



**Linnéuniversitetet**

Kalmar Växjö

Bachelor Thesis

# The Swedish Democrates way to success

*- A desk study of SDs rhetoric*



*Author: Jonna Andersson*

*Supervisor: Heiko Fritz*

*Examiner: Jonas Ewald*

*Semester: VT19*

*Program: Peace and development  
studies*

*Level: C-level*

*Course code: 2FU33E*

## Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to get an understanding of why the Swedish democrates (Sverigedemokraterna) keep on developing and progress as a political party in the parliament. The author is interested to see if the way SD work with their rhetoric skills is contributing to their election results. This will be done by collecting a number of different statements and interviews that SD as a political party or Jimmy Åkesson (the leader of the party) has been made. The thesis will highlight three different years due to the fact that the thesis is done under a time limit and to get a good and resonable size of the thesis. The chosen years will be 2013, 2015 and 2018 and a more thorough outline of why the author chooses to highlight these particular years is to be read later on in the chapter "*research method*". The result of the study shows that even though SD uses a rhetoric that in many arenas and other places should not be accepted at all, but in this arena, at the SD platform is accepted and it work in their way to keep on developing in a pace that makes the party gain more votes in every eletion and therefor beome one of the three largest political parties in Sweden. Radical voices and right wing values seems to be more and more common in Sweden and the answer to why this is happening in Sweden, this thesis, hopefully will contribute to get a more clear picture.

## Key words

- (SD) The Swedish democrats a political party in the parliament.
- (DA) Discourse analysis
- (CDA) Critical discourse analysis

## Table of content

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research problem	1
1.2 Research objective	1
1.3 Research questions	2
1.4 Relevance	2
1.5 Analytical framework	2
1.6 Research method	3
1.7 Disposition	3
<b>2. Background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Literature review</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Analytical framework</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Securitization theory	9
4.2 Securitization and its audience	10
4.3 Securitization of immigrants	11
<b>5. Research method</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 Methodological framework	12
5.2 Qualitative desk study	12
5.3 Discourse Analysis	12
5.3.1 Discourse	14
5.3.2 Content Analysis	14
5.4 Sources	15
5.4.1 Selection criteria	15
5.4.2 Delimitations	16
5.4.3 2013	15
5.4.4 2015	16
5.4.5 2018	16
5.4.6 Limitations	17
<b>6. Results</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 The political agenda of SD	17
6.2 2013	18
6.3 2015	20
6.4 2018	21
6.5 Hidden agenda	21
<b>7. Analysis</b>	<b>22</b>
7.1 Analysis of the research questions	22
7.2 The Swedish essence	25
7.3 The way forward	27

8

**Conclusion** \_\_\_\_\_ **27**

**Reference** \_\_\_\_\_ **31**

**Appendix** \_\_\_\_\_ **36**

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Research Problem**

This research will outline the discourse of immigrants from SDs point of view, as well as do an analysis where the securitization theory will be in focus since the theory and the fact that SD is portraying immigrants as a form of a threat against Sweden and its citizens as well against Sweden's welfare system.

The study will be guided by the securitization theory of the Copenhagen school given that it has become reference point in this subject. More on the theory later in this thesis, at this point the main thing to present is the research problem.

Sweden has had its dusts of right wing propagandas, and it seems to have come to stay. The political climate in Sweden today is well debated and SD is a political party that takes a lot of place and is widely debated in the media. Their story of success have everybody heard about, it is a fast growing party and the party is aiming high in future elections. In the election for European parliament SD shows high figures, if compared to previous years (Data.val.se, 2019). These figures that is presented in this thesis from the European parliament election above is just preliminary figures due to the fact that the election was held this weekend in Sweden and the counting of votes is still in progress. One can predict that the result of the election in the European parliament will resemble the election to the Swedish parliament where SD is the third largest political party.

### **1.2 Research objective**

This thesis will outline the discourse that the party (SD) has about immigrants and how this discourse has changed over time. How has the rhetoric and the discourse changed during elections and other happenings?

The timeline of the thesis will be focused around three different years. These will be presented further on in this thesis, the years will all be relatively current due to the fact that SD is a new political party (in relation to many other parties) and the most interesting results found were from these years; 2013, 2015 and 2018.

### **1.3 Research questions**

- What is SDs conceptualization of an immigrant?
- In what way could one see that SD have change their way of portraying immigrants during time?
- How does the SD discourse over time describe the impact of immigrants on Sweden?
- Did the way SD portrait an immigrant differ from before the crisis 2015?

### **1.4 Relevace**

The topic *Far right movements* are very much debated and as mentioned in the beginning of this chapter far right parties have been very successful in recent elections both in Sweden and all of Europe. This brings us questions that needs answers, why are far right parties popular and can it be possible that immigrants being portrayed as a threat or in a certain way the fact that parties like SD is growing?

As far to the peace and development studies one can see a need for this thesis in terms of a better understanding of the Swedish society and the current right-wing movement. Development and how the society and the globalization are evolving, and why it is contributing to the way people is affected by one another in how to see and understand the world and its different components is a subject that is in a constant movement.

This Research is not unique in the way of the aim to understand a right-wing party, more in a way of to get an understanding in the power (which could contribute to danger) of the language and the choice of rhetoric. As being presented later in the literature review in the analytical chapter there is a lot written about people's voting behaviour, this will be a contribution to this research in terms of getting a better and broader understanding of the progress of right-wing movements in terms of the power of language.

### **1.5 Analytical framework**

This thesis will be using an analytical framework due to the fact that the choice of theory to frame the thesis is the Securitization theory by Ole Wæger. The theory and security is well known and should according to Wæger be seen as an act of speech (Van Munster, 2012). Easily said; Something that has been said evolves to a threat. Two sections called

“securitization and its audiens” and “securitization of immigrants” will entail how the fact that someone can illuminate of a possible threat that does not become a threat until people starts to believe that it is a threat.

## **1.6 Research Method**

To form this thesis in the best of ways the chosen methodological framework became to do a qualitative desk study due to the time limit and the authors pre knowledge about it. The collection of quotes was made with caution and many statements, quotes and interviews was put against each other before there was an election being made. Through the method which helped the author come up with all the data that was needed the thesis next step is to present it in the result chapter and later on do an analysis.

## **1.7 Disposition**

This thesis contains eight defferent chapters. The first chapter which has been presented above is the *Introduction* chapter.

The second chapter, *background*, will guide you through SD’s history and the way they have been growing since they formed as a political party.

The third chapter, which is the *literature review* will provide what have had been written about similar subjects before.

The fourth chapter, *Analytical framework*, will entail the chosen theory which is the Securitization theory by Ole Wæver.

The fifth chapter, *Research method*, presents which sort of method is being made in terms of collecting data and a ground basis for the thesis.

The sixth chapter is the *result chapter* and this chapter will bring out all the result that the author have been able to outbring from the aim of the thesis.

