URBAN SEGREGATION AND THE PARADIGM OF SECURITY

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF SWEDISH URBAN POLICIES

MAJA STALEVSKA

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to explore the modalities of Swedish urban policy in its approach to urban segregation. By using a diachronic discourse analytic approach inspired by Foucault, I attempt to reconstruct the narrative of urban policy by looking at the problematizations of urban phenomena in urban programmes extending over the course of two decades. With respect to situating urban policy between the material realities of the spaces it seeks to address and the political rationalities that underline their framing in policies, I have used Foucault's concepts of *governmentality* and *dispositif*. The overarching goal of this study is to demonstrate the contentious nature of policy decisions which have been informed by the material realities of segregated areas as much as they have been informed by dominant socio-political and economic narratives under which the rhetoric construct of 'breaking segregation' (Andersson, 2006) has been subsumed. The study shows that policy decisions are often submerged in the "truth effects" of discourses established well beyond the boundaries of concentrated urban poverty, such as narratives of flows and mobility, sustainable development or economic growth - which in turn significantly affect the policy interpretation of phenomena such as poverty, urban crime and ethnic polarization.

Keywords: Urban Policy, Segregation, Discourse Analysis, Governmentality, Ban-opticon dispositif

Contents

Introduction

> Imagine a 4 year old daughter, or an 8 year old son, a boyfriend 20 years old, or a father 63 years old. What do they all have in common? They are all victims of shootings and have fallen victims to gang crime. A completely meaningless violence, they simply found themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time. Innocent people who end up in the shooting line, they leave behind parents, children and loved ones wondering why. No one should ask themselves that in our Sweden, no one. That is why it is so vital that the government works to increase the security of our country.. (Regeringskansliet, 2018a, min. 00:15)

The quote above is an excerpt from a press conference held in March by the Prime Minister of Sweden, Stefan Löfven, at which he announced the government's latest urban strategy aimed at breaking segregation in Sweden's so-called vulnerable neighborhoods. The conference took place in Skäggetorp, a suburb in the city of Linköping which, according to the official statistics of the Police, is one of the 23 most crime-exposed vulnerable areas in the country (Polisen, 2015; 2017). Following the high-pitched discussions over the country's problematic suburbs and the increase of violent crimes, the prime minister began his address reminding the audience of the casualties that have fallen victims to shootings between gang members - predominantly young and of foreign background, associated with areas known as socioeconomically challenged.

In view of the 2018 parliamentary elections, solving the issue of the vulnerable neighborhoods has become one of the main points of contention in political debates, in relation to issues concerning crime and immigration policy. Announced as the country's first strategy of its kind, the investment above was promoted as a highly prioritized part of the work for "A Sweden that holds together" (Regeringskansliet, 2018f, para. 2), the official slogan under which the social-democrat-led government promoted all initiatives aimed at increasing the social cohesion, safety and security of the country, through concerted efforts to reduce the crime and social exclusion in vulnerable areas (Regeringskansliet, 2017).

Wide cross-sectoral strategies aimed at disadvantaged neighbourhoods such as the one announced in Skäggetorp are not a particularly new occurrence in Swedish urban politics. In a similar context such as the present, marked by tensions over the high influx of refugees in the early 1990s, criminal youth and the ever-deteriorating living situation in public-housing suburbs, the government introduced the first area-based policy of this kind back in 1995, followed by two decades of urban anti-segregation policy. Is then the new strategy really the first of its kind? How does it differ from its predecessors? Have problems in disadvantaged areas changed in their nature, have segregation and exclusion become more extreme? Are the people living here in any way different, or is it just the policies that shift? These are the overarching questions that animate this particular study.

I take as a starting point Cochrane's (2007, p. 2) argument that "any consideration of urban policy makes it necessary to actively explore what Foucault calls the process of 'problematization'", or "how and why certain things (behaviour, phenomena, processes) became a problem. Why, for example, certain forms of behaviour were characterized and classified as "madness" while other

similar forms were completely neglected at a given historical moment; the same thing for crime and delinquency" (Foucault, 2000, p. 171). Such an approach implies that any attempt to understand a particular policy framework should take into consideration the contentious nature of the social meanings constructed and reproduced through the particular choice of discourses (Fischer, 2003). Moreover, it commands being aware of the inherently ideological and deliberative nature of the political process that surrounds the formulation of policy frameworks.

Following that, the primary aim of this research is to analyse the formulation of urban problems, or rather the problematization of certain urban phenomena through urban policies, conceived to tackle social exclusion and segregation in urban areas in Sweden. In that extent, the aim of the research is not to necessarily analyse the effectiveness of the policies or lack thereof, but to question their particular framing and discuss the potential ramifications for the realities of the groups and places these policies are conceived to help (Cochrane, 2007).

With the aim to approach and understand the problematization of particular phenomena from a wider perspective, I will try to place urban policy in a broader socio-political context and consider its aims in relation to other phenomena and (policy) issues as well. In order to set the limits to such a vast field, I have used Foucault's concept of the *dispositif,* referring in general to "the various institutional, physical, and administrative mechanisms and knowledge structures [including urban policy] which enhance and maintain the exercise of power within the social body" (O'Farrell, 2007). I will reflect on the role of the dispositif in relation to 'governmentality', as understood and defined by Foucault (1991). Additionally, I use Didier Bigo's concept of the 'ban-opticon dispositif' which pertains to the transnational control of immigration, and relate to what Bigo (2002, 2008), following Foucault (1991), has termed a 'governmentality of unease', in relation to what Agamben (2002) and Foucault (2007) agree has become a global generalization of the paradigm of security.

The relevance of this last theme for the present study derives from the growing emphasis placed on crime and the distinct law-and-order approach taken to recent urban strategies, not least in relation to migration issues. Namely, the current political debates on welfare, immigration and security, which have been somewhat pushed to the right, have affected the tone of the debate related to vulnerable areas and the issue of segregation. In a recent parliamentary debate, the leader of the Swedish Democrat Party suggested the deployment of the military in vulnerable areas as a way to deal with the exceptional crime rates, an idea which the Prime Minister did not condemn, or completely exclude as an option ('Löfven utesluter inte att sätta in militär', 2018). He maintained that the government would consider taking any measures necessary to effectively fight the crime in vulnerable areas, even though he added later that deploying the military would not be their first choice.

On top of the increasing public concerns over organized crime, events taking place in relation to developments outside the country, such as the conflict in Syria, specifically the emergence of religious fundamentalism and radicalization, have become an additional anxiety for the

government after data from the Police Authorities showed that the majority of Swedish citizens that have participated in foreign conflicts come from the disadvantaged areas (Polisen, 2015). In consequence, as concerns various policy fields, vulnerable areas have become, in the words of Bigo (2008, p. 32), the converging point of "previously unconnected conceptual worlds" such as "internal security, external security, […] crime and delinquency". These concerns have also been mirrored in recent urban strategies. Thus, in what looks like an increasing alignment of urban policy with concerns over crime and safety, in the present context of the Swedish welfare state - as a piece in Politico puts it - it seems like "the message of social equality has taken a backseat to law and order" (Duxbury, 2017).

Cochrane (2007, p.3) argues that the chief aspect which separates urban policy from other social policies is its spatial approach in the definition of social problems, since it primarily "focuses on places and spatially delimited areas or the groups of people associated with them". A look into the problematization process of urban policies thus entails taking a more careful approach toward the discursive representations of the spaces that inform a particular policy intervention. This directs the discussion towards the single element that has remained unchanged and unchallenged throughout the two decades of urban policy in Sweden: its intervention geography. Following Cochrane's (2007, p. 2) definition of urban policy as a policy that begins its "problem definition from area rather than individual or social group", Dikeç (2007, p. 23) argues that space and imaginaries of space are a central element to urban policy formation and more importantly the political reasoning which surrounds the formulation of the problems to be tackled and their potential solutions. Dikeç (2007, p. 22) relates this process of urban policy formation to Foucault's (1991) notion of governmentality, or specifically to "the mutual constitution of objects of governance and modes of thought – mentality – which […] makes specific forms of intervention possible":

> [G]overnmental practices, insofar as they involve both formation and intervention, are not merely 'confined' to designated spaces; they constitute those spaces as part of the governing activity. If urban policy has a governmental dimension, […] then its spaces of intervention are not merely the sites of governmental practice, but, first and foremost, its outcomes.

For that reason, this analysis has been particularly focused on the discursive representations of the so-called vulnerable neighbourhoods, as defined and delimited through the language of urban policy. Before I move on to presenting the study, I will provide a brief sketch of the delimitation, material realities and the narratives surrounding the concept of the so-called vulnerable neighbourhood which has preoccupied Sweden's urban policy in the past two decades.

What are vulnerable neighbourhoods?

The areas popularly known as the vulnerable or exposed neighbourhoods in Sweden are typically peripheral residential areas dominated by public housing and defined by a specific combination of social, demographic and economic markers such as high unemployment and low employment rates, an above-average rate of social benefit recipients, predominantly foreign background -

mainly non-Western European-population and a typically younger age-demographics. Notwithstanding the few exceptions of inner city neighbourhoods that fall into the same category, the term "vulnerable area" usually brings to mind an image of a Million Housing[1] suburb, commonly associated with poverty, crime, insecurity and often described in ethnic terms. In that sense, Alinia (2006, p.65) notes that the term suburb in Sweden has a normative meaning in the sense that it stands for social status rather that a geographic location. The suburb, she argues, is reserved for the poor, immigrant-dense, marginalized areas while middle-class neighbourhoods escape the category regardless of their location in the periphery (Alinia, 2006, p.63). This means that it is particular groups/categories of people living in peripheral areas that carry the signifier 'suburb', and not the places in itself.

Inasmuch owing to the reality of harsh economic and social conditions, this specific association of urban vulnerability has come to be particularly consolidated by the institutionalization of the phenomenon in public policy, specifically area-based initiatives from the past two decades aiming to break socio-economic and ethnic segregation. Thus, the somewhat monolithic and contorted representation of the poor suburb, which largely dominates media representations and political parlance, has to a great extent been informed by its mobilization in public policy.

Despite this, policies that have institutionalized the term do not share a single generally accepted definition over what exactly constitutes a "vulnerable" area (Brå, 2018). As noted by the National Council for Crime Prevention in their recent report (Brå, 2018, p.15), the limits of what is considered to be or not to be vulnerable neighborhoods are largely governed by the focus of the particular policy in question and the possibilities for operationalizing the concept. For example, the Police Authorities have defined vulnerable areas as "geographically delimited areas characterized by a low socio-economic status and a criminal impact on the local community" (Polisen, 2015, p.13) which, furthermore, based on the perceived severity of the situation could fall into one of three categories: (1) particularly vulnerable, (2) risk, or simply (3) vulnerable areas. Such delimitation naturally results from the Police Agency's specific focus on the prevention and clearance of crime.

On the other hand, urban social policies that focus on segregation traditionally don't use data on crime and perceived insecurity as criteria in their delimitation of urban vulnerability - even if and when crime is recognized as an issue related to concentrated urban poverty and crime-prevention strategies are included on the policy's agenda. Instead, this category of area-based strategies still relies mainly on socio-economic factors such as median income levels, unemployment and employment rates, the share of individuals on social assistance, the average levels of education or the share of people with foreign-background. This changed with the latest urban strategy launched

---

[1] The so-called Million Housing Programme was a large-scale state investment established in the period between 1965 and 1975, during which the state subsidized the construction of one million homes with the aim to replace dilapidated working class quarters and improve the living standard for a large section of Sweden's population.

in 2017, which accepted all definitions of urban vulnerability, including those put forward by the Police, regardless of the originating policy or the institutional framework.

The lack of a clear definition has created a certain confusion over the exact meaning and delimitation of the concept in urban policy which, following its inter-institutional borrowing, has prompted the interchangeable use of several terms when referring to the same areas: socioeconomically vulnerable, excluded, deprived, disadvantaged, immigrant-dense and so on. Each of these terms has its place in relation to a particular institution and moreover to a specific socio-political context which reflects the dominant political rationalities that command the approach to concentrated urban poverty.

Disposition of the thesis

The rest of the thesis is organized in the following order. The first part is divided into two chapters. The first chapter discusses the choice of methodology and its theoretical implications, the analytical framework and the design of the research. Finally, it provides a brief description of the empirical material and the final presentation of the study.

The second chapter delimits the conceptual framework of the study and presents the main concepts that have been employed in the analysis of the empirical material.

The second part of the thesis presents the results from the study, divided into four chapters according to the chronological order of the studied policies. The first chapter discusses the emergence of socioeconomic inequality, residential and ethnic segregation in Sweden, as well as the first anti-segregation efforts employed on a national level. The second chapter presents the socio-political context that surrounded the inception of the first urban policy in Sweden, the so-called Big City Policy, and provides an insight into its framework and implementation in the period between 1998 and 2006.

The third chapter provides an insight into the second generation of area-based initiatives launched under the Urban Development Policy (henceforth UDP), extending in the period between 2007 and 2014. This section rounds off with an account of the proliferation of urban riots in disadvantaged areas that took place at the turn of the 2010s.

The final chapter outlines the most recent anti-segregation strategies introduced between 2016 and 2018 under the common policy area known as Measures Against Segregation. Additionally, this section provides a discussion of their delimitation in relation to the imperative of security and the concurrent advancement of the criminal justice system in urban policy's intervention areas. Finally, the discussion and conclusion chapter will provide a summary of the results from the study and draw some general conclusions in relation to the conceptual framework.

Part I

Chapter 1. Discourse analysis

The main method of analysis employed in this study is a discourse analytic approach following Sharp & Richardson's (2001) development of a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis. The theoretical and analytical implications are informed by Foucault's theory on language, knowledge, and power. In the following sections I will elaborate on the theoretical grounding of the chosen method and its implications for research in policy analysis, followed by a closer look into the methodological framework proposed by Sharp & Richardson. Finally, I will reflect on the main challenges and limitations of the chosen methodology in terms of the analytical difficulties, research design, reflexivity and the presentation of the final results.

