 4: 18, own translation).

Opportunity: “TI” is used in following meaning: love for the nation has in times turned into hatred, “A good availability of jobs gives employees both security and freedom of choice.” (sd.se 4: 32, own translation), and, labor-immigration is a method to use when more jobs than employees exist.

Order: “OR” is used these meanings: we consider us (in descending order) to be a part of the, Nordic, European, western and global community, the difference between how (differently)

men and women chooses to live their life's no not have to be a result of a prevailing gender structure.

Police: "PO" is used in this sentence: "Police, border protection and law enforcement agencies need to be given necessary resources and authority to complete its task and protect citizens." (sd.se 4: 38, own translation).

Prevention: "PR" is not written any time and "FÖ" once in exists in this meaning: an obvious part of the constructional-planning should be crime-preventive and security-creating perspectives.

Protection, Safety & Security: "SK" is used in these contexts: the state should protect the nation from internal and external threats, a Swedish feature (which is constructive and democratic) is worthy of protection, the different cultures and common human heritages should be protected, and, the task of politics is create strong safety nets when parents are betraying their responsibility. Regarding "TR" & "SÄK" they are written in contexts of necessity for: legal security, a safe and lively home district, strong and secure families, employees to feel safe and secure on the working-market, social security, feeling of trust and safety towards the caregiver, well-behaved student to feel security, elderly to live a secure life's in safe homes, an "adaptation insurance" in the labor market, health-insurance, and, a (internationally) nonaligned security policy which can defend Sweden. Claims are made for: safety-systems are a central part of the welfare, security is a condition for freedom, society's basic organization and the natural social environment have a big impact on the citizen's security, immigration must be on such a level that it do not constitutes a threat against the welfare and security, multiculturalism leads to insecurity, the core family creates a safe upbringing environment, every human have a right for security, a national identity (with little differences in language, culture and religious views) have positive effects on a society's safety, labor is the only secure mean to achieve prosperity, great social inequalities threatens the security and cohesion, and, "In the trail of insecurity follows violence and instability" (sd.se 4: 38, own translation). Further: environments which risk creating feelings of insecurity and facilitate crime should be changed, SD want to recreate a safe, democratic, solidary welfare state, it is important with aspiration for safety, security and high moral, and there should be guaranteed high basic level of economic and social security.

Rational Choice: "RA" (rational) is not written in the claim: socialism and liberalism considers human to be rational. "VA" (choice) was found in these meanings: the citizens should "fully exercise their voting right in free and secret elections" (sd.se: 4, own translation), a free society leads to different life-choices, only Swedish citizens shall have voting right in common elections, the government expresses the nations will (by electoral results), pedagogical choices are important, there should be an increased freedom of choice for families, and, the method-choices regarding environmental problems should lay on the precautionary principle. The under-unit "VÄ" is found in following meanings: one can be a part of the Swedish nation by actively choose to assimilate to it, counties that practice female genital mutilation should choose to abandon it, students and parents should be given good possibilities to choose school, and, the choosing of SD's political representatives and positions are based on fundamental democratic principles.

Risk: "RI" is written in meanings that regard risks of: great class-inequalities and social injustices, aid (risks of fungibility), low compensation limits, permanent labor immigration, building collectives which are larger than the nation and, merging of "municipalities and country councils" (risk of closeness of the relationship between citizens and decisions-makers). The "government by the people" is also at risk when it is unclear who that people is,

in a state of several different people/groups. But, to educate one, to work and take risks, should pay.

Responsibility: “ANS” includes: environmental-, social-, long-term-, and immigration-responsibility. We should have responsibility for our planet, continent, country, and homestead, economic policy, for the community and other citizens wellbeing, and, for reforms – for those who lack resources (from state and municipalities). Also a responsible regulated market economy should exist. Finally we are “all responsible for our own actions and the consequences of them.” (sd.se 4: 7, own translation) due to our free will.

Routine Activity: “RU” (routine) is not written, while “AK” (activity) is written once it this context: that elderly are given meaningful activities and social interaction.

Situation: “SI” regards to: that SD’s nationalism is adjustable to new situations, of situations in which smaller “nations” exists in larger, whether it is a given sector or situation which best benefits the citizens’ interests, and, that the children’s best should be considered in all situations.

Threat: by “HO” exists in threats against the environmental and the national identity. Immigration is threatening and should be limited to temporary residence permits during that period that the life threatening consequences exist. Also was the European social conservatism born in a threatening class war (in the middle of the 19th century).

Victim: “OF” is written in this meaning: the victim should be given reparation for the harm they have suffered.

Anti-punitive turn

Cause: “ORS” is written in following claims: the inborn human egoism and competitive instinct do not have to cause damage, a problematic assimilation-process is one of the primary causes for a limited immigration, governmental support is needed for families that for some reason are falling apart, and, a mother and a father complete each other – of that cause should a child have the right for both (those) parents, and no other form of couple (of single parent) should be able to adopt.

Rehabilitation: “RE” is not written, while “BE” exist in claims that no one should not be treated differently depending on gender, age, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, nationality, or ethnic origin. Also animals should be treated with respect. “VÅ” is written in these meanings: people should be given the best possible evidence-based healthcare with good accessibility, some cultures provide better healthcare than others, and, one of the most central parts of welfare is healthcare, and state and municipalities should finance it, but not necessarily operate it. Further should health and social care have national quality-criteria’s, and provide tasty and nutritious food. Also should elderly be able to receive care in their home-environment as long as possible, and as well have a rich variety of care-homes

Social: “SO” regards to that SD: is a modern developed social conservative party but shares the ideology’s classical basic views – the idea of the welfare-state is in its basis a social conservative idea, and, do not accept that elderly are ending their life’s in social isolation – the elderly’s social needs should be met. Further is: sexual orientation not just a social construction, every human characterized by our social inheritance, the social capital the basis of the economy, the mass-immigration from distant countries economically and socially negative, and, culture defined as “socially transmitted patterns of living” (sd.se 4: 18, own translation). Also: do compulsory military service fills an important social function, built

environment should consider the need for social interaction, and, both biologically discrepancies and social constructions differentiate men and women.

Welfare: “VÄL” is used in these claims: national identity is the basis of the emergence of the welfare-state, all Swedish citizens should have the right for equal welfare, economic growth is necessary for the obtainment of our welfare, multicultural unlimited immigration leads to a reduced welfare, and, it is important to maintain a general, solidary financed welfare-model.