The sevent chapter, *Analysis*, will outline what analysis is being made from the results in the previous chapter.

The last chapter, chapter eight, is the *Conclusion*, in this chapter the author tries to sum the thesis up by go through the results and the analysis shortly and to come up with possible new subjects for theseses to come.

## 2. Background

The Swedish democrats (SD, Sverigedemokraterna) has gone through a tremendous progress and have been growing fast the last couple of years, the party has been active since 1988 and have its roots in the Nordiska Motståndsrörelsen (NMR), which is an extreme right-wing party (Expo.se, 2018). Today SD have taken distance from the NMR and their values and fully invest in their own party and politics. The two recent elections Sweden has been through, SD have ended up as the third largest party in the parliament. SD got 12,86 percent of the votes in 2014 (Data.val.se, 2018), and in 2018 the number increased with almost five percent, to 17,53 percent (Val.se, 2018).

People have for a long time considered Scandinavia to be liberal, and to some extent and in relation to other countries, it still is. However, the rise of right-wing populist parties in the Nordic countries is active and current and their anti-immigration values is most directed towards migrants from Muslim societies (Pelinka, 2013). In the Nordic countries there are a few right wing movements, The Danish People's Party were the “trendsetters”, and parties like SD in Sweden as well as the True Finns and The Norwegian Progressive Party followed their lead (Pelinka, 2013). These parties mentioned, have a narrow definite outlook, they are against immigration.

This right-wing party, one can argue, have taken the immigration question and made it their own. The party have in their political agenda which is available for everyone to read, who have access to their website, written about what the party will be focusing on in terms of e.g. migration politics, asylum immigration, abortion, family reunification, assimilation and so on (Sverigedemokraterna.se, 2018). One can argue, that SD have strong and strict opinions and standpoint in migrant politics. The fact that they have made the immigration and migration question to “their own” and by this perhaps have collected votes and sympathies during elections, could this be a tactical move from SD as they know that if they make up a threat against the population the citizens will act in their favour? Obviously SD have in their party program written about all their politics, not just the immigration migration question, but this is not relevant in this thesis and to this research.

While reading about SD and what researchers already have been written about them, more knowledge and in-depth research should be done in how SD as a party, and their party leader Jimmy Åkesson, chooses to express themselves during election periods and the time in between, also when there is a crisis such as in 2015 with the “refugee-wave”. There is not much literature to look more closely into the development of SDs anti-immigrant argument over time. There is not enough research done in this field and a thesis made through a short period of time when a lot happened in Sweden and in the world in terms of migration and asylum seekers, an in-depth research should contribute to research already been done.

### **3. Literature review**

Since SD is a radical political party, there are much written about the party and their political standing point. Although, after reading and doing research about the political party, more knowledge and in-depth research should be done on how SD as a political party, and particularly their party leader Jimmy Åkesson, chooses to express themselves during election periods, between elections and during difficult times such as e.g. the “refugee-wave” that occurred in 2015.

As early as 2006, Arzheimer & Carter wrote that in the last two decades west Europe right-wing parties have gotten a lot of attention due to their success in elections (Arzheimer and Carter 2006). The text highlights the parties progress and its role in the everyday life. Many important and informative framing of questions is taken under consideration and the most interesting question could be “*In addition, many of the studies that do exist, not surprisingly have tended to focus only on why right-wing extremist’s parties have been successful, rather than on why they have not*” (Arzheimer and Carter, 2006). This quote brings many question and thoughts to me as a researcher. Could it be the fact that the use of rhetoric contributes to people assumptions and beliefs about extreme right-wing parties? The combination of the words *extreme right-wing parties* and the word *successful* used in the same sentence paints a picture for the audience and it could perhaps be a way of change the meaning of a text or a message?

Kai Arzheimer also writes about the contextual factors behind extreme right-wing voting in the western Europe, and there are a lot to read about people's voting behaviour. This subject is interesting, but the amount of research done in it is much and it could be to

some extend contribute to this thesis to understand the way people dedicates to right-wing movements.

Ethnic competition and ethnic conflict are two major parts of people's voting behaviour (Arzheimer, 2009). Arzheimer refers to Jackman and Volpert (1996) and their quantitative comparative analysis of extreme right-wing electoral supporters. The findings were “that the extreme rights benefits from (1) high unemployment, (2) higher electoral thresholds reduce the support for the extreme right and (3) multipartyism in combination with a proportional electoral system is associated with higher levels of extreme right voting” (Jackman and Volpert, 1996). The text does not tell if the way of passing along information or if the use of words and the way of speaking about right-wing politics and their values contributes or change on terms of the current political climate.

So far, this literature review have highlighted extreme right-wing voting and its most important components. Below will be listed some Swedish authors and what is written about e.g. the “*Swedish way*” and the “*Swedish people*”.

Furthermore, Ekman and Poohl (2010) have written a book about SD and it is a critical examination of SD. The book contains chapters such as “One people - One country”, “The War against Islam”, “the hunt for an ideology” and much more (Ekman and Poohl, 2010). This book brings up a broad picture of what SDs goal is as a political party as well as what their values are and so forth. Another author who have done much research about SD as a party and their progress during time is Anders Hellström who points out that the party knows that they must be valid and trustworthy political party to gain sympathizers. (Orban 2016). Since they are aware of this, they can choose how they submit their values and their political agenda so that it fits into the frames of the *regular voter* and in line with the culture codes of Sweden. Hellström mentions a few important counter stones which SD have put more effort to make almost sacred e.g. Sweden's historical heritage and the national myths of Sweden. Although that time and the development keep in going forward, SD highlights how it once was and that formerly Sweden were a much more safe and better country (Orban 2016).

Hanna Hallgren (2012) has in an article charted how SD and different media in Sweden reacted on Breivik's massacre in 2011, and how they accuse the left-wing, feminist and antiracist for the event on Utøya. This in an article which is written from Hallgrens point of view which contains a critical aspect and a lot of perspectives which can contribute to this thesis. The thing that is missing, or the thing not brought up in this article, is an in-depth analysis of SD and their discourse of immigrants. Hallgren is mostly focusing on the fact that SD can, and have, turned the picture around to their advantage instead of facing the real debate that is that a terror crime has been performed and this time by a Norwegian and not by a person with muslim connection.

There is not much literature to look more closely into the development of SDs anti-immigrant argument over time. However, the scene in Europe, mentioned earlier, looks much similar anywhere you come. By doing some research, one can see that there is journals and articles written about this phenomenon but not from SDs point of view. One example is Scheibelhofer (2017) who in an article writes "*I analyse how Austrian politicians used imageries of 'foreign masculinity' to portray refugees as a threat to society, to delegitimise solidarity with them and to argue for restrictive measures. The analysis integrates approaches of masculinity studies, critical migration studies, and postcolonial feminist research and applies methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)*" (Scheibelhofer, 2017).