Theoretical implications

All approaches to discourse analysis, despite practical and theoretical differences, are considered to be grounded in a social constructivist understanding of reality. At the core of the social constructivist approach lies the rejection of the idea that there exists a neutral language which can be used to objectively describe social issues and phenomena. In the case of policy analysis, a social constructivist approach emphasizes the contentious nature of the political rationalities and the policy frameworks that they uphold. Moreover, it challenges their claim of policy analysis that allows to empirically test and distinguish between the right and wrong policy answers (Fischer, 2003). In the field of policy studies, this approach is usually criticized as relativistic by more positivist approaches which, Fischer (2003) argues, tend to take facts and issues as pregiven. Fisher maintains that the positivist approach, which is grounded in "technical rationality", sometimes "deceptively offers an appearance of truth […] by assigning numbers to decision-making criteria and produces what can appear to be definitive answers to political questions" (Fischer, 2003, p. 14). Following this, he stresses the importance of understanding that "politics and policy are grounded in subjective factors" and "what is identified as objective 'truth' by rational techniques is as often as not the product of deeper, less visible, political presuppositions" (Fischer, 2003, p.14). A social constructivist approach "focuses on the crucial role of language, discourse, rhetorical argument, and stories in framing both policy questions and the contextual contours of argumentation, particularly the ways normative presuppositions operate below the surface to structure basic policy definitions and understandings" (Fisher, 2003, p.15).

Sharp & Richardson (2001, p. 193) note that different approaches to discourse analysis can yield different research results, which they maintain is a consequence of the varying importance that each strand attributes "to developments in institutional structures and communication as causal factors in bringing about social change". The main point of divergence is the operational definition of discourses, or rather which elements they are considered to encompass and where they are manifested (Sharp & Richardson, 2001). Thus, before choosing an analytical approach one must first define the limits of discourse.

From this viewpoint, Sharp & Richardson (2001) divide the field roughly into two theoretical strands. The first strand views discourse as an entity manifested only in language and communication, which in turn usually limits the study of discourses to linguistic analysis. The second theoretical strand belongs to scholars inspired by Foucault that understand discourse as manifested in both text and practice. In their view, discourse is manifested in language and communication, but also in "institutional structures, practices and events" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, p. 199). Sharp & Richardson (2001, p. 195) argue that for those that use this interpretation "'a discourse' is not a communicative exchange, but a complex entity that extends into the realms of ideology, strategy, language and practice, and is shaped by the relations between power and knowledge". To summarize, the first strand analyses "discourses in text", while the second "discourses in text and practice" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, pp. 195, 205).

Following the tradition of discourse analysis in urban studies and urban geography, Loretta Lees (2004) also distinguishes two theoretical strands. The first, she argues, "descends from the long Marxist tradition of political economy and ideology critique" and sees discourses as "different ways of thinking" competing to become hegemonic knowledge (Lees, 2004, p. 102). The focus of this approach is to uncover (mis)representations of reality which serve to obfuscate existing patterns of power and vested interests (Lees, 2004). Lees places the communicative strand, highlighted by Sharp & Richardson, in the same tradition but emphasizes their particular focus on discourse coalitions (Lees, 2004, p. 102): "this work takes for granted the identity of the actors in question and theorizes the way coalitions form not in terms of the shared material interests focused on by Marxist theory but through discourse and persuasion". Scholars in this line of theory focus on argumentation, rhetoric, problem framing and narratives (Schön & Rein, 1993). Their understanding of discourse, as expressed only in language, means that social change could be achieved only by effecting changes in communication, which in turn is achieved through institutional changes (Sharp & Richardson, 2001).

The second strand, Lees argues, disputes the view that discourses are just a skewing of reality and maintains, following Foucault, that each discourse creates its own reality or "regime of truth" (Lees, 2004, pp. 102, 103). According to Foucault, nobody stands outside of the realm of discourses and thus it is impossible for anyone to claim knowledge of the ultimate reality (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). This is why he argues that the search for what is "true or false" is a futile mission and we should instead focus on the discursive struggles and the underlying power structures that produce "truth effects" through language and knowledge (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 14; Lees, 2004). Social change in this approach is considered to take place in the conflict of competing discourses.

As I mentioned in the beginning, this thesis makes use of a discourse analytic approach inspired by Foucault. There are two particular reasons why I decided to go in that direction. First, this approach is sensitive to the "historical and cultural specificity of particular ways of knowing the world" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, p. 193). To be able to investigate the genealogy of problem formulations, identify potential discursive conflicts in policy rationalities and understand why and

how they happened, the study requires a historically attuned approach which seeks to understand these events in the socio-political contexts in which they are embedded. The importance of a historically oriented approach is central to Foucault's work. This is in line with his rejection to subscribe to ahistorical and universalistic norms in fear that their "ethical uniformity with the kind of utopian-totalitarian implications" could be potentially detrimental to democracy (Flyvbjerg & Richardson, 2002, p. 50). His viewpoint is that power relations can only be challenged through a study grounded in their specific social and historic context (Flyvbjerg & Richardson, 2002, p. 51): "For Foucault the socially and historically conditioned context, and not fictive universals, constitutes the most effective bulwark against relativism and nihilism, and the best basis for action".

The second reason for choosing this approach is related to the aim of this study to confront the particular problem framings of urban issues with policy practices, events and actions that extend beyond documents. This entails a consideration of a variety of "linguistic and non-linguistic materials—verbal statements, historical events, interviews, ideas, politics" which, as Fischer (2003, p. 73) argues, can demonstrate how particular "actions and objects come to be socially constructed". I argue that this implies adopting a definition of discourse which extends beyond the textual re-presentations of places in urban policy texts over to "material social practices, codes of behaviour, institutions and constructed environments" embedded in policy discourses (Sayer in Richardson & Jensen, 2003, p. 44). In short, a Foucauldian understanding of discourse as manifested both in language and practice (Sharp & Richardson, 2001).

Richardson & Jensen (2003, p. 16) propose an approach to discourse analysis which "embraces material practices" with the aim to "bridge the gap between textual discourse and socio-spatial practices". They define spatial policy discourses "as an entity of repeatable linguistic articulations, socio-spatial material practices and power-rationality configurations" (Richardson & Jensen, 2003, p. 16) and propose using language, practices and power rationalities as analytical categories in order to understand "the ways in which spaces and places are re-presented in policy discourses in order to bring about certain changes of socio-spatial relations and prevent others" (Richardson & Jensen, 2003, p. 16). Their approach follows the same theoretical and methodological implications as the approach that Sharp & Richardson (2001) map out. The following section will lay out this methodological framework and provide an overview of the analytical steps taken in this particular study.

Methodological considerations

The overarching goal of the study is to see how dominant discourses influence the formulations of social issues presented in urban policy and how in turn they pre-determine what would be considered rational courses of action. The idea is to demonstrate that policy issues are never just a matter of undisputable fact. Instead they are informed by particular narratives which always represent particular interests and don't always reflect entirely objective views. Discourse analysis is thus used "to explore certain practical questions about the operationalization of rhetorical constructions" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, p. 199). In that sense, the present study traces the

development of discourses situated under the rhetorical construct of 'breaking segregation' (Andersson, 2006).

The first methodological step in this approach is identifying the discourses that will be studied. Sharp and Richardson (2001, p.201) note that this is a "central difficulty" since it is a subjective decision that the researcher takes. They propose identifying the discourses to be studied by taking a look into discursive struggles which in line with a Foucauldian approach should be manifested in the change of both policy rhetoric and practice. In this study, the central discursive conflicts are played out around the framing of segregation which moves between re-presentations that cast it as a socio-economic and ethnic inequality issue, to perspectives emphasizing immigration as a source of the problem, or as a law-and-order subject. From that point, the "discourse framework" of this study was identified from theory and from "the broader socio-political context of the policy process" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, pp. 198, 199).

The main limitation in the focusing of my research was the fact that I did not manage to reach relevant actors familiar with policy issues that could be interviewed in the time-frame of this project, which meant that I would have to rely more on insight from theory and the empirical material at hand. This has limited the primary data to official governmental documents. The main problem with this is that documents re-present a more cleaned-up version which often omits the deliberative processes or potential discursive conflicts in the policy-making process, most of which occur away from the public eye.

To account for this lack of behind-the-doors insight into the policy-making process and still provide a more exhaustive and rounded view of recent policy changes, I tried to pay as much attention to the connections of the narrative furthered in urban policy texts with policy changes in other areas, related law changes, parliamentary motions and debates, political statements and debates, party programs, as well as online media sources which provide comment on related issues. Nonetheless, a future study would certainly benefit from interviews with key actors involved in the policy process which could provide a more in-depth view of the institutional dynamics and the minutiae of discursive struggles that take place behind closed doors. This would certainly give a more complete insight of the discursive shifts surrounding recent urban policies.

Before presenting the empirical material, I will reflect briefly on the choice to limit the research to the official discourse of the central government and leave out, at least for now, the plethora of other, potentially alternative, discourses that circulate in the media, in the civil society or come from the problematized neighbourhoods themselves. To that end, I turn to a discussion of the production and dissemination of discourses and their relation to power.

A simple claim that the central government holds the largest power and thus the monopoly over the dominant discourse is not satisfactory, particularly not from a Foucauldian governmentality perspective which maintains that power is no longer located exclusively in the hands of the central government, but is rather dispersed and exercised throughout the spectrum of social relations away from the centres where "it makes itself felt and visible" (Uitermark, 2005, p. 146). In regard to the

conception of national policies for example, Uitermark (2005) argues that the central state almost always draws upon locally produced concepts and knowledge, as the institutional actors that are active on the local level are the first to identify existing problems, well before these issues become a matter of national attention.

However, following Poulantzas (1978), Uitermark argues that "the state is central to processes of distribution" of different resources (such as discourses) across different scales and the institutional infrastructure (Uitermark, 2005, p. 150). Thus "the birth of a particular [national] policy initiative can be considered as a moment in a process where discourses are circulated, selected and reshaped" on the part of the central state (Uitermark, 2005, p. 150). Certainly, the local level always produces competing versions of reality - however, whose version of reality will be picked up in policies depends on multiple factors such as the social context, the prevailing ideology of the central actors or the possibilities for local actors to "help their discourses jump scales" depending on "their relative power position" (Uitermark, 2005, pp. 151–152).

For that reason, the present study has been limited to public, specifically national level policies, that have a clear area-based focus or an explicit urban dimension. To that end, the study is limited to policy documents that focus on breaking segregation and alleviating crime in vulnerable areas in Sweden. The analysis of the policies, as I mentioned in the introduction, entails the use of three key variables: (1) the criteria used to identify and delimit the policy's intervention areas, (2) the definition of problems aimed to be tackled and (3) the employed strategies. The final variable helps to some extent with a common problem faced by researchers adopting "Foucault's broad definition of discourse" that is "which elements of social practice are to be regarded as important in the analysis" (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, p. 201). The next section provides a brief presentation of the policies that were analysed for the study, and the secondary empirical data which has supported the insights from official policy materials.

Empirical material

The focus of this study is on what Cochrane (2007, p.2), following Edwards (1995, 1997) defines as "urban social policy", or rather urban policy which entails intervention in issues of concern to social welfare. Cochrane argues that this particular framework is what mainly distinguishes urban policy from related fields such as urban planning or housing policy. In that sense, urban social policy "can be assumed to […] mobilize a wide range of policy tools to engage with them [issues of social welfare] and to make claims to having holistic ambitions that go beyond those of particular professional areas" (ibid, p. 2).

By that definition, I have identified three particular clusters of area-based initiatives launched under urban policy in Sweden, extending in the period from the second half of the 1990s, up until 2018. The first is the Big City or Metropolitan policy (Storstadpolitik in Swedish), officially known by the Metropolitan Development Initiative (Storstadsatsningen in Swedish and henceforth the MDI) which was introduced in 1998. The MDI and the Big City policy extended until 2007, before they were replaced with the Urban Development Policy (or Urbant Utvecklingspolitik in

Swedish) which extended until 2014. The UDP was implemented in two phases: the first in the period 2008-2011 through the so-called Local Development Agreements (a framework inherited from the MDI), and the second, known as the URBAN 15 initiative, in the period from 2012 until 2015.

Finally, the Long-term Reform Program for Reduced Segregation Year 2017-2025 (henceforth just the Reform Program) was announced in 2016 under the new policy area termed *Measures Against Segregation*. It was officially institutionalized in 2017 with a plan to extend until 2025. The strategy I briefly mentioned in the beginning, officially known under the equally unwieldy title as the Government's Long-term strategy to Reduce and Counter Segregation (henceforth just the Reform Strategy), is a further development of the Reform Program introduced in March 2018, planned to run as long as 2028.

In the framework of the initiatives listed above, I analysed a number of official governmental documents including policy guidelines, parliamentary motions and debates, policy evaluations, research reports, law proposals and amendments, etc. In addition to the primary empirical material, I analysed public documents and reports that are also in some way concerned with issues relevant to urban policy and segregation but do not subscribe to the same policy field. This volume encompasses mainly studies and reports published by the Police Agency and the Swedish National Council for Crime-Prevention in relation to security and crime in vulnerable areas.

Additionally, the analysis is supported with statistical data published by SCB (Official Statistics of Sweden), particularly from the Registry data on Integration, as well as statistics on crime rates and perceived insecurity provided from the National Council for Crime-Prevention in the framework of the Regular National Security Survey (NTU).

Finally, the empirical analysis is supported with statements and commentary from political debates and speeches, party programmes and manifestos, as well as news reports commenting on governmental policies or reporting on major events that took place in vulnerable areas.

The main limitation in terms of the analysis of the empirical material of the study has been the language issue. The bulk of the empirical material used in the research is written in Swedish, which required a translation by the author, including also secondary materials such as media reports, video and online debates.

Presentation of the study

It is particularly incumbent on researchers which seek to show the contentious nature of social meanings reproduced through discourses to be attentive to the narratives that are put forward through scholarly texts such as the present. Following Foucault's argument that nobody stands outside of discourse (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002), it is necessary to acknowledge that the researcher through her role in the interpretation of the phenomena at hand is also re-producing certain established discourses. Bent Flybjerg argues that the best way to address this issue is by presenting the study through the method of "narratology", or guiding the reader through the

"streets and alleys" of the study and leave each one space to make their own conclusions, rather than presenting a synthetized view (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.7). Although I do not have the luxurious space of a book to achieve such a level of detailed account, I still take as an example his narratology in *Power & Rationality,* and try to chronicle the development of national urban policy in Sweden in the past two decades.