In 2018 there were a report published by the Institute for Future Studies (Institutet för Framtidsstudier) named "*The voters of the Swedish democrats. Who are they, where do they come from and where are they heading?*". This report is written by Kirsti Jylhä, Jens Rydgren and Pontus Strimling and its purpose is to investigate which factors that contributes to their growing selector support. In their report they also analyse the factors and potential future development of voters choosing to leave the social democrats and the moderates and lay their political vote on SD instead. The report aiming on focus on these three questions;

1. What characterize the voters whom votes on SD and how do they differ from the social democrats and the moderate's voters?

2. What characterizes the voters who have switched to the Swedish Democrats from the Social Democrats and the Moderates and how do they differ from those who today vote for the Social Democrats and the Moderates?
3. What causes the voter flows between the Swedish Democrats, the Social Democrats and the Moderates, and how can future mobility be expected to look? (Institutet för framtidsstudier 2018, pp. 10-11).

In the report the authors have drawn the conclusion, together with other researchers, that to put a vote on SD which is critical to immigration is because one considers that the immigration threatens the country in some way, e.g. in the way criminality increases or that the Swedish culture is weakened (Aichholzer & Zandonella, 2016; Elgenius & Rydgren, 2017). The way they portray how the voters of SD thinks and connects with the party and from which parties they come from is in line with other journals and reports presented in this thesis, it does not give an answer on how the rhetoric or the choice of language and certain words contributes to the fact that the party evolves and continues to grow.

Did the way SD portrays an immigrant differ from e.g. before the “refugee wave” in 2015 and the years that have followed? There is not enough research done in this field and research done on this subject will contribute to the research already been done. To look at the discourse of SD concerning immigrants and if it has changed over time will force the author to investigate how SD as a party have answered on globalization, crisis, and immigrants coming to Sweden. Due to SDs strict migrant politics, how can one see, or is it even visible, how and if the party have changed the way of response to their own politics during time and how the political climate contributed to the acts of SD?

## 4. Analytical Framework

This chapter will begin with a description of the analytic framework which is the Securitization theory by Ole Wæver from Copenhagen School of security studies. To get a more understandable picture of this subject, there will also be a section which will outline the connections between securitization of immigrants and securitization and its audience. The choice of theory was in fact a natural choice due to the fact that it seemed interesting to the author and made sense to the topic of the thesis.

### 4.1 Securitization theory

To frame the work of this thesis, the chosen theory is The Securitization Theory from Copenhagen School of security studies. The Copenhagen school tried to show a different view on the theory of securitization which had established a debate between those who claimed that threats are objective and to those who argued that security is subjective. The new way, that the Copenhagen School argued for, was that security should be seen as an act of speech, which in other words mean that something being said evolves to a threat (Van Munster, 2012). Ole Wæver, one of the founders of this theory, argues that a securitization speech act need to follow a certain rhetorical structure. This structure contains three criteria's;” (1) *Claims that a referent objective is existentially threatened,* (2) *demands the right to take extraordinary countermeasures to deal with that the threat,* and (3) *convinces an audience that rule-breaking behavior to counter the threat is justified*” (Van Munster, 2012). This in other words points at by label something as security, contributes to that an issue is dramatized as an issue of high priority. According to The Copenhagen school, problems or threats, can be categorized as non-political, politicized and securitized. These three concepts will be presented below;

*Non-political problems* mean that the government do not handle these problems, and the problems do not have a place in the public debate or in any kind of decision making progress. *Politicized problems* are a part of the public politics and needs an official decision making in a higher level and an allocation of government sources. *Securitized problems* mean that the problem is presented by the state as an existential threat which demands emergency and special force which is beyond the limits of the normal political procedure (Buzan, Wæver and Wilde, 1998 p.23-24).

To connect security with migration is not unusual in the time we are living in now. The media and the political climate have done its fair share to the contribution for the growing of the connection. According to Castles, De Haas and Miller (2014) people becomes a psychological threat because of the colour of their skin, how they choose to dress, or their name is unfamiliar from what you are used to. And, obvious, a person who identifies with a religion could in some persons minds be a potential threat (Castles, De Haas, Miller 2014, p.198). They also highlight the fact that people whom are fleeing their countries, is doing this because of the violence they have been and could be exposed to. Most of the people is seeking a better life where the human right is being valued (e.t al p.199). The resemble between that people is forced to flee because of violence and the fact that they are fleeing to a safe nation is not very much written about, it is the dominated threat a person or a country faces that become the popular debate (Castles, De Haas, Miller 2014, p.199).

The securitization theory will be used in a way to see if media, and SD, uses their position to create a knowledge to its citizens, and in those terms, create a correlation between the public opinion and the way media and SD reports.

#### **4.1.1 Securitization and its audience**

Ole Wæver argues that the most important counter stone when it comes to securitization is in fact the relevant audience. Wæver also mentions that the audience have in the earlier work not got enough of attention, and now in the most recent research and in the debate about securitization, the audience gets more knowledge.

*“Anyone can stand up and say this and that is a threat. Something happens at the moment when an audience accepts that because of this threat, they are willing to accept that we go to war, keep secrets, shut down this debate, make whatever extraordinary measure we otherwise would not do”* (youtube.com). This quote is collected from an YouTube clip from 2014 where Ole Wæver tries to explain what securitization mean. The fact that he and the theory wants to turn the debate around and to get people to understand that it is the way we speak and the way we choses to define things that makes events and things securitized.

#### 4.1.2 Securitization of immigrants

This thesis aim is to understand if and how the way SD and Jimmy Åkesson make statements and talk about immigrants have changed over time and if there is a possibility that immigrants are being portrayed as a security problem. The connection between the way politicians communicate to gain sympathies and voters could be closely engaged with the securitization theory by with means to put a form of negative or as Wæver puts it as a threat on immigrants and migration.

Receive countries of refugees usually points out three different possible threats.

1. Cultural threats, which means that immigrants threat the nation building as well as the society. The nation is a fixed piece which is meant to stay that way, and immigrants and refugees does not contribute to this fixed idea (et. al p.199).
2. Socio economic threat, in this threat society refers to that immigrants and refugees "*takes our jobs and money*".
3. Political threats are that some religious groups main task is to foil the Swedish nation and the state. This form of talking about humans and groups of people contributes to the segregation and the gap between groups of people (Castles, De Haas & Miller 2014 p.199)

If there is a way to make people feel unsafe in Sweden at the same time is a fragile climate in the country due to many circumstances with people fleeing from war or threats, to put the blame and make the ones fleeing for their and their familis lifes is to throw people under the bus. The three bulletpoints in the setion above make a clear statement on how to come up with threats which will make the citizens of Sweden frightened and unsure.

## **5. Research method**

### **5.1 Methodological framework**

In this chapter I will outline and justify the methodological framework chosen for this discourse analysis desk study of SDs way of portraying immigrants through time. It begins with an explanation of the desk study and continue with an overview of what a discourse analysis is and a summarize of the definition of the word *discourse*. The chapter will also discuss the limitations and delimitations as well as the availability of data and sources for the thesis.