Chapter 2. Conceptual framework

In this chapter I will present the conceptual framework which has informed my analysis. I will start by outlining the concept of *governmentality* as put forward by Michel Foucault and situate urban policy in the heterogenous field of governmental techniques - *dispositif* - deployed with the aim to manage the multiplicities of vulnerable areas and the groups associated with them. These two particular concepts, which delimit the main conceptual framework of the study, enabled me to understand the modalities of urban phenomena problematized in national urban programmes and understand their mutations over time in relation to the dominant socio-political rationalities.

Governmentality and the dispositif

Foucault defines governmentality as "the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow the exercise of […] power that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses [dispositives] of security as its essential technical instrument" (Foucault, 2007, p.108). He defines the dispositif as a heterogenous formation made of specific "discourses, institutions, architectural structures, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific enunciations" and so on, "which in a certain historical moment had as its essential function to respond to an emergency" (Foucault in Bussolini, 2010, p.91).

The critical element to governmentality is thus, according to Foucault (1991, p.95), "not of imposing law on men, but of disposing things, of employing tactics rather than laws, or even of using laws themselves as tactics". Its operative function is to *dispose* rather than *impose*. In this sense, Foucault (2010, p.91) notes, "the dispositif has an eminently strategic function". What he means by that is that a dispositif does not just represent a crowd of unrelated policies, laws, discourses, structures and all the other elements listed in the definition above, but the relationships between these elements in regard to a common goal, or an emergency. This is why, Deleuze adds, "the philosophy of Foucault often appears as the analysis of concrete 'dispositives'" (Deleuze in Bussolini, 2010, p. 100).

Following this, I want to emphasize that the importance of the concept of the 'dispositif' for the present study is twofold for it has both an analytical and a localizing function. By this I mean it helps situate urban policy and its specific historic formulations in the heterogenous field of administrative measures and enunciations in relation to a particular historic event of emergency.

However, I have to stress that this is not a study of the 'dispositif of urban policy', nor do I try to make the claim that such a thing exists. As I already mentioned, urban policy is merely a part of a larger apparatus which embodies the variety of elements which Foucault listed, all interacting in a single diagram with a specific purpose. Bigo (2008, p.33) argues, "[t]hese relations are formed by the dispositif that cross between institutions and are not reducible to the logics of these institutions". To demonstrate his claim, he points to the misguided criticisms of Foucault's theory on the dispositif of the *prison* for which he uses the concept of the panopticon (a special type of an institutional surveillance facility imagined by 18th century philosopher Jeremy Bentham) in order to demonstrate the paradigm of governmental control and disciplinary practices. Bigo (2008, p.34) argues that Foucault's critics often missed the main point of his theory by looking at the dispositif as a logic limited to the enclosed punitive space of the prison. Instead, he maintains, what needs to be recognized is that the prison is just a concentration of the various "mechanisms of surveillance and control" that are otherwise "scattered throughout society".

The parallel between Foucault's theory and urban policy lies in the fact that urban policy's intervention geography, much like Bentham's surveillance architecture in the 'dispositif of the prison', becomes the spatial concentration of the various mechanisms and workings of a particular dispositif which has a specific role. This means that urban policy's intervention geography only streamlines the effects of various mechanisms that converge in relegated neighborhoods, making visible the effects of dispositif otherwise "scattered throughout society". Physical planning, housing policies, integration policies, welfare policies, the national immigration regime (regulation of labor migration, refugee reception policies, settlement of asylum seekers) and the regime of the EU (the Schengen zone) - they are all part of the diagram that manages life "across the concrete material conditions that they put in place" (Bigo, 2008, p.22).

It becomes clear that one element can, and often is, linked to different apparatuses at the same time (Bussolini, 2010). I mentioned in the introduction that urban policy has recently become aligned with aims and issues traditionally pertinent to the fields of crime-prevention and security, which wasn't always the case. The term alignment here is essential as it points to the dynamic structure of the dispositif in Foucault's use of the term. I will borrow Deleuze's interpretation, who describes the dispositif as

> a multilinear ensemble […] composed of lines, each having a different nature. And the lines in the apparatus [dispositif] do not outline or surround systems which are each homogenous in their own right, object, subject, language and so on, but follow directions, trace balances which are always out of balance, now drawing together and then distancing themselves from one another. Each line is broken and subject to changes in direction, bifurcating and forked, and subject to drifting. (Deleuze, 1992, p.159)

Following Deleuze's definition, one can understand how the changes in the perception of particular issues, aims and ends at certain historic junctures - reflected not least in the shifting directions of policy vectors - can place seemingly self-enclosed and homogenous fields - such as welfare, immigration or crime policy - on the same continuum. This means that urban policy can be

redefined, fitted and mobilized to respond to different and sometimes multiple strategic functions at the same time, once leaning more toward welfare issues, other times more toward the regulation of immigration, or toward the prevention of crime. Identifying these strategic functions is, I would argue, a valuable analytical tool that can help make sense of the problematizations raised by urban policies across time and space, as well as why were particular strategies put forward to alleviate them. The analysis of discourses in which these practices are embedded is I would argue one way to identify these strategic functions.

The paradigm of security

I will briefly return to the definition of governmentality presented above, where Foucault introduces the concept of the 'security dispositif' which he maintains is the basic principle of governmentality exercised in the modern state. Security in his use of the term is not limited only to safety threats related to wars or a state of siege, but rather to all sorts of variables related to a population - disease, crime and delinquency, circulation of people and goods, natural disasters and so on. A security dispositif is thus, as he notes in his definition, concerned primarily with manipulating the given multiplicities of a particular population in regard to previously calculated risks (Foucault, 2007, pp.32–38).

What Foucault is trying to emphasize with the paradigm of security is the impetus of modern governments to govern populations by formulating risks and calculating costs in relation to potentially disruptive events or crises, in order to be able to intervene and steer them in a desired direction. He argues that the goal of governmentality in that sense is not to realize some utopian vision of a perfect society that will exist somewhere in the future, but to aim toward an equilibrium determined in relation to a set of given multiplicities, convenient ends and social and economic costs. Foucault (2007, p. 35,36) argues that modern governments have long ago let go of the notion that all crises can be prevented or that all negative elements can be completely excluded from the equation, which is why, he maintains, governmentality is concerned mainly with the calculation of probabilities:

> it is simply a matter of maximizing the positive elements and of minimizing what is risky and inconvenient, like theft and disease, while knowing that they will never be completely suppressed. [W]ork […] on quantities that can be relatively, but never wholly reduced, and, since they can never be nullified, one works on probabilities.

In a similar vein, Agamben argues that the main objective of modern governments is not to prevent a crisis or a disaster from happening, but allowing it to happen, or even help if necessary, in order to be able to intervene in it and effectively restore security:

> "we must understand that nowadays government aims not to maintain order, but to manage disorder. And disorder is always there, we see it: crisis, unrest, emergencies, state of necessity … they're evoked all the time." (Agamben, 2013, min. 8:45)

This is particularly valuable for understanding the impetus of modern governments, including that of Swedish administrations, to think in terms of de-stabilizing events, identifying dangerous

groups, threats, or any sort of disruptive elements such as terrorism, violent crime or urban unrest - many of which often converge in poor neighborhoods. This is also the reason why the essential mechanisms of governmentality include practices of population sorting and surveillance of groups deemed risky (Bigo, 2008).

Following Foucault's and Agamben's (2002, p. 14) views on the "paradigm of security", one could argue that urban social policy, as far as it starts its definitions from the containment of security issues (minimizing the risks and inconveniences of concentrated urban poverty), can be considered an instrument for the control and management of disorder. Urban policy in Sweden for example, seems to internalize this security-driven approach by combining elements of population sorting (defining socioeconomically vulnerable groups and the areas where they concentrate) linked with narratives of de-stabilizing scenarios always related to vulnerable groups and the negative effects arising from their urban relegation - commonly grounded in discourses centred on poverty, ethnicity and crime.

Bigo (2002) argues that one of the most prominent contemporary examples of such "pro-active governmentality" which rests on a paradigm of security is the trans-national control of immigration. He maintains that "[f]ifteen years of intensive rhetoric have created the belief that poverty, crime and mobile populations are inextricably linked" and have in turn facilitated restrictive immigration regimes and policies that limit the movement of entire populations, even though we know that "the correlation between crime, foreignness and poverty is altogether false" (2008, p.16). Bigo argues that in turn this narrative underlines the "securitization of immigration" which seeks to limit the mobility of poor minorities and certain populations that are considered to be undesirable or risky (Bigo, 2002). The techniques and mechanisms that converge toward the control of the movement of particular populations are in turn enabled by the use of normative imperatives which seek to "normalize the non-excluded": "the most important of which is free movement" or the "imperative of mobility" (Bigo, 2008, p.35). He calls this diagram of control and surveillance techniques the ban-opticon dispositif (Bigo, 2008).

Bigo (2008, p.39) argues that institutions engaging in this sort of "pro-active governmentality" often tend to exaggerate the likeliness of certain threats or the negative consequences of particular phenomena, while seeking to both "reassure good citizens" and "deter the others". He calls this the 'management of unease' (Bigo, 2008) - a type of "political technology" which capitalizes on collective anxieties "not by reassuring but by worrying individuals about what is happening both at the external and internal levels" (Bigo, 2002, p. 81). He notes that this state of 'unease' is particularly alive with groups "who feel discarded" from society or "cannot cope with the uncertainty of everyday life", which he finds to be a ubiquitous feeling in the "risk society" of the neoliberal project (Bigo, 2002, p. 65).

I would argue that Bigo's discussion is particularly relevant in the context of urban policies concerned with ethnic polarization, as is the case with Sweden. Thus, I wish to round off this theoretical framework with a new section where I will outline his views on the trans-

nationalization of (in)security, the purpose of the ban-opticon dispositif and most importantly its relation to ethnically segregated neighbourhoods (Bigo, 2008).

The ban-opticon dispositif

Bigo (2008, p.15) grounds the concept of the ban-opticon dispositif in the so-called "policing at a distance" enabled by the move of border controls from the national to the borders of the EU and beyond, which drew forth a scaling up of the field of internal security to the EU level. He (2008, p.17) argues that in its traces, internal and external security have become enmeshed, setting the ground for "widely disparate phenomena such as […] the fight on terrorism, drugs, organized crime, cross-border criminality, illegal immigration" to be placed "on the same continuum".

In turn, security activities - traditionally related to crime and terrorism - have also moved beyond their limits of policing over to the regulation of immigration. Bigo maintains that we owe this shift to the discourse which has successfully related migrants, poverty and crime into a single genealogy. He argues that this has in turn provided the opportunity, for security professionals and politicians alike, not only to control international migration but also "any citizen who does not correspond to the *a priori* social image that one holds of his national identity" (Bigo, 2008, p.17, emphasis in original). This has legitimated the surveillance of urban populations living in certain "zones labelled at risk" (Bigo, 2008, p.17), such as socioeconomically challenged and ethnically segregated neighborhoods.

For Bigo (2008, p. 35) this surveillance paradigm anchored in the body of the migrant and aiming to restrict the movement of potentially risky groups, is the present-day variant of Foucault's panopticon - a disciplinary surveillance of the entire population, the Pan. Bigo (2008, p.34) maintains however that if Foucault's panoptic paradigm exists, there is no "centralized manifestation" of it "transposed on a global level", but rather a heterogenous diagram of mechanisms, practices, institutions and discourses that converge toward the surveillance of "trans-border movements of individuals". In that sense, for Bigo the ban-opticon dispositif is a kind of transversal apparatus which cuts across different scales, borders, national and international institutions, with the aim to modulate the flows of cross-national migration:

> This dispositif is no longer the panopticon described by Bentham. It is a Ban-opticon. It depends no longer on immobilizing bodies under the analytic gaze of the watcher but on profiles that signify differences, on exceptionalism with respect to norms and on the rapidity with which one "evacuates". (Bigo, 2008, p.44)

While Bigo remains mostly concerned with the networks of (in)security professionals (police, military, intelligence services) implicated in a "management of unease" on a trans-national level, my focus remains within the limits of the nation in relegated urban areas where national and EU borders are transposed in the centre of the state through the surveillance and policing of minority groups deemed risky or dangerous. The extension of this security apparatus to ethnically segregated areas lends relevance to the concept of the ban-opticon dispositif for the present study. This is especially so in view of the recent urban policy shifts relying on an implied connection of

groups of minorities to public disorder and organized crime, which come on top of a series of restrictions in Sweden's immigration regime after the 2015 refugee crisis, alongside a row of policies regulating the internal movement and housing conditions of asylum-seekers. I would argue thus that Bigo's theory provides a valuable perspective for analysing the rationalities and modalities of urban policies that seek to break ethnic segregation (Bigo, 2008).

Part II

Chapter 1. The emergence of socioeconomic inequality and segregation in Sweden

> In the metropolitan areas live the richest people in Sweden. But here live also the poorest (Prop. 1997/98:165, p. 8).

The emergence of the issue of social exclusion and urban segregation on the policy agenda in Sweden is to some extent influenced by international narratives, particularly of EU policies. Area-based initiatives in Sweden have in fact proliferated after 1995 since Sweden became a member-state of the EU. The increasing space given to (urban) social exclusion in EU policy in the beginning of the 1990's was in turn, as Atkinson (2000) notes, the response to the deepening urban deprivation in EU states caused by the economic restructuring to which Sweden was not immune either. Atkinson (2000) argues that urban policies were becoming the cheaper alternative to expensive social protection systems which, as Andersson (2006) has also noted for Sweden, became unsustainable under EU's economic growth regime.

However, the moral panic over the increasingly deteriorating living situation in some parts of the metropolitan areas of Sweden has become particularly pronounced in the 1990's when rising socio-economic disparities began to appropriate an increasingly ethnic distribution. The period of high economic stagnation in the first half of the decade - characterised by a sharp rise in unemployment rates reaching from 1.6% in 1990 to 8.2% in 1993, was followed by an economic boom marked with rising employment rates which hardly made a dent in the unemployed immigrant population (SOU 1997:118). The disparities in unemployment between the native and immigrant population grew from 2.8% for natives versus 5.2% for foreigners in 1985, to 8.1% versus 22.4% in 1996 (SOU 1997: 118). Additionally, while the three largest cities collectively accounted for over 41% of the national GDP, their poorest areas remained severely below the country's average, despite the large economic expansion.

Some researchers that have studied socio-economic inequality in Sweden, argue that there are multiple factors that have contributed to the rising gaps. Gustavsson (2006) argues that rising wage disparities (in both the lower and upper half of the wage distribution) fuelled the increase of inequality during the 1990, while Andersson et.al. (2010) argue it is capital gains among the top income groups, coupled with "increasing returns to educational investments" (Gustavsson, 2006).

The government on the other hand maintained that the rising inequality was generally the result of bigger structural changes, mainly related to the economic restructuring following massive deindustrialization, which saw large numbers of workers being released from production and rendered economically unnecessary (Prop. 1997/98:165). Under these conditions, those with lower education levels and the weakest connection to the labour market or society in general found themselves most affected. For people of foreign background, this would come on top of the already existing challenges related to the ethnic discrimination in the labour and housing markets (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.24). A study on segregation patterns done before urban policy was first introduced, showed that foreign-born citizens' income status was highly dependent on their country of origin: in 1994, among non-Swedish speaking immigrants, the proportion of employed persons in the working age stood at 36%, compared with 62% for immigrants from the Nordic countries and 72% for native Swedes (SOU, 1997: 118, p.21).

As inequality progressed, the developments became particularly visible in the spatial concentration of low-income and predominantly immigrant population in "the least attractive" neighbourhoods in the metropolitan areas (SOU, 1997:118, p.3). The fact that socio-economic inequalities came to be manifested in a particular urban segregation pattern, was on the other hand influenced by a host of institutional factors related mainly to housing and immigration policies.

Between 1965 and 1975, the government subsidized the construction of one million homes in response to a housing shortage, an initiative which was in itself introduced in order to modernize Sweden's housing stock and improve the living conditions for the working class population living in overcrowded substandard housing. However, the well planned and spacious apartment blocks had a significant lack of amenities and very limited tenure choices which consequently made them the least attractive segment of the housing stock. The so-called Million Housing suburbs came to be related quite early on with the concentration of low-income groups, as an out-migration of middle-class residents left the predominantly public housing neighbourhoods in the outskirts the fastest entry point for poorer residents into the urban housing markets.

An equally important factor that has contributed to the formation of socio-spatial inequalities both within and among cities is, according to Scarpa (2016), the immigration policy regime which affected both the composition of immigration and the relative position of immigrants in the labour market. From the 1960's and onwards, as a result of the rationalization of the economy in Sweden, labour migrants mainly found jobs in the expanding service sector, which fuelled the migration of mainly unskilled or low-skilled workers to the country (Bevelander, 2010). Additionally, a cross-border immigration policy change in 1968 concerning the tightening of work-related migration to Sweden for immigrants from non-Nordic countries, changed the immigration patterns which from the early 1970s came to be dominated mainly by refugees (Bevelander, 2010). This has ultimately contributed to the rise of inequality between the native and foreign-born population, which was in effect reflected in their choice of housing types and location. As the economy entered into recession at the end of the 1980s, the newly-arrived migrants – predominantly refugees - would be

pushed more and more toward the less attractive public housing suburbs of the big cities where chances to enter the labour market were better.

The first anti-segregation efforts

The prevailing viewpoint among researchers and policymakers in Sweden concerning segregation is that residing in socio-economically vulnerable neighborhoods affects negatively low-income and immigrant groups' chances for successful integration into society (Scarpa, 2015). Moreover, "residential segregation is believed to reinforce (or even be an independent cause of) income inequality in cities" (Scarpa, 2015; p.8). For that reason, efforts for breaking segregation and circumventing negative neighbourhood effects have in fact been present on the policy agenda ever since the early 1970s. Before the first urban policy was introduced in the 1990s, Andersson et al. (2010, p.237) argue there existed two other types of anti-segregation initiatives employed previously: the so-called housing and social mix policy and the refugee dispersal policy.

The first was introduced mainly in response to the rising criticism aimed at the recently built Million Program housing areas which became segregated quite early on as a result of their rather homogenous tenure structure. However, Anderson et al. (2010) argue that the results of the policy were rather limited largely due to the limited tenure restructuring pursued (primarily tenant-driven rental-to-homeownership conversion in higher income areas where residents could afford it) as well as the slump in new constructions toward the 1990s.

The refugee dispersal policy launched in 1985 was introduced with the aim to deflect newly-arrived refugees away from already immigrant-dense areas in larger cities (Andersson et al., 2010; Scarpa, 2016). This policy was also rather ineffective, mainly because of the fact that small towns with smaller and less variated job markets where refugees were settled failed to keep them from moving back to the metropolitan areas in search of employment (Andersson et al., 2010). Finally the policy was relaxed in 1994 and refugees were given more freedom in choosing their own accommodation and place of residence (Scarpa, 2016).

The past two decades on the other hand have been dominated by area-based initiatives which focused less on physical measures and redistribution of populations, and more on the groups settled in the socio-economically vulnerable residential areas. This was reflected in the conception of the first national urban policy in Sweden in 1998, which I will turn to in more detail in the following chapters.

Chapter 2. The inception of Urban Policy

> What is commonly referred to as immigrant problems, therefore, is rather a social problem. By this we mean the poorer standard of immigrant-dense areas with incipient slumification, very high unemployment and cuts that hit hardest against the already weak groups. (Expressen, 1994)

When compared to the current urgency surrounding the introduction of the Reform Strategy in vulnerable areas, it seems like the images associated with disadvantaged neighborhoods in the 1990's when urban policy was first conceived - did not differ all that much from the images invoked today. Immigrants, public housing, high unemployment, social assistance dependency, youth delinquency, crime and gangs were the most prominent signifiers of the areas which were back then referred to as immigrant-dense, the least attractive, the concrete suburbs, the problem areas and sometimes even as the ghettos. As the quotation above demonstrate, the problem of these areas was generally considered to fall back on the shoulders of the poor integration of immigrants.

On top of the severe economic recession and soaring unemployment that hit Sweden in the beginning of the decade, the increasing number of refugees coming at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s - culminating in 1992[2] - contributed to the panic surrounding the situation in so-called immigrant-dense vulnerable areas. Local governments in immigrant-represented districts became particularly anxious over the reception and settlement of refugees, mostly in fear of rising costs for social benefits, the thinning of their tax bases and the already high concentrations of vulnerable groups and foreign-born as compared to other districts (Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå, 1994). Some municipalities even opposed receiving any more refugees or allowing immigrants to settle in already immigrant-dense areas. For example, in 1994, the head of the municipal council in Botkyrka - a municipality south of Stockholm with over 40% foreign-background population, suggested a special law which would prohibit immigrants from moving to those areas that were already immigrant-dense:

> In some residential areas, the concentration reaches up to 80 percent. There is high unemployment and crime among immigrants - and social security costs are likely to soar. Currently it is not possible to prevent people from settling where they want, which is why we need an exemption from that law. Botkyrka needs to avoid taking in more refugees and also has the right to deny immigrants to settle in immigrant areas. (Dagens Nyheter, 1994)

Local administrations were not the only ones pushing for more restrictive policies. As Martens (1997) notes, the right-wing populist party New Democracy (Ny Democrati - NyD), which was formed and entered Parliament in 1991, actively pushed for both "a more restrictive immigration policy" and a tougher stance on law and order as regards the population in the country with foreign background (Martens, 1997, p.185). Martens recalls also that increasing crime rates amongst

---

[2]According to SCB's official statistics, the first spike of asylum seekers was in 1989 with 30 335 applications for asylum received until the end of the year. These numbers remained somewhat stable in the next few years until 1992 which saw a record of 84 018 asylum applications (www.scb.se).

foreign-born were often cited in official statistics, until in 1994 a new law was introduced that "made it easier to expel foreign citizens convicted of an offense" even if and when the offense was "relatively minor" (ibid, p.185). Likewise, Boréus (2006, p.91) notes that media coverage of refugee issues and those considered "immigrants" was particularly negative during the early 1990s, not least dominated by reports on crimes committed by foreign-born citizens.

As the number of asylum seekers decreased by 1993 and the economy started to recover, the public debate took a shift toward the unemployment issue mainly among Swedish citizens with foreign background, particularly those living in disadvantaged areas. As employment rates grew for the native-born, the unemployment among immigrants remained at a record low. Following the heated debates over failed integration, the government set up a new committee under the name Immigration and Refugee Committee (IFK) in 1993, with the task to evaluate the current immigration policy. As noted in a later review of integration policy from 2006, the IFK did not do much to divert from the racist language that was used in relation to immigrants in public debates at the time (SOU 2006:79, p.13). The report notes that the IFK maintained that immigrants' welfare dependency was a major cause of unemployment among people with foreign backgrounds and moreover that the unemployment of immigrants depended on themselves and their shortcomings (SOU 2006:79, p.13). Finally, the IFK argued that in order to facilitate their integration the government would have exercise greater control and impose certain demands on them (SOU 2006:79, p.13).

Finally, in 1994, in what seems as a particularly sensitive time for immigrants in Sweden, the government estimated that there was an urgent need to initiate actions that would help break the housing segregation in a limited number of immigrant-dense neighbourhoods (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.71). The government's investment officially titled *Special efforts in vulnerable residential areas* - known also as the Blomman Initiative, covered twelve neighbourhoods in eight municipalities (Integrationsverket, 2000) chosen by their high unemployment rates, high social assistance dependency and a higher concentration of immigrant population (see Table 1). According to a policy document released two years later, the final choice was made on the basis of the areas' immigrant-concentration (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.73). The starting point, as noted in the evaluation report by the Ministry of Integration (Integrationsverket, 2000), was to tackle the ethnic and housing segregation by helping unemployed non-Swedish citizens to enter the labour market:

> The already high concentration of immigrants in certain residential areas in metropolitan regions has increased even more by the recent refugee and family immigration. In the big cities, employment for immigrants has developed more negatively than in the rest of the country. The social assistance dependency of non-Swedish citizens is very high […] and social security contributions have increased drastically. […] Against this background, the Government proposes that SEK 125 million are allocated for specific operations in immigrant-dense urban areas. The purpose of the efforts should be to strengthen the skills and increase the labor participation among residents in these areas and to contribute specifically to good social development and prevent exclusion. (Prop. 1997/95:100, p. 138-139)

In 1998, the government introduced a similar initiative, the so-called National Examples, which was in part a continuation and deepening of the Blomman, with a special focus only on four districts. The official aim was to promote integration by increasing the safety and attractiveness of vulnerable areas. Both strategies thus marked a shift from previous anti-segregation efforts by targeting primarily socioeconomic factors or rather by focusing on the groups and individuals that live in disadvantaged areas, rather than on the areas themselves[3].

Concerns related to immigrants and their integration in Swedish society at the time were not limited to the Blomman and the National Examples. Between 1991 and 1995 the government implemented the so-called PLUS-project, an effort distributed in twelve immigrant-dense neighbourhoods aimed to develop a model for preventative social work for youths at risk in vulnerable areas (Kassman, 2002). In 1996 the government also introduced the first national crime-prevention policy in which, amongst other things, it particularly emphasized the importance of social crime-prevention in immigrant-dense segregated areas that were regarded as having a 'springboard effect' on crime and other social issues (Justitiedeprtamentet, 1996). According to the policy proposal, the Million Programme housing areas where people usually have poorer opportunities to experience the welfare society's various benefits, were more prone to high rates of criminality. The policy urged for an expansion of crime-prevention outside of criminal law through the return of informal control in society, believed to be lost with increased urbanization and, not least, the high immigration to the country which has changed the population's composition (Justitiedeprtamentet, 1996). The bill referred both to the Blomman- and the PLUS-projects as two positive examples of such social crime-prevention work. Additionally, alongside the proliferating initiatives conceived on a national level there was also an increasing number of local strategies initiated by municipalities, as well as a number of EU projects aimed at socioeconomically disadvantaged areas [4].

What this somewhat provisory genealogy of urban policy's predecessors reveals is the inception and gradual development of the dispositif of which urban policy is part and parcel today. A dispositif put in place in response to concentrated urban poverty, the growing inequalities between urban residential neighbourhoods, between native and foreign born, but also in relation to the concerns over immigrant concentration, failed integration and in its traces increased social and economic costs. The importance of these early area-based projects for the present study lies not only in the fact that many of the objectives visited in the Blomman initiative, the National Examples or the first crime-prevention policy would find their anchor in the first national urban policy, but in the fact that they reveal the particular 'emergency' in relation to which urban policy was conceived in the first place.

---

[3] The condition of the Million Housing stock and the need for renovations are discussed routinely in regard to housing segregation efforts, but concrete actions have taken place mainly outside of urban policy. Physical measures under urban policy objectives have been used only sporadically and always as secondary to socioeconomic objectives.

[4] For example, the URBAN-programme, which was an EU project, was administered in five vulnerable, immigrant-dense neighborhoods in Malmö from 1997-2001. The goal were geographically delimited areas marked with serious social issues such as high unemployment, bad health conditions and high dependence on social benefits (Stigendal, 2012, pp.14-16).

Table 1. Statistical data for the areas included in the Blomman efforts and the National Examples[5] (for the year 1998).

Munici-pality	Neighbourhoods under Blomman Initiative (1995-99)	Nationella Exempel (1998-99)	Foreign-born (%)	Unemployed (%)	Social assistance dependency (%)
Huddinge	Vårby		42.7	9.9	24.9
	Flemingsberg		42.7	9.3	20.5
Botkyrka	Alby		52.2	13.4	24.3
	Fittja	Fittja	60.1	12.4	29.7
	Hallunda-Norsborg		45.9	9.8	18.8
Hanninge	Jordbro		38.8	12.5	28.8
Stockholm	Rågsved		33.6	10.7	29.4
	Rinkeby		60.0	13.7	46.1
	Tensta		56.4	15.2	40.7
	Husby		54.5	17.4	36.1
Södertälje	Ronna		49.6	15.1	30.1
	Geneta		33.8	13.7	21.2
	Hovsjö		48.4	13.5	23.0
Solna	Blåkulla		38.3	8.7	13.4
Malmö	Hyllie		35.4	16.0	29.9
	Rosengård	Rosengård	62.1	19.3	64.2
Göteborg	Gunnared	Gårdsten[5]	40.7	16.0	30.4
	Lärjedalen	Hjällbo[5]	43.3	15.3	34.7
	Kortedala		26.4	12.7	20.2
	Bergsjön		45.9	17.8	40.0

Source: Integrationsverket (2000).

The following chapter outlines the institutionalization of the first national urban policy, its official framework, objectives and guidelines, as well as its similarities and divergences from the first area-based initiatives.