### **5.2 Qualitative desk study**

This research has been conducted through a desk study with a qualitative approach according to Bryman who argues that an approach to documents that emphasizes the role of the investigator in the construction of the meaning of and in texts (Bryman 2016, p.694). He also mentions that there is of importance that allowing categories to emerge out of data and on recognizing the significance, to better understand the meaning of the context in which an item or subject being analysed (Bryman 2016, p.394). The approach of the thesis will also be abductive which means that it will be a mix of both empirical material and the theoretical framework. The understanding of abductive approach is to analyse the authors findings through a theoretical frame to create a form of understanding of the basic problem, and further on to explain and support the authors arguments (ibid. p. 394).

This study will be, as previous mention, done through a desk study, due to the decision to do a discourse analysis (the term discourse analysis will be further discussed below). The choice to do a desk study with a discourse analysis seems to be a bright choice and a fair project timewise. To get answers to the research questions is the choice of method a fair choice.

### **5.3.Discourse analysis**

In terms of reaching the best results and to get answers to the research question mention in previous chapter the chosen methodological framework will be to do a discourse analysis since in comparison with a conversation analysis this way (the discourse

analysis) is much broader, and it can be applied to texts as well as to the spoken word (Bryman, 2016 p.531). As far as the aim for this thesis, there will not be any interviews done by the author, instead the author will be forced to listen and to read interviews already being made and this could be connected to what Bryman pointed out.

To reflect on what Bryman writes in *Social Research Methods*, the discourse analysis goes in line with the purpose of this thesis which is to analyse the discourse SD have in terms of immigrants, and to reflect over if the use of language has changed over time, or in fact changes while referring to different types of immigrants. Does the party lay different values on different immigrants?

Michel Foucault is the father of “Foucaultian discourse analysis”, which have become an academic field on its own. Foucault mean that the term discourse is a historically contingent social system which contains both knowledge and meaning. In other words Foucault points out that discourse, in a way, is to organise knowledge that later structures the development of social relations through the shared understanding of both the discursive logic as well as the acceptance of the discourse as social fact (Adams 2017). Both Bryman and Foucault is well known for their different forms of analysing discourses.

According to Jørgensen and Phillips (2010), there are three examples of discourse analysis. The first one is to use it as a framework for analysis for national identity. The way of understanding national belonging and what consequences does the different divisions of the world into nation states have? Another way could be to explore the understanding of national identity for cooperation between people in e.g. a workplace or in an organisational context. The third research topic could be that expert knowledge is transported in the mass media and the indication for questions of e.g. power and democracy.

### **5.3.1 Discourse**

To get a clearer picture of what a discourse analysis is, I will now describe the word discourse. The word has different definitions and could be hard to get a clear meaning of, this is by own experience during different courses in university. While doing some research on the definition, it comes to my knowledge, that there are more people feeling

uncertain on the real definition of the word discourse. One example of the diffusion of the concept is presented below;

“The concept has become vague, either meaning almost nothing, or being used with more precise, but rather different, meanings in different contexts. But, in many cases, underlying the word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life, familiar examples being ‘medical discourse’ and ‘political discourse’” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2010 p.12).

According to Jørgensen and Phillips, as mentioned, the definition has become vague but the underlying meaning is as well as Bryman puts it Something that is being done discourse is in other words performative (Bryman 2016).

### **5.3.2 Content Analysis**

To examine the rhetoric SD is using further, there will be a content analysis done as well. The meaning of content analysis is that the researcher is interested in frequency of words and expressions given to certain topics.

A definition by Holsti (1969) is that “*A content analysis is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristic of message*” (Holsti 1969, p14). To be objective in this sense means that it is of importance that there is transparency and that the researchers personal biases do not intrude or affect the process (Bryman 2016, p.284). Another definition sounds like this “*Content Analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication*” (Berelson 1952, p.18).

This desk study will be done by collecting data and information from different media channels where the party has made statements or interviews and from their own published papers such and website. The previous work that was mentioned in the literature review will be much useful in the analysis part of this thesis.

## **5.4 Sources**

This thesis will build upon sources from Swedish media and Swedish newspapers which is available for all to see and read. These sources are found online, and it does not take much effort or digging to find them. It is easy information that anybody can get a hold on if wanted. It is important to remember that even if the sources are easy to find, it does not turn them into bad sources. When a DA (discourse analysis) is being made it is easily mistaken for a CDA which is a similar analysis, but in fact a narrower way of analysis. Both the DA and CDA is a three-dimensional method. The first dimension is to analyse the text. This dimension could be combined with other dimensions, e.g. the second dimension which is how the text is being communicated. The third dimension is taking the social limits under consideration when it is about a whole cultural society. The method is flexible in the way that one must not do all three dimensions. If one wants to do a CDA but just analyse the text, this is just as legit as to do all three dimensions (Lindgren 2011). This paper will be focusing on doing a text analysis on its own but in some angles a CDA can be in favour. Further on, with a text analysis the meaning is to evaluate information and language being used since hidden messages and different layers of information could appear.

Fairclough whom is very much connected to CDA mentions that the three questions one should pay attention to is:

1. How is the text designed?
2. Why is it designed this way?
3. How else could it be designed?

To make this thesis understandable in its easiest way the election to use these three questions will be implemented and answered in the analysis chapter below.

### **5.4.1 Selection criteria**

An important work due to this thesis, is to evaluate which sources to use. By investigate how other authors such as Hedemark below have been working to collect sources, and which ways have been most helpful, the choice fell on these four criterias;

1. The sources should be able to relate to one and same object.

2. The context or the form which the sources is presented should be able to connect.
3. The sources should be able to relate to the same concept.
4. The sources should be able to contribute knowledge to certain types of relations (Hedemark, 2009).

These four criteria will be the ground while choosing the sources. To put it in easier words the empirical material will be related to the rhetoric of Sverigedemokraterna.

#### **5.4.2 Delimitations**

To keep the research in a reasonable size, one delimitation is to focus on three different years. The chosen years is 2013, 2015 and 2018. Why the choice fell on these particular years is presented below. There will also be a selection of statements that have made contribution to the political climate as well as the political debate.

#### **5.4.3 2013**

This year is chosen because while doing research it was quotes and statement from this year that got the authors attention and the quotes were very much radical and provoking. 2013 is a interannual in terms of one year before election year in Sweden and the refugee wave have not happen to Sweden, and the world, yet.

#### **5.4.4 2015**

In 2015 the world, and to narrow down it a bit, Europe experienced a rise in the number of people seeking asylum. Sweden received more than 160 000 people who was fleeing from e.g. war and persecution. This year felt like a year that had to be in this thesis in terms of how much newspapers and politicians wrote and talked about refugees and immigrants.