The Big City policy and the Metropolitan Development Initiative

While the Blomman investment was still in full force in immigrant-dense areas, immigration policy was replaced with integration policy in 1997, following the IFK's assessment that targeting immigrants as a separate group opposite Swedes is a discriminatory practice that had negative consequences for integration and social cohesion. This would since be justified only for newly-arrived immigrants in the first years of their stay in Sweden which were considered most critical

---

[5] Gunnared and Lärjedalen represent separate council districts that were merged with Angered district in 2010. Until 2010, Gårdsten and Hjällbo (with 9 other areas) were under the administration of Gunnared and Lärjedalen, respectively (www.statistik.goteborg.se).

to their integration process (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.49). This was in turn a shift of paramount importance for urban policy since it affected the formulation of issues in vulnerable urban areas.

The so-called Big City policy, the first urban policy conceived on a national level, was developed in the same year when integration replaced immigration policy. In line with the IFK's assessment, residential segregation in the Big City policy was identified as being primarily a class issue driven by socioeconomic disparities that fell largely along ethnic lines (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.1). The term "invandrartätta" (immigrant-dense) was dropped from use when referring to vulnerable neighborhoods which were hitherto described as socioeconomically disadvantaged areas that are also ethnically segregated. This was particularly emphasized in the proposal bill for the Integration Policy, where it was specifically noted that the main focus of all future government support for vulnerable areas should be to facilitate the transition to efforts characterized by an overall view of increased labor participation: "the government believes that this is one more reason to talk about specific interventions in vulnerable neighborhoods rather than as until now on specific efforts in immigrant-dense areas" (Prop.1997/98:16, p. 72). By the same token, urban policy commanded a broad approach to tackling segregation that went beyond the narrow framework of previous efforts which focused solely on the integration of immigrants into the labor market. Instead, its focus would be on the so-called "outsiders' class", including a broad definition of vulnerable groups united in their long-term exclusion from employment:

> In simplicity, one could say that it is the question of two classes, on the one hand an outsider class and, on the other hand, all the others (whose common denominator is that they are established in the labor market) that constitute the core of welfare. Here, above all, young people, immigrants, single mothers, workers on long-term sick leave and people with social problems as well as those that depend on social contributions are overrepresented. (Prop. 1997/98:165, p.70)

The Big City policy had thus two overarching goals: fostering economic growth and breaking socioeconomic and ethnic segregation in the three metropolitan areas (Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmo). The first objective sought to provide an unfettered economic growth and increase the number of jobs, while the second objective had its focus on growing social and economic gaps which were seen as a weight to the cities' economic expansion. Only the second objective had an area-based framework and focused on disadvantaged neighborhoods. This goal was further broken down to several areas that guided the policy's implementation, with a priority on increasing employment rates, reducing benefit dependency and improving education levels, followed by raising the attractiveness and safety of vulnerable areas, improving health and increasing democratic participation (Prop. 1997/98:165). According to Andersson (2006), in the implementation phase the second objective received considerably more space in terms of concrete efforts, funding and media exposure.

The objectives set in the Big City policy were implemented with the so-called Metropolitan Development Initiative (MDI) which replaced the Blomman efforts and the National Examples in vulnerable areas in 1999. The shift in the approach to segregation outlined above, would somewhat

affect the choice and delimitation of the MDI's intervention geography, or at least the starting point in its definition of vulnerability. The delimitation of target areas started by categorizing all districts in the three cities according to their median income in eight income groups, ranging from extremely high-, to very low- and extremely low income- (SOU 1997: 118). The top two groups were found to be the most homogenous with regard to their residents' financial situation (with almost no low-income population), while the situation was reversed in the two bottom groups. Also, there was an increasing equalization between the top six groups with a positive growth in the period between 1985 and 1994, while the two bottom groups showed practically no social mobility (SOU 1997: 118). Thus, it was decided that the policy should focus only on the "very low income" and "extremely low income" areas (referred to hitherto as *vulnerable areas*) and exclude "all other areas" out of the policy's focus (SOU 1997: 118, p. 28).However, out of 49 areas with extremely and very low income that were marked as vulnerable (SOU 1997: 118, pp. 89-101), the MDI would focus only on 24 neighborhoods. The final choice was made on the basis of several other factors that coincided with the low-income levels: the share of social assistance recipients, the average education levels and the proportion of citizens with foreign-background (see Table 2). The final list included all twelve "immigrant-dense" areas that were initially covered with the Blomman initiative.

Table 2. Characteristics of socioeconomically vulnerable areas included under MDI, compared to the municipal and national average

	Vulnerable areas		Municipalities with vulnerable areas		National average	
Year	1998	2006	1998	2006	1998	2006
Unemployment Rate (%)	18.9	14.1	11.2	15.4	19.1	14.3
Employment Rate (%)	47.2	51.6	70.1	72.3	73.3	76.7
Share of individuals on social benefits (%)	8.4	5.4	1.8	1.4	1.0	0.8
High school Eligibility (%)	71.3	70.4	86.4	86.9	91.5	89.6
Population with foreign background (%)	35.7	44.9	9.7	12.3	3.4	4.4

Source: SCB[6]

It seems thus that despite the shift in the definition of vulnerability, the Big city policy kept the integration perspective it inherited from previous initiatives. By that token, the Ministry of Integration received a special assignment from the government to report data specifically on the development in vulnerable areas covered with the MDI. Moreover, in a report published in 1999, the crime-prevention committee - which was formed to implement the objectives of the crime-

---

[6] Statistik om Integration, available at https://www.scb.se, (accessed 01.08.2018).

prevention policy introduced in 1996, emphasized that crime-prevention efforts should be prioritized in vulnerable areas and moreover that "an important thought behind these efforts is to benefit the integration policy goals" (SOU 1999:61, p. 63).

This outlook on the role of urban policy in relation to integration issues, would help to tip the scale in the following policy that replaced the Big city framework in 2007. The so-called Urban Development policy (UDP) will not only divert from the general class-issue approach to urban segregation commanded by its predecessor, but it will bring urban policy back to immigrant-dense areas without changing a single neighbourhood on the list. The following chapter will demonstrate how UDP related socioeconomic issues with integration in vulnerable areas to begin with, but moreover how it eventually brought urban policy closer to crime policy in response to rebelling youth and the spread of organized crime in immigrant suburbs.

Chapter 3. Urban Development Policy

Following a shift to a centre-right government for the first time since 1994, urban policy would enter a new phase in 2007 and see its main goal of breaking segregation re-aligned mainly from an integration perspective. Urban policy would in fact cease to exist as a separate policy area at this point and be placed under the objectives of a reformulated integration policy, alongside questions concerning "newly-arrived immigrants' establishment in society, compensation to municipalities for refugee reception, the promotion of integration and Swedish nationality" (Prop.2008/09:1). Needless to say, the revised urban policy, or what has remained of it, would be primarily oriented toward the ethnic dimension of urban inequality.

Consequently, the Big city policy would be replaced with the so-called Urban Development policy (UDP) and its goal of breaking segregation with the aim to have (1) fewer individuals in exclusion in districts characterized by exclusion, and (2) fewer districts characterized by exclusion (Skr. 2008/09:24). Although there is no clear definition of 'exclusion' (utanförskap) provided in the new proposal bill - as Scarpa (2015, p.1) notes - the term was used as a "shorthand in Swedish political debates, replacing the term "segregation" and indicating the spatial overlapping of areas of immigrant concentration and areas with problems of poverty, long-term unemployment, and welfare dependency". In reality, an 'area characterized by exclusion' was essentially just a different name used to describe the same type of socioeconomically vulnerable areas treated with the MDI. UDP would keep the same list of vulnerable areas included with the previous efforts, and add 14 new neighbourhoods to it located outside the metropolitan areas.

The intervention spaces of urban policy had thus clearly remained the same; what changed was the approach to the issue of segregation, or rather how it was formulated. The integration policy under which UDP was introduced focused principally on the integration of immigrants, or as Grander and Stigendal (2012) would argue, on the relationship between immigrants and non-immigrants. This was reflected in the UDP, whose underlying premise was that high rates of

immigration, coupled with high residential mobility in vulnerable neighbourhoods, was the single most important factor that influenced the situation in the areas negatively (Skr.2009/10:233, p.79). Similarly, in a governmental report on integration policy published in 2009, it was asserted that segregation is mainly the effect of a strong out-migration of Swedes from immigrant-dense suburbs, followed by an in-migration of foreign-born mainly from non-European countries:

> Country of origin is the single most important factor in explaining the degree of segregation. People with higher education and a stronger position in the labor market often have fewer immigrants in their environment. (Skr.2009/10:233, p.79)

The increase of asylum-seekers and the high rate of family-related immigration in the period 2006-2008, as well as the concentration of newly-arrived immigrants in socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods, were underlined as one of the reasons as to why segregation remained stable in the second half of the 2000s (Skr.2009/10:233). The high occupancy of newly arrived immigrants coupled with a high relocation of people who had a job was underlined as the main factor that kept vulnerable areas poor even in times of good economic activity. Therefore, the main focus of urban policy's efforts was placed on the integration of newly-arrived immigrants into the labour market.

Since segregation was considered to be primarily the effect of weak integration, the debate over class issues and the more general approach to socioeconomic inequalities introduced with the MDI became a secondary concern. Socioeconomically vulnerable areas became once more a term which was typically mobilized in relation to immigration and integration issues, and by the same token, groups of immigrant background were the common association with the social problems arising in vulnerable areas as an effect of segregation.

Speaking of social problems, growing insecurity and crime rates in vulnerable areas - regarded to be direct effects of housing segregation, have started to receive considerably more space under UDP, especially after 2011. It was underlined that increasing security, alongside labour market participation and education, is a priority issue for breaking segregation. Most of the concerns in relation to security as an effect of urban exclusion were developed in a separate publication by the National Crime Prevention Council, which was published in the same year as UDP (Brå 2008:16). The primary aim of the council's report, *Insecurity and Segregation*, was to combine the policy objectives of crime and urban policy with respect to tackling exclusion. In a similar vein, in the 2008 budget proposal for crime policy, segregation, unemployment and exclusion were emphasized as the underlying causes of criminality, especially among the younger population, which is why it was established that it is of utmost importance to "break the exclusion" in vulnerable areas (Prop. 2007/08:1, p. 17). Likewise, integration policy warned of the potentially negative effects for children growing up in resource-poor neighbourhoods with widespread exclusion where successful role-models and positive values were absent due to the high unemployment and concentration of social problems:

If an individual cannot expect any major return on education, work or other type of skill development, it may also be more tempting to instead focus on social community with others in similar situations. Thereby tensions arise between investing in human capital and building social capital. Certain mechanisms can increasingly affect individuals in vulnerable minority groups, and in the long run they risk being expressed in the form of, inter alia, resignation, self-chosen isolation from society, gang crime, "beneficiary mentality" and possible political radicalization. (Skr. 2008/09:24, p.16)

In line with these concerns, the government commissioned the Crime Prevention Council and the National Police Board to participate in local development work[7] in urban policy's intervention areas, alongside the Labor Market agency and the Social Insurance agency. Additionally, in both integration and crime policy at the time, increased police presence in crime hotspots - specifically in vulnerable areas, was underlined as an imperative to increasing safety, better crime-prevention and faster clearance of crimes (Skr. 2008/09:24; Prop. 2007/08:1). This was related to the government's aim to significantly increase the number of police force by the end of 2010 (Brå, 2013). Consequently, in a governmental review of UDP from 2009, the marked increase in the perceived safety since UDP was introduced in vulnerable areas - while crime rates remained largely unchanged, was noted to be the likely effect of the increased police presence (Skr. 2009/10:233, p.81). On the other hand, the Crime Prevention council's statistics show that for the same period the level of trust in the police among residents in vulnerable areas had in fact decreased from 54% to 48%, while marking an increase from 59% to 62% on a national level (source: Brå[8]).

The increased police presence on one hand, was met with tax cuts and a decrease in public welfare spending on the other. Alongside the abolishment of the wealth tax and the significant reduction of property taxes (Pettersson, 2014), the government reduced income taxes - benefiting high-income earners the most and low- and middle- income earners only marginally, while rationalizing welfare spending only to those issues where it was considered to be needed the most (Hegelund & Suhonen, 2014).

The 10% decrease of public tax revenues in turn affected negatively the public expenditures on social insurance (Hegelund & Suhonen, 2014). Government spending on both sickness benefits and the unemployment fund (the so-called a-kassa) had decreased between 2006 and 2014, despite the soaring unemployment rates after the 2008 crisis, particularly in vulnerable areas (Hegelund & Suhonen, 2014). According to SCB (Statistics Sweden), between 2008 and 2011 the unemployment rates in vulnerable areas had increased by 9%, compared to the 4% average increase in municipalities with excluded areas and the nation (see Table 3). The disparities in unemployment rates between the native and foreign-born population also grew in this period, from

---

[7] Local development work refers to all efforts and projects that were included within MDI and UDP in the frame of the so-called Local Development agreements (LUA in Swedish), signed between the state, the municipalities included with urban policy and several agencies considered crucial to the work, such as the Labor market agency and the Social Insurance agency.

[8] Brottsstatistik och resultat från NTU i URBAN15-områden, available at https://www.bra.se (accesed 01.08.2018).

9.0% for Swedish-born versus 17.1% for foreign-born in 2008, to 11.7% versus 23.8% in 2011. Unemployment for immigrants born outside the EU/EEA countries went up from 21,2% to 29,1% (SCB). Likewise, the share of individuals on social benefits has increased by 0.8% in vulnerable areas, compared to 0.3% and 0.2% increase in municipalities with excluded areas and the nation, respectively (see Table 3).

Table 3. Characteristics of the excluded areas included under UDP, compared to the municipal and national average.

	Excluded areas		Municipalities with excluded areas		National average	
Year	**2008**	**2011**	**2008**	**2011**	**2008**	**2011**
Unemployment Rate (%)	20.3	29.2	11.2	15.4	10.5	14.1
Employment Rate (%)	55.1	53.7	75.5	74.6	77.5	76.8
Share of individuals on social benefits (%)	4.4	5.2	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.0
High school Eligibility (%)	68.7	68.6	87.6	86.8	89.1	88.0
Population with foreign background (%)	37.6	40.9	7.66	8.49	4.8	5.3

Source: SCB

Following the same line of development, by 2011 it seems like urban policy had started to retreat from vulnerable areas, with UDP entering a new phase focusing only on exchange of knowledge between those institutions concerned with segregation, supported with evaluations and statistical follow-up of the development in excluded areas. SCB was commissioned to gather data on integration (labour market participation, demographic developments, education and democratic participation), while the Crime Prevention Council provided statistics on crime rates and the level of insecurity in vulnerable areas. In the period between 2012 and 2015, in line with the government's decision to focus only on the absolutely most vulnerable areas, urban policy would be limited only to 15 neighbourhoods - the so-called Urban 15 - which were characterized by employment rates below 52%, social assistance dependency over 4.8%, and less than 70% eligibility for upper secondary school (see Table 3 for a comparison with the national average).

However, obstinate segregation, deep seated poverty and increasing police presence would be brought to light in the rising outburst of urban unrest in disadvantaged areas. Widespread panic in the media over the security crisis in the "burning" suburbs and the growing ethnic tensions in their aftermath would only further exacerbate the negative effects of exclusion:

> The Social Insurance Agency, the Employment Service and Nordea are just a few who have left the district in recent years. Although the riots may have contributed to it, many Rinkeby

residents believe that they are being punished collectively. In the mall closing at seven, there is only one ATM. Retailers complain about high rents and poor maintenance. Some fear that property owners want to remove them from the area, so that the homes can be rented out to anyone working in Kista. - People here feel nobody cares about them. It creates a lot of negative energy. We also want to be a part of society, says Hassan Ali.('Vill ha jobb – inte poliser', 2012)

The proliferating tensions in the vulnerable suburbs at the turn of the decade would thus herald in a new era of urban social policy underlined by law-and-order objectives and focused on close surveillance of problematic vulnerable areas. Before I move over to presenting the final vestiges of urban social policy, I will try to capture the general atmosphere in disadvantaged areas in the aftermath of urban unrest. The aim of the following chapter is to provide an insight into the contemporary transformation of the approach to segregation, as well as the developments standing behind the concurrent advancement of the criminal justice system in the spaces of urban policy.

The suburbs are burning

> Malmö. Thick black smoke obscures the night sky and the ground is shaken by powerful shots. The protests in Rosengård have degenerated into a war against the police.
> "There is so much anger within us" - says a young man with half his face covered by a Palestinian shawl. ('Fullt krig i Rosengård' , 2008)

Clashes, burned cars, stones thrown at police and firemen - this would become a recurring image in news and media after riots started to erupt across disadvantaged neighborhoods at the turn of the decade - Rosengård in 2008, Gottsunda in 2009, Rinkeby in 2010, Tensta in 2012 and Husby in 2013. However, this time around the issue of poverty would be confronted with increasing concerns over drug trafficking, gangs and not least, ethnic and religious tensions in the immigrant-dense suburbs.

The proliferation of tensions between youth and police in several of UDP's suburbs would highlight the increasing discriminatory practices of the police particularly toward young individuals of foreign background. Occurrences of discrimination by members of the judiciary toward people of foreign background and residents of vulnerable suburbs, had been noted in several studies before. In their research on discrimination in the criminal justice system, the Crime Prevention Council found that people with foreign background were often subjected to police controls only because of their minority status, or that they were often treated in a degrading or disrespectful way by police and other members of the judiciary (Brå, 2008a). Likewise, the council found that there are perceptions within the judiciary that some minority groups and certain types of crimes go together, or that people of certain backgrounds are considered less trustworthy than ethnic Swedes (Brå, 2008a).

In his report for SOU (the government's official investigations) on the work of the police in marginalized suburbs, Simon Andersson marked a growing mistrust among residents toward the police, which he argued was the result of mechanisms such as "racist stereotyping" in police work

based on background (Andersson, 2006, p. 158). Several accounts of residents from the suburbs in the aftermath of riots - such as the one by 20 year old Abdullah from Tensta who participated in one of the conflicts, would indicate that it was overwhelmingly youth of immigrant background that were the target of commonplace 'stop and search' policing practices in vulnerable areas:

> - Anger and powerlessness lie behind the riots in Rinkeby and Tensta. And the frustration from the police's abusive treatment. That night he decided to get back at them for years of police harassment. Just like all the youngsters we meet, he tells us how often he has been stopped and checked. Once a police patrol came to his training session and took him for interrogation over a robbery.

> - The worst thing wasn't the violation to be suspected over something I have not done. The worst thing was that they called my mother and scared her. ('Vill ha jobb – inte poliser', 2012)

With the recurring outbreaks of public unrest, particularly after the riots in Husby in 2013, the question of security in relation to exclusion would start to receive growing attention alongside the regular concerns about unemployment and education. This would be reflected in the greater involvement of the judiciary and consequently the increasing penetration of criminological terminology in urban social policy.

In a widely cited report published in 2015, the Police Authority have made their own assessment of the security situation in segregated areas (Polisen, 2015). Alongside the introduction of a number of new concepts, such as "parallel society"[9], which weren't previously used in relation to vulnerable areas in Sweden, the Police made their own categorization of urban vulnerability according to socioeconomic indicators combined with data on crime rates, types of criminal structures and perceived insecurity. A total of 55 areas (including many of the neighbourhoods of urban policy) were divided into groups of particularly vulnerable, vulnerable and areas in risk. *Particularly vulnerable* areas were defined as neighbourhoods characterized by a low socio-economic status and a criminal presence that leads to a widespread inconvenience for the police to fulfil their mission, with the overall situation marked as acute (Polisen, 2015, p.13). *Risk* areas were defined as neighbourhoods considered to be at risk of becoming particularly vulnerable, with the situation described as alarming (Polisen, 2015, p.14). Finally, *vulnerable* areas were defined as §areas characterized by a low socioeconomic status where crime has an impact on the local community, with the overall situation described as serious (Polisen, 2015, p.13). The report from the police prompted the media to question whether the places where 'the public in many cases

---

[9] The term 'Parallel societies' ('Parallelgesellschaften') was coined by the German social scientist Wilhelm Heitmeyer in 1996, in order to describe a type of self-segregated immigrant community - in the case of Germany related to the emergence of Islamic fundamentalist groups "propagating a form of voluntary cultural segregation from the mainstream German society" (Hiscott, 2005, p. 3). Hiscott notes that the term has since been picked up by other scientists resulting in its more general applicability to areas of "ethnic-cultural or cultural-religious homogeneity" (Meyer, 2003). He mentions moreover that it has become a catch-word popularized after 09/11 by both media and politicians in Germany - particularly of conservative and right-wing persuasion, mainly as a soundbite in debates over restrictive immigration policies (see also Loch, 2012).

feels like criminals rule in the area' and where 'the police fail to fulfil their task' shouldn't be called outright "no-go zones" - a term ordinarily used by the military referring to areas controlled by paramilitary groups or rebels (Gudmundson, 2014).

The stronger emphasis on crime and the advancement of the police in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, does not reflect entirely the overall development of crime in the areas in the past few years. The number of reported crimes in the neighbourhoods of urban policy has in fact been in a constant fall since 2010, closing the gap with the national level from a difference of 34% in 2008/09, to 17% in 2015 (see Table 4). The reason as to why the Police Agency made their own evaluation of socioeconomically vulnerable areas, alongside the concerns over organized crime, is in fact closely related to the incidence of riots and public unrest: "the situation in these areas is worrying and, in many cases, has led to the failure of the police to fulfil their task" (Polisen, 2015, p.3).

Table 4. Number of reported crimes in the areas of urban policy, compared to the national average.

Number of reported crimes per 100.000 residents			
Year	The whole country	LUA/URB[10]	Difference (%)
2008	13,285	17,800	34
2009	13,292	17,680	34
2010	12,547	16,567	33
2011	12,852	16,513	29
2012	12,168	15,944	32
2013	12,076	15,213	26
2014	12,426	15,039	22
2015	12,459	14,569	17

Source: Brå[11]

In the meantime, the spread of concepts such as "no-go zones" which incite paranoia of losing territories in the midst of the nation, have certainly changed the tone of the conversation when it comes to vulnerable areas - even though the Police rejected the term on the grounds that it does not appropriately describe the situation in the suburbs. This didn't stop its burgeoning use by media and some politicians who continue to expound on the lurking dangers and grim scenarios from the loss of the suburbs to criminal gangs. Meanwhile, terms such as "parallel society", a concept which by definition implies voluntary segregation, have become the recurring subject of police reports on vulnerable areas which have mushroomed since 2015.

In 2017, as the Police expanded the number of vulnerable areas to 61, the Moderate party made a motion to parliament for deploying the military in particularly vulnerable suburbs in cases of public unrest or when residents interfere with the work of the police (Mikael Cederbratt et al., 2017).

---

[10] From 2008-2011 the data refers to the 38 LUA districts; between 2012-2015 the data covers only the URBAN 15.
[11] Brottsstatistik och resultat från NTU i URBAN15-områden, available at https://www.bra.se (accesed 01.08.2018).

Similarly, the leader of the Swedish Democrats speaks of a war against Swedish society going on in the suburbs and proposes demolishing vulnerable suburbs in order to get rid of the issue of segregation (Frick, 2018; Åkesson, n.d.). Against the backdrop of Sweden's "national security crisis", the Moderate party also promised investing 50 million SEK for setting up surveillance cameras in particularly vulnerable areas, after the Police put up 60 cameras in three of Stockholm's most vulnerable urban areas ('Storsatsning på kameror i särskilt utsatta områden', 2017).

Despite the fact that the situation in poor neighbourhoods hasn't changed particularly (according to data from SCB it actually marked an improvement in socioeconomic terms), the public discourse is riddled with debates on the acute situation in vulnerable areas requiring not only a more effective urban social policy but also restrictions on immigration and a stronger rule of law, in order to take back the control over areas with spiralling crime. Political parties both left and right are competing over who will employ more police force if they win in the following elections, with both the Alliance and the Social Democrats promising 10 000 more policemen by 2024 (Alliansen, 2018; Socialdemokraterna, 2017). In their election programme - *Security in a new era,* the social democrats have emphasized that "there must be high levels of police presence in the socially vulnerable areas" that will guaranty an "available, present and effective policing" (Socialdemokraterna, 2017).

Many of these concerns have been synthesized in the latest urban policy which the prime minister called "the largest security program in modern time" (Löfven, 2018b). Under the overarching aim of eradicating poverty and ending the existence of vulnerable areas, the government promises safety in terms of housing, stable jobs and better health, but "first and foremost" security from crime - starting with changes in penal law, more police force and camera surveillance in vulnerable areas (Löfven, 2018b). The prime minister presented the program in a recent speech at Järva week (*Järvaveckan*), a political forum held in the home district of three particularly vulnerable areas in Stockholm's northern periphery:

> Some claim that the question of law and order is not a leftist question. That's completely wrong! Who will be hit the hardest when the state is unable to maintain the law and order? Who cannot move around when gang criminals try to take over their neighbourhood? Whose children are at greatest risk of being dragged into crime and drugs? It's those that already have it the hardest! That is why law and order is a leftist question. It is a matter of justice and solidarity! (Löfven, 2018b, paras 26–33)

In the following chapter I will present the delimitation, objectives and efforts proposed in the framework of this security program and discuss the move of contemporary urban policy into the field of stricter immigration policies, advancement of law and order in vulnerable areas and the shift to a more restrictive welfare policy.

Chapter 4. 2018-2028: Measures Against Segregation

*"*No man is an island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main.*"*

(Löfven, 2017, para. 1)

In July 2016, the Prime Minister introduced a new urban initiative for breaking structural segregation by reciting John Donne's famous "No man is an island" poem. In his speech at Almedalen week - a prominent annual political forum, he noted that despite seeing its highest employment rate since 1992, Sweden has also seen islands of inequality and insecurity grow further. Against the backdrop of the refugee crisis, "Daesh's killings" and "the global economy's new opportunities", the prime minister highlighted "it's time to end the shooting, car fires and drug trafficking", "attacks against the police, firemen and ambulances", "religious extremism gaining power over public space", as well as "the paralyzing unemployment and hopelessness that pave the way to crime and extremism" in segregated areas (Löfven, 2017). In light of the upcoming renewal of efforts in vulnerable neighbourhoods, he particularly highlighted the challenges related to integrating the newly-arrived into the housing and labour markets.

The concerns expressed in the prime minister's speech have been streamlined into a new policy area introduced in 2017 under the heading *Measures against segregation*. That same year, in the framework of the new policy, the government launched the so-called Long-term Reform Program for Reduced Segregation (*Långsiktigt reformprogram för minskad segregation* in Swedish, henceforth just the reform program), aimed to raise socio-economically vulnerable areas from poverty and break structural segregation. Only one year later, the government launched a new initiative - the so-called Long-term strategy to Reduce and Counter Segregation (*Regeringens Långsiktiga Strategy för att minska och motverka Segregation* in Swedish, henceforth just the reform strategy), which represents a further development of the reform program. Seeing as both strategies contain the same framework, aims and delimitations, and in order to avoid repeating the same information, I will focus mainly on the framework presented with the reform strategy.

The issue of security, or rather insecurity, in the past two years has been the hallmark of political debates in Sweden on both sides of the aisle. This eruption of the "right to security" - which Wacquant (2001; 2009, p. 243) argues is just "the correlate of, and a fig leaf for, the dereliction of the right to work", has become the most touted issue by Swedish politicians in welfare debates as of recent. By the same principle, the two most recent urban strategies are laced with security issues, from securing jobs and curbing unemployment - through cutting unskilled labour immigration and reducing refugee reception, to the right of citizens to be free from crime (Löfven, 2018b).

The reform strategy was thus presented as a long-term, cross-sectoral welfare program that will break socioeconomic and ethnic segregation under the motto "a safe Sweden that holds together" (*Ett tryggt Sverige som håller ihop*) (Regeringkansliet, 2018, p.2). The ambitious strategy aims to fight crime, break long-term unemployment, improve schools' and students' results, improve social services and reduce housing segregation and overcrowding in disadvantaged areas

(Regeringkansliet, 2018). Segregation is defined in terms of a class inequality which falls predominantly along ethnic lines:

> The government's work focuses primarily on socio-economic segregation, which is considered to explain best the origin of segregation patterns in Sweden. Ethnic segregation is targeted as well, but it is mainly explained by socio-economic factors, which is why the latter aspects are central. (Regeringkansliet, 2018, p.11)

However, proposed policy measures demonstrate that the definition of vulnerability covers more than just socioeconomic status. The strategy asserts that there are a number of different aspects to urban vulnerability - such as those pointed by the Police in relation to crime and insecurity - which previous urban policies did not consider. In turn, alongside the urban areas previously covered, the list by the Police is now also part of urban policy's geography (the two lists overlap to some extent). This indicates that the reform strategy, in comparison to previous urban programmes, has a much wider reach both in terms of geography, definition of urban vulnerability and, as I will demonstrate further, the type of practices proposed.