#### **5.4.5 2018**

This year is brought in to the thesis because this is the most recent year where an election has been held. SD became (for the second time) Sweden's third largest political party after The Social Democrats (Socialdemokraterna) which got 28,26% (Data.val.se, 2018) and the Moderates (Moderaterna) who collected 19,84% by Sweden's votes (Data.val.se, 2018). SD as mentioned ended up in third place with 17,53% of the votes.

Aware of the delimitation of years it seems to be the most relevant way of conducting this research. To examine SDs political party programs and statements from all active years takes a lot of time and effort. This would be interesting, in another thesis perhaps when more time and room were given. The choices were also taken under consideration since these are years when there is election in Sweden and the chance to find much more information, statements and interviews is much greater.

#### **5.4.6 Limitations**

SD is a political party from Sweden, the author of this thesis is Swedish and have Swedish as native language. This will be a limitation to this thesis in terms of that documents, journals and the most information for this thesis will be read by the author in Swedish and then translated into English. Certainly, will the translation come with a form of rendering because of the translation. This will be crucial since there are not much literature and information in english. This is, however, something the author have acknowledged and will have in mind while writing the thesis.

### **6. Research results**

This thesis is made from a personal interest by the author, due to from the education, the author found a special interest in the way society is dividing people into groups. Is there a connection between the society and the way people in political party's is dividing people according to which rhetoric and language they are using?

#### **6.1 The political agenda of SD**

Sverigedemokraterna is in their website and their political agenda, which can be read online by anyone who has access to a computer and an internet connection, writing about their vision for Sweden and its citizen. If one really reads the agenda and focus on the sections which this thesis is looking at such as immigrants and migration the understanding of a unite society with one people (swedes) is to aim for (Sverigedemokraterna.se) At the same time, one can notice, that they use positive words to make it more acceptable and easier to assimilate.

Some words in SDs political agenda, the author of this thesis, is experiencing being used in extenuation ways. It sometimes can be perceived that there is a hidden message in the

texts, but it is not everyone, every citizen who reads it, that understand the underlying meaning of the information. Words can be loaded with many different meaning and it is the people or as Waeger puts it, the audience, who decides how to embrace how the information should be understood and processed.

It is possible to reform a society with the use of words as SD have done. SD have used though language and kept on developing and been growing as a political party. It could be an explanation why the party and members of the party been proceeding with the radical statements, because they have got a receipt in terms of that the party keep on growing instead of shrinking even though their choice of rhetoric.

Later on in the analysis chapter there will be a more objective review of the way SD is using words in their favour. While reading a statement or an interview for the first time it can perceive in one way but if one readit again and again, there could be new information to be found and proseeded. It is not unusual that people like Jimmy Åkesson, who is a political party leader, have gone to a rhetoric class to be prepared for the work that a political party leader have to do. Obviosly there are a lot of interviews and speeches that must be held and at those arenas it is important that what a spokesman for a party is saying makes sense and is trustworthy. At the same time that the right rhetoric is in favour at these events, many people are extremely good at twisting the words to some extend.

The sources, and the quotes, will be translated from Swedish to English here below. The original quotes will be attached in the appendix in the end of this thesis for the ones who are interested.

## **6.2 2013**

The quote below is from 2013, one year before the election 2014.

*“The thought of a society which takes care of its citizens ang gives them a basic security is something that addresses me, it feels like everyone have given up on that thought. I do not understand why the social democratic politics have done that. The source in a society like that is togetherness, to build something together. It was this that made it legit and got accepted to do the tremendous social reforms in Sweden. The Swedish society have been shattered – through internationalization, mass immigration and through the act of*

*Marxists and liberals who have taken over and abandoned the social conservatism which permeated all the political parties before 1968” (Dagenssamhalle.se, 2013).*

Jimmie Åkesson uses word like “internationalisation” and “mass immigration” in a way of blaming globalisation and immigrants the fact that the Swedish society has, according to them, broken down. In this quote, important phrases like e.g. the thought of a home for every Swedish citizen “*folkhemmet*”, cohesion and building something together are important. These phrases are being put against the words mentioned before, internationalization, mass immigration, and the result divides people into different groups. The fear of immigrants who according to SD, threaten Sweden and its welfare is build up upon a statement that is connected to the securitization theory which is chosen to be a part of this thesis. The political party makes immigrants into the problem, immigrants are to blame for, what SD thinks, is a shattered society. These beliefs can become very dangerous if people take them seriously. It is easy to spread the word and make others belief in things that in fact are not true, or in most cases magnified.

This below is a part of an interview in SVT news, from 27<sup>th</sup> of April in 2013. A member of SD whom also is a part of the parliament had in an online chat called dark skinned Africans “monkeys from hell”. This became a big news story in Sweden in 2013 and the political party leader Jimmie Åkesson got interviewed about it.

Is it racist to say monkeys from hell about people? – Reporter

*“It depends entirely on what one has as a starting point to make a statement like that” –  
Jimmy Åkesson*

So, you mean that it does not have to be a racist comment? - Reporter

*“When it comes to that story our group management in the parliament made a clear statement which I stand behind. I have full confidence for those who have made that statement” – Jimmy Åkesson (SVT Nyheter, 2013)*

Åkessons answers to the reporter’s questions can perceived shocking in terms that he does not take a stand against what his political companion have been saying. For a politician to make a statement as the one above can both be received as objectionable, racial, and for some for sure as a truth and a legit thing to say. If a political party leader finds it legit

to talk about people in this way, in a newspaper for everyone to read, it is quite a big chance that people adjust to this and makes beliefs and gets convinced that it is acceptable to talk about other people in this way. If people read and listen to this kind of statements one can get common to it, and eventually find it not disturbing.

Åkesson refers to the management and the management in this part is higher in the political hierarchy compared to Jimmy Åkesson. This can contribute to that the quote and the information can get more understanding and easier get accepted due to the fact that people have faith in those who are high up in the hierarchy.

### **6.3 2015**

In 2015 there were a lot that happened in Sweden in terms of immigrants and the political debate. As written above Sweden, Europe, and the world faced a tremendous movement of people. It was especially the war in Syria which contributed to people fleeing their homes and countries to seek a better and most important safer life for them and their families in e.g. Sweden.

Presented below is a part of a news story published in Aftonbladet the 29<sup>th</sup> of August in 2015;

The reporter asks this question;

Due to the crime prevention council, there has not been an increase worth mentioning in the statistic of violent crimes since the seventies. How do you think your rhetoric rhymes with that?

Jimmy Åkesson answers;

*“My opinion is partly that, that.. um.. Very many people experiencing a situation today where there is a different character on crime. This type of suburb riot is a relatively new phenomena in Sweden. This type of gang criminality and organised crime is also relatively new”* (Aftonbladet, 2015).

In this quote Åkesson does not point out immigrants or refugees directly. He refers to suburb riot, gang criminality and organized crime as a new phenomenon in Sweden. Due to the fact that the quote is from year 2015, which is the year when Europe received a tremendous number of refugees. A connection could perhaps be made were Sweden is

facing a new future and the ones coming to Sweden as refugees is contributing to the “new phenomena”, that Åkesson is mention in the quote, in Sweden. This could be possible linkages people will draw or perhaps not.