As regards the delimitation of vulnerable groups, most of the focus is placed on problematic youth and ethnic polarization, fuelled by wider discussions over immigration and integration issues. Concerns related to organized crime, drug trafficking, public disorder and religious extremism are placed in the same category (Regeringkansliet, 2018). Not least, in a recent address to the nation the prime minister made a direct connection between crime and immigration, by asserting that the key to breaking the vicious cycle of crime and ethnic segregation lies in a successful integration, regulating labour migration and reducing the reception of refugees: "in order for integration to work and for people to get jobs and become an integral part of society, Sweden needs to receive fewer refugees than it has so in recent years" (Löfven, 2018a).

In the context of the same issues, the social democratic party made an election promise to introduce a so-called 'language obligation' for immigrants, to curb a benefit mentality among the foreign-born population: "[w]e do not hesitate to make demands. We […] want to introduce a language obligation, which makes it compulsory to participate in language training if you live on social support and need Swedish to get a job" (Löfven, 2018b, para. 54). In the meantime, according to the Swedish Migration Agency, Sweden went "from having the EU's most generous asylum laws" down "to the minimum EU level" (Migrationsverket, n.d.).

The refugee crisis from 2015 has particularly influenced the government to put forward a number of laws and administrative measures that seek to avoid further concentration of newly-arrived in vulnerable areas. For example, to mitigate the unequal distribution, in 2016 the government introduced the so-called Settlement Act (SFS 2016:38), similar to the immigrant dispersal policy that ran from 1985 to 1994, compelling each municipality to take a certain number of refugees. The new policy is mentioned in the reform strategy, with the argument that the unequal distribution of newly-arrived migrants among municipalities is one of the main causes of housing segregation, alongside shortcomings in physical planning.

On the other hand, in response to the shortage of affordable housing, which was further exacerbated by the refugee crisis, the government introduced a legislative ease in the Planning and Building Act opening up new possibilities for municipalities to set up housing on temporary building permits. The ease which is meant to enable a quicker provision of housing for refugees (asylum-seekers that had received residence permits), rests on a clause that allows bypassing some of the regular criteria for the production of housing, which implies a certain decline in its standard and quality (Boverket, 2015; Prop. 2016/17:137). While the government insists this is only a temporary measure - asserting that normal production of housing will continue, the concentration of vulnerable groups in sub-standard homes goes against the logic of the government's anti-segregation efforts, not least against the routinely used argument that the low standard of Million program housing exacerbates segregation. Moreover, it goes against the pleads for better integration of newly-arrived migrants, not least since many of the locations earmarked for temporary housing sit on the absolute periphery of cities and in small towns with very limited commuting and job opportunities.[12] This is in fact the first time in Sweden's housing policy history that housing is being targeted and tailored for specific groups (which are in this case arguably negatively favoured). Thus, contrary to the prime-minister's quote from the Almedalen speech, it seems that some groups, under special circumstances, can and should be treated as "an island".

Overcrowded housing conditions, trades with illegal housing contracts and housing insecurity in general, are likewise discussed mostly in relation to the challenges newly-arrived face in view of their limited options. The segregated housing market, the shortage of affordable units and the rampant discrimination by landlords (Regeringkansliet, 2018, pp.19-20) are recognized as the main reasons why newly-arrived, mostly asylum-receivers, are forced to either reside with relatives in cramped public housing or buy illegal housing contracts. In turn, a special commission - formed by the government - proposed a law amendment that will render buying "black" housing contracts a criminal offense punishable by prison (SOU 2017:86).

Nonetheless, the reform strategy undoubtedly commands a wide approach to segregation. On the one hand, it proposes subsidies for the construction of more rental housing with a cap on rent levels, investments in energy-efficient retrofitting of the Million Programme housing stock, support for renovation of public spaces in vulnerable areas, increasing employability through further education and language training, as well as employing more teachers in segregated schools (Regeringskansliet, 2018c, 2018d, 2018e). On the other hand, it cites the government's "historic increase" of the budget of the Police Authority and calls for increasing the presence of police force and extensive camera surveillance in crime hotspots in particularly vulnerable neighbourhoods. Likewise, it mentions the recent introduction of tougher and longer punishments for attacks on first responders - police, ambulance and the fire department - including prison sentences between one and six years, which comes in response to the proliferation of riots in vulnerable areas (SOU

---

[12] For example, Lund municipality has earmarked four locations for temporary housing: one is on the edge of Linero, a district situated on the periphery of Lund; one is in Veberöd - a locality which counts less than 6000 inhabitants; and the final two are on the periphery of Dalby - a locality counting a little over 6000 inhabitants (source: https://www.lund.se/omsorg--hjalp/invandring-och-integration/bostader-for-nyanlanda/).

2018:2, p.12). Additionally, in the list of measures taken in response to segregation there is a reference to a wide cross-institutional collaboration including the Swedish Prison and Probation service, the Security Service and the Police Authority, facilitated in concern with security-related issues in vulnerable areas (Regeringskansliet, 2018b).

The framework of the reform strategy and more importantly the measures discussed in relation to it are, arguably, demonstrating a gradual movement toward a more restrictive welfare policy which seems to be increasingly conjoined with the 'right hand' of the state (Wacquant, 2001). Although many of these proposals still exist only as handles in political debates or as discursive formulations in policies, nonetheless, there is an apparent shift in political reasoning. There are indications that in the future welfare and integration will most likely come with a quid pro quo attached to them, as in the case with the proposed language obligation for immigrants: "[i]n our strong society, we will both set high demands and provide great opportunities" (Löfven, 2018a). Furthermore, there are signs pointing a move toward a penal approach to poverty, arguably one in the sense that Wacquant (2001, p. 407, emphasis in original) identifies in the European political context: "characterised by a *conjoint, twofold accentuation* of *both* the social regulation *and* the penal regulation of social insecurity".

Even though the latest policy programme has yet to be fully implemented and the results are still far from becoming tangible, some parallels in terms of the employed narratives can be drawn from comparisons with past policies. The final chapter of this thesis will thus provide a brief comparison of the three periods, a summary of what I believe are the most disruptive changes in terms of shifts of policy discourses and finally a conclusion from the study which I hope will set the ground for further research.

Discussion and conclusion

> This issue with youth gangs has become a cold reality for us over the years. We have realized that we need to put a lot more resources into trying to integrate immigrants into society. (Expressen, 1998)

> In some parts of our country, Swedish law does not apply. Södra Rosengård, Tensta, Rinkeby, Husby, Vivalla, Ronna, Araby, Tjärna Ängar, Biskopsgården, Bergsjön, Hallunda/Norsborg, Skäggetorp. The list goes on. These areas are governed by criminal gangs. They are armed and commit crimes. Many young people in these areas look at these criminal gangs and rely on them as an alternative to work and education (Mikael Cederbratt et al., 2017).

This thesis began with the aim to explore the modalities of Swedish urban policy in its approach to relegated urban areas which it seeks to address. The primary attempt was to situate urban policy between the discursive representations of the urban phenomena that it has problematized and the political reasoning, or govern-mentalities (Dikeç, 2007), that founded their particular formulation. In a broad sense, this entailed an attempt to situate urban policy in the field of the ban-opticon dispositif and explore its modalities in relation to its strategic function.

The overarching question which has animated this study was finding out how have urban policy problematizations developed toward the present discussion of vulnerable areas as dangerous crime-hotspots that require particularly organized police action. Moreover, it sought to uncover just how much have the policy decisions been informed by the material realities of such areas and by dominant societal discourses that extend beyond urban policy and possibly beyond national debates. This thesis is an attempt to reconstruct the narrative of urban policy with respect to answering these questions.

One of the main limitations of the employed research method, as pointed out by Sharp & Richardson (2001), is that it makes little account of the direct material outcomes of particular policies. Even when it does to some degree, these are limited due to the difficulty to separate policy outcomes from the impact of compound socio-economic influences. In this case this is particularly impossible as the main discursive struggle in recent policy history has occurred merely a year ago and is still being played out. The future will show what will be the consequences of the policy practices resulting from the reform program.

Still, as concerns the material realities of disadvantaged neighbourhoods despite policy outcomes, it seems like not too much has changed. Socioeconomic inequality and segregation remain a real and serious issue for Sweden, despite the continued employment of urban strategies that seek to alleviate urban exclusion. According to the data from SCB's integration registry, vulnerable areas have seen only a marginal improvement since urban policy was introduced and still deviate significantly from the national average in terms of unemployment, employment, education, health and perceived security. Data from SCB's segregation index show that ethnic segregation has remained almost unchanged between 1997 and 2016. In the meantime, urban riots continue to shake disadvantaged suburbs across the country. The urgency attributed to urban programmes by the government and their political opponents in itself attest to the continued pervasiveness of the issue of segregation.

However, it is obvious from the presented data that the relative importance of certain urban issues in relation to other, hasn't always changed proportionally to the situation on the ground. The negative effects of some issues resulting either from urban segregation or from bigger structural changes in society, can and often are exaggerated to a certain degree, even if just by way of granting them a discursive presence in policies. In that sense, this study did not seek to answer questions such as 'Are disadvantaged people really prone to criminal behaviours?' or 'Are migrants really a burden to the welfare system?' - questions which would require a different sort of analysis. The real concern is why are such arguments put forward, what is their purpose in this policy framework, and which rationalities do they underlie. How does the legitimacy of the proposed policy actions hinge on their instrumentalization in the discourse of the particular policy context?

The policy treatment of segregation from the inception of urban policy with the Blomman Initiative and the MDI all the way to the UDP and the Reform Program has clearly seen a lot of shifts - both

in the economic and the socio-political landscape. I would argue however that not each shift has resulted in drastic differences in terms of policy practice. Conversely, I believe that aside from the event of institutionalizing urban policy with the Blomman Initiative, the reform program is arguably the single most disruptive moment in the history of urban policy in Sweden. The constitutive elements of urban policy's narrative - immigration, unemployment, social assistance dependency, youth delinquency, crime and gangs - have remained the same. This is evident in the circumstances surrounding the shift in the approach to urban segregation as manifested in the reform strategy which demonstrates striking resemblance to the socio-political and economic context that gave rise to the Blomman Initiative. However, they have been brought to new extremes in the latest bout of anti-segregation initiatives.

The reason for this is, I would argue, the prevalence of narratives which feed into the state of "unease" that Bigo (2008) has described. Although urban segregation and incidence of violent crimes in vulnerable areas remain an undisputable fact, I would argue that the negative effects of urban segregation can and often are exaggerated to a certain degree, to the point where they've often been used as a leeway into imposing restrictions on newly-arrived migrants or introducing unpopular policies. As the study showed, the economic crisis and the spike in refugee reception in 1992 were used by political elements such as New Democracy to incite "unease" and call for restricting the immigration regime over immigrant crimes and failed integration. It is not a surprise then that the Blomman Initiative took-off on the notion that the high unemployment among foreign-born is limited to their (in)capacity to integrate in the Swedish society. Even though the MDI - influenced by the reformulated Integration policy - took a turn toward a more wide approach to the issue of segregation, the move of urban policy under integration with the UDP demonstrates that the immigrant/non-immigrant duality is still the main category which operates under the policy framework of breaking segregation. This has become evident with every disruptive event, be it from the inside in the form of urban riots or from the outside in the form increased refugee reception and economic crises, which bring ethnic relations immediately to the front.

The most obvious indicator that policies and the issues they choose to tackle are more than just technical decisions, is the fact that each political shift in the state has been marked with a new policy response to urban segregation. Even though most of the time the changes relative to previous practices were minor, this nonetheless proves that policy-making is widely shaped by political rationalities. Political rationalities on the other hand are always embroiled in power struggles, starting from the local level in disadvantaged areas where policy problems are usually first recognized and formulated, to the city and national level where discourses are "circulated, selected and reshaped" through their institutional networks (Uitermark, 2005, p. 150). Moreover, cities and nation-states are often submerged in the "truth effects" of discourses established well beyond national boundaries, such as narratives of flows and mobility, sustainable development or economic growth. This study demonstrates that hegemonic socio-political and economic discourses that transcend national boundaries can significantly affect the interpretation and policy outcomes of phenomena such as segregation, immigration, urban crime and urban riots.

Aside from economic developments, immigration patterns and the shifting attitudes towards immigration over the years I believe have affected policy decisions the most. The aftermath from the so-called refugee crises from 1992 and 2015 make this particularly evident. The rhetoric constructs centred on immigration, crime and poverty that underline the mechanisms of the Ban-opticon dispositif as described by Bigo (2008), have undoubtedly influenced the policy response to segregation from the very first initiative. Its relative influence to policy outcomes in relation to other narratives can be argued, but nonetheless it has always been the constitutive element - both in the inception of the first anti-segregation policy in 1995, and even more so in the more recent programmes. The most obvious outcome of the employment of such narratives has been their instrumentalization in populistic discussions re-presenting immigration as an irresistible force as a leeway into the introduction of certain unpopular policies. The representation of immigration as a burden to the social protection system legitimizes the move toward restricting the immigration regime as one way to thwart the deepening of urban poverty, exclusion and urban segregation. The emphasis on incidents related to organized criminal groups on the other hand has served to legitimize systematic surveillance and policing as the most efficient way of containing the sporadic acting-out of discontent populations. Restricting immigration and policing the rage of disadvantaged minorities is maybe the easier alternative to dealing with deep-seated poverty, rising inequalities and marginalization through slow and sometimes improbable systemic change. Tougher law-and-order policies give fast and visible results, which have a reassuring effect on a population that has been constantly scared and discombobulated with news of drug shootings, burning cars and an over-powered police force. Without trying to overstate the significance of the recent shifts, I would argue that this new approach to urban relegation with an increased emphasis on security measures that trump structural considerations of systemic poverty, shows an increasingly subjective and politicized approach to segregation.

The employment of Bigo's theory of the ban-opticon dispositif is just one way of interpreting the events that I have tried to capture. A different conceptual perspective or even a more detailed case-study approach without pre-defined discourses might potentially show some different aspects in the development of urban policy. As Flybjerg (1998, p.8) argues, "No phenomena can have only one narrative or a single genealogy, just as no historical situation can be explained as having emerged out of total necessity".