Due to the challenge that Sweden and Europe were facing with the amount of people seeking a new and safe life in a new country there could be

#### **6.4 2018**

Before the election in September 2018, there were a lot of debates between the party leaders of the parties in the parliament. This is not unusual, it is a part of the campaign. These debates are broadcasted on the television for all of Sweden's citizens to see. One critical statement that SDs party leader Jimmy Åkesson made where the fact that he blamed the refugees and immigrants for the way Sweden have developed.

The text below refers to a news article from Aftonbladet, a Swedish newspaper, the article is about what just mentioned. Jimmy Åkesson, SDs party leader got offensive while debating why immigrants do not get a job in Sweden. And his answer is;

*” We do not tell the reason why immigrants do not get a job. It is because they are not Swedes, and they do not fit in here in Sweden”.* (Aftonbladet.se, 2018)

This became a huge thing in Sweden and was widely debated. This statement contributes to the segregated society that exists in Sweden today. To divide people into different groups in terms of belonging, and in a hierarchy that usually is called “we” against “them” is a form of exercise power. To establish that *being a swede* is the only way, and the right way, is to perform power on human beings. Åkesson is putting a value on being a swede, and those who are not Swedes is not as high in the hierarchy as one born in Sweden. These illusions becomes reality for people and it can provide to the racism that already exists in Sweden today.

#### **6.5 Hidden agenda**

According to Foucault, everything that is spoken, contributes to how we see the world. This sort of statements mentioned above which is made by the party leader of a political party in the government make a mark in how people will vote, and how people will see

the world. The citizens get affected and get a picture of how the world is known and who to blame. Since the development that SD have been through the last twenty years there are much that talks for that SD is going to climb higher and to call it a hidden agenda seems sometimes wrong due to the fact that SD is talking freely about pressured subject such as migration and immigration. In their website they highlights the fact that the four most important questions for the party is (1) Serious migration politics, (2) One unite country, (3) Good welfare, (4) A safe society (Sverigedemokraterna, 2019). The thought of a hidden agenda could have been the plan from the start when the political party was made, but after some time the party experienced the success and a hidden agenda perhaps seemed useless. They gained sympathizers due to the radical statements and right wing politics.

## **7. Analysis**

The analysis of this thesis will be presented below. To what extent did the research questions from the introduction in this thesis got an answer? The chapter will be easy to follow due to the arrangement where every question is answered separated.

### **7.1 Analysis of the research questions**

One of the research questions in this thesis where: *What is SDs conceptualization of an immigrant?* This is presented below according to the quotes brought up in the result chapter previous.

In the sources that this thesis has highlighted SD points out that immigrants is people who come to Sweden and threatens the society and the Swedish welfare. This is in every quote and statement in this thesis proven. In the first statement in 2013, Åkesson divides people in different groups. He argues that due to mass immigration Sweden have gotten weaker and those to blame is immigrants. This can be referred to a “we and them” debate where people are put in different groups according to if one is a swede or not. In the second quote from 2013 a spokesman for SD is calling dark skinned people from Africa “hell monkeys”. The person is doing a connection between people from Africa and monkeys which in many ways connects with racism. To un humanise a person is a form of making putting other people over certain of people. In this quote there is a hierarchy being made

in the form of that Jimmy Åkesson is calling people for monkeys. One can argue that the choice of words, monkeys and hell, is very much chosen with conscious. This is a way of paint up a picture for the audience whom in their turn gets used to hear these kinds of sayings about human beings. In the quote from 2015 where Åkesson is blaming the fact that immigrants are not swedes is because they do not get jobs is another way of dividing the people and place them in a hierarchy.

If one should try to describe an immigrant with the words from all four quotes it could look something like this: an immigrant is a monkey from hell, who does not have a work. This is because the immigrant is not Swedish and since the immigrant came to Sweden, the country is suffering from more crime and riots than before.

There are not many positive things that the quotes brings up and a picture of an immigrant spreads fast when spokesmen with great power talks about people in this way. It is a dangerous thing to call another human being for an animal (monkey in one of the quotes of this thesis). This makes it clear that the ones making these kinds of statements does not believe that humans, which ever country one origin, has the same value. An animal does not stand equal to the human, so if people starts to see other people like animals it can become a problem.

The second question; *In what way could one see that SD have change their way of portraying immigrants during time?*

The debate has for a long time sounded the same. The party is shouting out their zero tolerance against racism at the same time as racist statements are being made by spokesmen of the political party as well as by the sympathizers of the party. This is now a days a regular happening in Sweden and it does not even get that much attention now a days. The political party have had members who have made statements and acted out on immigrants, and later got suspended from the party because of their behaviours. SD have taken a stand and got a lot of media in these cases and one possibility could have been that they also got new voters and sympathizers by doing this. The question is what to come? This could be just the beginning.

It appears that when it is election year, or close to election, the statements and insults against immigrants get a bit harder and colder. If one evaluate the quotes of this thesis the ones from 2013 are radical and upsetting in the way of portraying immigrants. This is in the year before the election in Sweden, the year the party is out campaigning for votes, they are campaigning hard and does not fear of using these kinds of words to describe immigrants. At the same time as the party, or sympathizers of the party, is calling certain immigrants for monkeys from hell, they are aware of it does not work with only this rhetoric. In the first quote of this thesis the political party is making sure that people know that the party has a soft side as well. Åkesson mentions how the people of Sweden should work together for a functional Sweden.

The third research question is; *How does the SD discourse over time describe the impact of immigrants on Sweden?*

The statement that SD made in 2013, which can be read in the result section above, puts immigrant in a special group who is a threat against the people whom is born in Sweden. It is a clear sectioning off good people and bad people. SD is making up a picture of a perfect country which is Sweden. And the ones coming here brings criminality with them, and the purpose of the criminality and the violence is to hurt our country and to make Sweden weak.

To take advantage of this sort of happening like the refugee wave in 2015 makes sense in a way of when new information and a new cultures contributes to a new society, people is more on guard and if the information tells people that they must be scared and on guard because Sweden is not as safe as it once were since there are new residents in Sweden whom does not share the same traditions, language and culture as the rest of us who are born and raised in Sweden. The fact that the party has kept on growing has resulted in a party which keep on blaming the refugees and immigrants when it comes to violence, the number of rapes being done in Sweden and that Sweden's welfare system is being used in wrong ways and not far along is going to be wrecked.

As written earlier in this thesis, one of SD's most important question is to have a good and reliable welfare system in Sweden. Sweden is one of the top countries in the world when it comes to having a welfare system (The Economist, 2019). The economist mentions that the welfare model combines high taxes, generous welfare, collective

bargaining, high educational standards and a reasonably free-market economy. All this combined together results in high living standards. And this is what SD seems to be frightened to lose if Sweden and Europe are receiving refugees who are threatened to death or experiencing war in their origin countries.