Reference list

Primary Sources

Brå (2008). *Otrygghet och segregation. Bostadsområdets betydelse för allmänhetens otrygghet och oro för brott.* Rapport 2008:16. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.

Brå, (2008a). *Diskriminering i rättsprocessen. Om missgynnande av personer med utländsk bakgrund.* Rapport 2008:4. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.

Brå (2013). *Satsningen på fler poliser.Vad har den lett till?* Rapport 2013:12. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.

Brå (2018). *Relationen till rattsväsendet i socialt utsatta områden.* Rapport 2018:6. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.

Justitiedepartamentet (1996). *Allas vårt ansvar. Ett nationellt brottsförebyggande program :*Ds 1996:61.

Mikael Cederbratt et al., (2017). *Utökat samarbete mellan polis och militär: Motion 2017/18:2556.* Stockholm: Riksdag.

Integrationsverket (2000). *Vad hände med Blommanpengarna?: nationell utvärdering av särskilda insatser i utsatta bostadsområden : delrapport 1.* Norrköping: Integrationsverket.

Polisen (2015). *Utsatta områden – sociala risker, kollektiv förmåga och oönskade händelser.* Stockholm: Polismyndigheten, operativa avdelningen.

Polisen (2017). *Utsatta områden - Social ordning, kriminell struktur och utmaningar för polisen.* Stockholm: Polismyndigheten, operativa avdelningen.

Prop. 1997/95:100. Förslag till statsbudget för budgetåret 1995/96.

Prop. 1997/98:165. Utveckling och rättvisa–en politik för storstaden på 2000-talet.

Prop. 2007/08:1. Budgetpropositionen för 2008.

Prop. 2008/09:1. Utgift Område 13: Integration och jämställdhet. *Budgetpropositionen för 2009.*

Prop. 2016/17:137. Tidsbegränsade bygglov för bostäder.

Regeringkansliet (2018). *Regeringens långsiktiga strategi för att minska och motverka segregation.*

SCB: dnr: 2017/1421. *Att mäta segregation på låg regional nivå.* Stockholm: Statistiska centralbyrån.

SFS 2016:38. Lag (2016:38) om mottagande av vissa nyanlända invandrare för bosättning.

Skr. 2008/09:24. Egenmakt mot utanförskap – regeringens strategi för integration.

Skr. 2009/10:233. Egenmakt mot utanförskap – redovisning av regeringens strategi för integration.

SOU 1997:118. *Delade städer: underlagsrapport från Storstadskommittén.* Stockholm: Fritze.

SOU 1999:61. *Brottsförebyggande arbete i landets kommuner.* Slutrapport från Kömmittén för brottsförebyggande arbete KBA. Stockholm 1999

SOU 2004:79. *Allt ljus på storstadspolitikens lokala utvecklingsavtal? Förslag till nationellt utvärderingsprogram*. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet.

SOU 2005:29. *Storstad i rörelse – kunskapsöversikt över storstadspolitikens lokala utvecklingsavtal*. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet.

SOU 2006:79. *Integrationens svarta bok. Agenda för jämlikhet och social sammanhållning.* Slutbetänkande av Utredningen om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering. Stockholm 2006.

SOU 2017:86*. Hyresmarknad utan svarthandel och otillåten andrahandsuthyrning.* Betänkande av Utredningen om åtgärder mot handel med hyreskontrakt. Stockholm 2017

SOU 2018:2. *Stärkt straffrättsligt skydd för blåljusverksamhet och andra samhällsnyttiga funktioner*. Delbetänkande av Blåljusutredningen. Stockholm 2018

Secondary sources

Agamben, G. (2002). *State of exception* (Vol. 2). University of Chicago Press.

Agamben, G. (2013).'Giorgio Agamben on biopolitics' [online video], retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=skJueZ52948 on 06.08.2018

Alinia, Minoo (2006) 'Invandraren, Förorten och Maktens Rumsliga Förankring: Berättelser om Vardagsrasism', in M. Kamali (ed.), *Den Segregerande Integrationen: om Social Sammanhållning och dess Hinder*. Statens offentliga utredningar, SOU 2006:73, pp. 63-90.

Aliansen (2018). Ökad trygghet – för alla.

Andersson, R. (2006). 'Breaking Segregation'—Rhetorical Construct or Effective Policy? The Case of the Metropolitan Development Initiative in Sweden. Urban Studies, 43(4), 787–799. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600597608

Andersson, R., Bråmå, Å., & Holmqvist, E. (2010). Counteracting Segregation: Swedish Policies and Experiences. *Housing Studies*, *25*(2), 237–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673030903561859

Atkinson, R. (2000). Combating Social Exclusion in Europe: The New Urban Policy Challenge. *Urban Studies*, *37*(5–6), 1037–1055. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980050011226

Bevelander, P. (2010). The immigration and integration experience: The case of Sweden. *Immigration Worldwide: Policies, Practices, and Trends*, 286-302.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, *27*(1_suppl), 63–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270S105

Bigo, D. (2008). Globalized (in)security: The field and the ban-opticon. In A. Tsoukala & D. Bigo (Eds.), *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty* (Vol. 20083125). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203926765.ch2

Bussolini, J. (2010). What is a Dispositive? *Foucault Studies*, (10), 85. https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i10.3120

Boréus, K. (2006). *Diskrimineringens retorik: en studie av svenska valrörelser 1988-2002: rapport*. Norstedts Juridik AB.

Castle, S. (2010, September 19). Swedish Anti-Immigration Party Claims Seats. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/20/world/europe/20sweden.html

Cochrane, A. (2007). *Understanding urban policy: A critical approach*. Blackwell Publishing.

Deleuze, G. (1992). What is a dispositif. *Michel Foucault: Philosopher*, 159-168.

Hiscott, W. (2005). Parallel societies, a neologism gone bad. *Multicultural Center Prague*, 1-15.

Dikeç, M. (2007). *Badlands of the Republic, Space, politics, and urban policy*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Retrieved from https://web-b-ebscohost-com.proxy.mau.se/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzE3Njk1M19fQU41?sid=3772fe53-0ac9-41fe-9fa6-af58362458f8@sessionmgr120&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1

Flyvbjerg, B. (1998). *Rationality and power: Democracy in practice*. University of Chicago press.

Flyvbjerg, B., & Richardson, T. (2002). Planning and Foucault: In search of the dark side of planning theory. In Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 44-62.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (2000). *Fearless speech.* New York. Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (2007). Security, territory, population: lectures at the College de France, 1977-78. *Choice Reviews Online*, *45*(04), 45-1971-45–1971. https://doi.org/10.5860/CHOICE.45-1971

Gustavsson, M. (2006). The evolution of the Swedish wage structure: new evidence for 1992–2001. *Applied Economics Letters*, *13*(5), 279–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504850600581906

Grander, M., & Stigendal, M. (2012). *Att främja integration och social sammanhållning*. En kunskapsöversikt över verksamma åtgärder inom ramen för kommunernas bostadsförsörjningsansvar.

Hegelund, E. & Suhonen, D. (2014). Mest åt de rika. Fördelningsstudie av Alliansregeringen politik 2006-2014. Katalys. no 12

Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. 6 Bonhill
Street, London England EC2A 4PU United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208871

Kassman, A. (2002). *Samverkansprojektet: att hitta former för arbete kring utsatta ungdomar*.
Ungdomsstyrelsen.

Lees, L. (2004). Urban geography: discourse analysis and urban research. *Progress in Human Geography*,
28(1), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph473pr

Loch, D (2014). Immigration, segregation and social cohesion: is the 'German model' fraying at the
edges?, Identities, 21:6, 675-692

Meyer, Thomas. Parallelgesellschaft und Demokratie. s.l., 2003.

O'Farrell, C. (2007). Key concepts. Retrieved 30 May 2018, from https://michel-foucault.com/key-
concepts/

Peter L. Martens. (1997). Immigrants, Crime, and Criminal Justice in Sweden. *Crime and Justice*, *21*.
Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147632

Pettersson, O. (2014, February 17). Sänkta skatter har gett mindre till välfärd | SvD. Retrieved 8 August
2018, from https://www.svd.se/sankta-skatter-har-gett-mindre-till-valfard

Poulantzas, N. (1978). *State, Power, Socialism*. Verso.

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2017, September 8). Långsiktig satsning för ett Sverige som håller ihop
[Text]. Retrieved 9 July 2018, from
https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2017/09/langsiktig-satsning-for-ett-sverige-som-
haller-ihop/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018a, March 15). Sverige ska hålla ihop – segregationen ska brytas [Text].
Retrieved 10 July 2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2018/03/sverige-ska-
halla-ihop--segregationen-ska-brytas/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018b, June 26). Insatser för att minska brottsligheten [Text]. Retrieved 8 July
2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-politik/regeringens-samlade-insatser-mot-
segregation/brottslighet/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018c, June 26). Insatser för att minska långtidsarbetslösheten [Text].
Retrieved 8 July 2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-politik/regeringens-samlade-
insatser-mot-segregation/arbetsmarknad/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018d, June 26). Insatser för minskad boendesegregation och stärkt
samhällsservice [Text]. Retrieved 8 July 2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-
politik/regeringens-samlade-insatser-mot-segregation/boende/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018e, June 26). Insatser inom utbildningsområdet för att motverka segregation [Text]. Retrieved 8 July 2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-politik/regeringens-samlade-insatser-mot-segregation/utbildning/

Regeringskansliet, R. och. (2018f, June 26). Regeringen drar upp inriktningen för arbetet med att minska och motverka segregationen med ny strategi och miljardstöd till 32 kommuner [Text]. Retrieved 8 July 2018, from https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2018/06/regeringen-drar-upp-inriktningen-for-arbetet-med-att-minska-och-motverka-segregationen-med-ny-strategi-och-miljardstod-till-32-kommuner/

Richardson, T., & Jensen, O. B. (2003). Linking Discourse and Space: Towards a Cultural Sociology of Space in Analysing Spatial Policy Discourses. *Urban Studies*, *40*(1), 7–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980220080131

Stigendal, M. (2012). Malmö: från kvantitets-till kvalitetskunskapsstad.

Scarpa, S. (2015). *The spatial manifestation of inequality: residential segregation in Sweden and its causes.* Linnaeus University Press, Växjö.

Scarpa, S. (2016). Immigration policy regimes, welfare states and urban inequality patterns: A comparison between Malmö and Genoa. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *23*(4), 862–877. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776415578199

Schön, D., & Rein, M. (2002). Reframing Policy Discourse Martin Rein and Donald: Schön. In Argument Turn Policy Anal Plan (pp. 153-174). Routledge.

Sharp, L., & Richardson, T. (2001). Reflections on Foucauldian discourse analysis in planning and environmental policy research. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *3*(3), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1002/jepp.88

Socialdemokraterna (2017). Political guidelines. Security in a new era.

Storsatsning på kameror i särskilt utsatta områden. (2017, July 12). Retrieved 16 August 2018, from https://moderaterna.se/storsatsning-pa-kameror-i-sarskilt-utsatta-omraden

Uitermark, J. (2005). The genesis and evolution of urban policy: a confrontation of regulationist and governmentality approaches. *Political Geography*, *24*(2), 137–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.07.009

Wacquant, L. (2001). The penalisation of poverty and the rise of neo-liberalism. European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 9(4), 401-412.

Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor: The neoliberal government of social insecurity*. duke university Press..

News articles

Dagens Nyheter. (1994, June 16). Botkyrka says no to immigrants - Dagens Nyheter - News Clip 1994-06-16 - Retriever. Retrieved 19 July 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Duxbury, C. (2017, April 4). Swedish PM's pledge: No more Mr. Nice Guy. Retrieved 15 July 2018, from https://www.politico.eu/article/stefan-lofven-swedish-pms-pledge-no-more-mr-nice-guy/

Expressen. (1994). We will collaborate with immigrants - Expressen - News Clip 1994-11-03 - Retriever. Retrieved 19 July 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Expressen. (1998, June 9). Youth League in Stockholm. Police have mapped the gang - district for - Expressen - News Clip 1998-06-09 - Retriever. Retrieved 19 July 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Frick, C. (2018, January 17). 'Krig mot det svenska samhället': SD vill sätta in militär mot upplopp i förorter. Retrieved 16 August 2018, from https://nyheteridag.se/krig-mot-det-svenska-samhallet-sd-vill-satta-in-militar-mot-upplopp-i-fororter/

Fullt krig i Rosengård. (2008, December 19). Retrieved 4 August 2018, from https://www.aftonbladet.se/a/p613qw

Gudmundson, P. (2014, October 29). 55 'no go' zones in Sweden. Retrieved 5 August 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Göteborgs Posten. (1995). 'Little ghetto about to grow big' - Göteborgs Posten - News clip 1995-11-05 - Retriever. Retrieved 19 July 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Löfven, S. (2017). Tal i Almedalen. Retrieved 8 May 2018, from https://www.socialdemokraterna.se/vart-parti/politiker/stefan-lofven/tal3/tal-2016/tal-i-almedalen/

Löfven, S. (2018a, May 31). Tal till nationen - i SVT. Retrieved 31 July 2018, from https://www.socialdemokraterna.se/vart-parti/politiker/stefan-lofven/tal3/tal-2018/tal-till-nationen---i-svt/

Löfven, S. (2018b, June 17). Tal på Järvaveckan. Retrieved 31 July 2018, from https://www.socialdemokraterna.se/vart-parti/politiker/stefan-lofven/tal3/tal-2018/tal-pa-jarvaveckan/

Löfven utesluter inte att sätta in militär. (2018, January 17). Retrieved 15 July 2018, from https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/lofven-utesluter-inte-att-satta-in-militar

Migrationsverket. (n.d.). Historik. [text]. Retrieved 24 September 2018, from https://www.migrationsverket.se/Om-Migrationsverket/Migration-till-Sverige/Historik.html

Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå. (1994, June 15). FRIGGEBO: LÅT INVANDRARE LÖSA PROBLEMET

      MED INVANDRARTÄTA BOSTADSOMRÅDEN - Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå - Nyhetsklipp

      1994-06-15 - Retriever. Retrieved 19 July 2018, from http://web.retriever-

Vill ha jobb – inte poliser. (2012, May 28). Retrieved 4 August 2018, from

      https://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article14889715.ab