Fourth question: *Did the way SD portrait an immigrant differ from before the crisis 2015?*

If one compare the quotes that has been presented in this thesis the author highlights the fact that the quote from 2013 makes no sense. It is barbaric and badly phrased, there is a tone to it that will make people upset. It feels like Åkesson want to make a headline in the newspaper and contribute to the unstable climate that prevails in Sweden at the moment. The quote from 2015 when Åkesson does not mention refugees nor immigrants as the one to blame for the riots or crimes that is being done in Sweden sends out a form of contemplation. The quote leaves the drawing of a conclusion to the ones who is reading the text. SD could take a step back and chose not to make a radial statement or radical answers to the reporter's question due to the fact that the climate in Sweden and Europe already is unstable. Later, in 2018, which is the last chosen year to collect sources from, the language and rhetoric seems to become more direct and accusatory against especially immigrants. SD, or Åkesson in this quote, blames the fact that people with immigrant backgrounds with no jobs, does not fit in here and it is the fact that they are not Swedes that is the problem.

They make it sound like people who is born in Sweden does not have any problem finding and keeping a job. Again, SD is making a hierarchy where people born in Sweden is way much ranked than people with other origin countries. The year 2018 is an election year for Sweden. One can argue that due to their progress as a political party in the parliament, even though radial statements have been made they choses to continue to go down the same road and put the blame on those who are not originally born in Sweden. The result of the election got SD a third place one again. The way they have chosen to speak and write about immigrants and refugees seems not to have made any sympathizers doubtful, as the writer of this thesis I am wondering if their rhetoric is being used in their favour. The fact that people have gotten used to the language and their choice of words is the

scariest thing, no one gets no longer surprised or even upset while a party in the parliament make radical and racist statements in the media for everyone to read and listen to.

## **7.2 The Swedish essence**

Jimmy Åkesson and SD as a party has been known for its tactics of creating a solidarity and unite Sweden as one people. In their website one can read that human beings are born with a form of essence which is inherent and a part of us. This part makes us who we are and people from other countries have other forms of essences (SD.se, 2018). By saying this and convince people that to be able to live together, in one community, or in one country, people have to adapt. SD mentions the word assimilate frequently in their political party agenda and by this they mean that people who migrate to Sweden, for many of reasons, e.g. moving here for work, to study, seeking asylum and so forth must assimilate to become a swede (SD.se, 2019). This means that they have to neglect their own culture and adapt to the Swedish culture. By making assimilation a central and important thing, one have got to wonder how the party and its sympathizers should have thought of it, if it was the other way around. If Sweden perhaps, in the future, is experiencing a war or a natural disaster and the only way of survival is to flee to a country which you never have visit before, you do not speak their language and you do not share the same culture. How would people react, how important would it be to assimilate? The Swedish essence that SD is talking about would for certain still be on their mind and I have trouble seeing that the ones who have the beliefs that when you come to a new country and will be a part of their society should give up who you are and where you come from and assimilate to a new person in a new unknown country.

## **7.3 Use of words**

According to Foucault's theory the ruling discourse, which is defined as the political power relations today within a society and that the majority succeeds with the task to create and uphold how the world should be interpreted by maintain the discourse (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000, p.24). This can be applied in the quotes above in terms of Jimmie Åkesson is making statements which contribute to a more segregated society than the one that exists today. By using words like; *sammanhållning* (cohesion), *tillsammans* (together), *legitimitet* (legitimacy) and *acceptans* (acceptance) in the first quote from 2013, the quote gets a start which contributes to a sense of positivity, the quote makes sure that people should be included and feel safe. Due to this, the following part of the

quote proceed in a different direction. In this part they are using words such as; splittrats (shattered), internationaliersingen (the internationalisation), massinvandring (mass immigration), övergett (abandoned). These words have in this quote a negative connotation and contribute to a negative experience of immigration to Sweden.

The second quote from 2013 uses phrases and words such as; litar fullständigt (trust completely), uttalande (statement). These are words with a lot of meaning, heavy words, and they are used to bring peace and safety to people. The words have a positive connotation. The quotes refers to an earlier online-chat that a member of the party have had where he had been referring dark skinned Africans to monkeys from hell. The words monkey, and hell is words that contains a negative connotation.

When putting words against each other in the quote from 2015, there are some words with a negative connotation; brottslighet (criminality), förortsupplopp (suburb riot), gängkriminalitet (gang criminality), organiserad brottslighet (organized criminality). These are words and phrases which I think that Åkesson is fully aware of could contribute in their favour. Words like these makes people feel unsafe and when one is feeling unsafe it is easy to question what is really true, and what is best for me and my family? This could be what have happened in Sweden in the last ten to twenty years. People are unsure of what is going to happen, and the instinct of caring and see after one's family becomes priority number one.

The quote from 2018 contain phrases like; do not fit in and they are not swedes. These phrases also contributes to a segregated society. We against them, were we are "the swedes" and them are "the immigrants". If one should think and reason like this, everyone who is born in Sweden share the same values and are in fact better persons. From the start they value a person who is born in Sweden higher in the hierarchy than someone who have been born in perhaps Afghanistan and later ended up in Sweden. There is always a sort of advantage for the people who is born in Sweden.

#### **7.4 The way forward**

If the process of SDs development is taking under consideration one can imagine that their story of success would not end here. Even though they are using radical words to describe immigrants and refugees as well as making statements that contributes to a

segregated society they get more and more voters when election is held in Sweden. It seems like they have found a way that works for them and to change course would obviously make no sense due to the fact that their goal is to grow as a party and to climb the political ladder. Next election in Sweden is in year 2022, how this will unfold is no one who knows. One can only imagine that if the party has come this far now, why should it not be able to gain even more sympathizers and votes in 2022?

## **8. Conclusions**

To sum up this thesis and to point on the direction that possible future thesis could contribute this thesis final part contains thoughts and finding for further research on the subject.

The fact that SD as a party in the parliament has made tremendous progress and growth as a political party is hard to disclaim. Many times, the party have had members, both people with a leading position within the party, as well as people supporting the party (citizens of Sweden) whom have made statements based on stereotypes and racism even though the party's policy takes a stand against these kinds of statements and values. Even though this have happened the party have kept on progressing and gained sympathizers to the party. How far could SD take the immigrant and migration politics and how much right wing propaganda can a country accept before the value of every human life is taking under consideration?

A political party can, if the goal is, grow very fast in a short matter of time. This has SD shown and it has certainly been a successful journey. The party and its way to success could surely be a guide for all political parties to learn from. With every extreme statement SD has made they have also bent the rules of what is accepted and what is not. This is an acknowledgement that me as the author have been processing the march forward as a political party in Sweden. By saying that other political parties should do as SD have done is not to say that radical opinions and right wing politics is the way forward. All though, a clear agenda and a straight politic is to aim for.

As well as for every citizen to know that to convince people requires some sort of power, one can not only blame the right wing political party which in Sweden is called Sverigedemokraterna. Every human being have their own will and their own responsibility to look up fact and to sort fact out and to create a picture that is trustworthy. Everything you know have to have some sort of fundamental truth in the end, gossip is, or at least I learnt as early as a child that gossip is not to be true and should be taking under consideration.

One thing that strikes me as an author and whom have been doing much reading is that the fact that a person whom have been fleeing war and a possible threat becomes the threat (or in fact get pointed out as a threat) when arriving to a new country. This is an insight that could be under consideration while, and if, doing another thesis in relation to this subject because it is sort of a new way of facing a problem that exist. How does a human being react to have been threatened and to become a threat to people without doing any harm to someone? Huysman (2000) have written a journal which explains how migration has developed into a form of security issue in western Europe, and how the European integration process is making it worse.

There could be a thesis done of the learnings by the refugee wave in 2015. What happened? How did the municipalities work together with other authorities to tackle the enormous challenge that Sweden and Europe were facing? How did the people working with this full time experience the amount of work and the quality of the work for example?

For the future, and for future challenges like refugee waves and natural disasters, Sweden and Europe must have a plotted way on how we are going to work and do the best we can for the ones in need. The truth is that Sweden managed to handle the refugee wave in 2015, but, it could have gone smoother, for sure. There has to be a prepared plan when something like this happen again, because it is only a matter of time.

This thesis started out with a PM that contained thoughts about reaching out to females with immigrat background who is voting for SD. This is in fact the subject that thrills me the most due there are a lot of values that SD stands for that does not goes hand in hand with the fact that you are a woman with immigrant background. It would have been interesting to see which political questions they find most interesting and what their

thoughts about SDs immigration and migration politics are. Another topic to raise with the participants is how they feel about SDs politics regarding women's rights.

## Reference

Adams, R. (2017). *Michel Foucault: Discourse*. [online] Critical Legal Thinking. Available at: <http://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/11/17/michel-foucault-discourse/> [Accessed 21 Dec. 2018].

Aftonbladet. (2015). *Åkesson kan inte svara på om brotten ökat*. [online] Available at: <https://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/a/Onaq53/akesson-kan-inte-svara-pa-om-brotten-okat> [Accessed 28 Apr. 2019].

Aftonbladet. (2018). *SD och SVT i möte efter storbråket i debatten*. [online] Available at: <https://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/a/WL5v6K/sd-och-svt-i-mote-efter-storbraket-i-debatten> [Accessed 18 Mar. 2019].

Aftonbladet. (2018). *DEBATT: Rör inte vårt folkhem, Jimmie Åkesson*. [online] Available at: <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/J1ygWX/ror-inte-vart-folkhem-jimmie-akesson> [Accessed 25 Feb. 2019].

Aichholzer, J., & Zandonella, M. (2016). Psychological bases of support for radical right parties. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 96, 185–190.

Aisch, G., Pearce, A. and Rousseau, B. (2017). *How Far Is Europe Swinging to the Right?*. [online] Nytimes.com. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/05/22/world/europe/europe-right-wing-austria-hungary.html> [Accessed 2 Feb. 2019].

Berelson, B (1952). *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. New York: Free Press  
Castles, J, De Haas, H and Miller, M (2014) *The age of migration*

Dagenssamhalle.se. (2013). *Jimmie Åkesson: Även svenskar behöver assimileras*. [online] Available at: <https://www.dagenssamhalle.se/nyhet/jimmie-akesson-aeven-svenskar-behoever-assimileras-4727> [Accessed 8 Apr. 2019].

Data.val.se. (2018). *Röster - Val 2018*. [online] Available at: <https://data.val.se/val/val2018/slutresultat/R/rike/index.html> [Accessed 12 Dec. 2018].

Data.val.se. (2019). *Preliminär - Val 2019*. [online] Available at: <https://data.val.se/val/ep2019/prelresultat/E/rike/index.html> [Accessed 27 May 2019].

Data.val.se. (2019). *Röster - Val 2019*. [online] Available at: <https://data.val.se/val/ep2019/slutresultat/E/rike/index.html> [Accessed 27 May 2019].

Delby, J. and Wrede, M. (2013). *Jimmie Åkesson: Även svenskar behöver assimileras*. [online] Dagenssamhalle.se. Available at: <https://www.dagenssamhalle.se/nyhet/jimmie-akesson-aeven-svenskar-behoever-assimileras-4727> [Accessed 23 Apr. 2019].

Elgenius, G., & Rydgren, J. (2017). The Sweden Democrats and the ethno-nationalist rhetoric of decay and betrayal. *Sociologisk Forskning*, 4, 353–358.

Hedemark, Åse (2009). *Det föreställda folkbiblioteket [Elektronisk resurs] : en diskursanalytisk studie av biblioteksdebatter i svenska medier 1970-2006*. Diss. Uppsala : Uppsala universitet, 2009.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Available at: <https://www.mah.se/Nyheter/Nyhetsarkiv/Sa-vinner-Sverigedemokraterna-valjare-och-politisk-makt/> [Accessed 20 Dec. 2018].

Huysmans, J. (2000). The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(5), pp.751-777.

Institutet för framtidsstudier (2018). *Sverigedemokraternas väljare. Vilka är de, var kommer de ifrån och vart är de på väg?*. [online] Available at: [https://www.iffs.se/media/22379/forskningsrapport\\_2018\\_2.pdf](https://www.iffs.se/media/22379/forskningsrapport_2018_2.pdf) [Accessed 4 Apr. 2019].

Jørgensen, M. and Phillips, L. (2010). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE.

Lindgren, Simon (2011). *Populärkultur: Teorier, metoder och analyser*. Malmö: Liber AB.

Orban, L. (2016). *Så vinner Sverigedemokraterna väljare och politisk makt - Malmö universitet*. [online] Mah.se. Available at:

Scheibelhofer, P. (2017). 'It won't work without ugly pictures': images of othered masculinities and the legitimisation of restrictive refugee-politics in Austria. *NORMA*, [online] 12(2), pp.96-111. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/18902138.2017.1341222> [Accessed 5 Feb. 2019].

Sverigedemokraterna. (2019). [online] Available at: <https://eu.sd.se/> [Accessed 21 May 2019].

Sverigedemokraterna. (2019). [online] Available at: <https://eu.sd.se/asyl-och-omvard/> [Accessed 15 May. 2019].

Sverigedemokraterna. (2019). *Vad vi vill*. [online] Available at: <https://sd.se/vad-vi-vill/> [Accessed 26 May 2019].

SVT Nyheter. (2013). *Åkesson vägrar svara om "aphelveten"-skandalen*. [online] Available at: <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/utrikes/akesson-om-aphelveten-skandalen> [Accessed 26 Apr. 2019].

The Economist. (2019). *Immigration is changing the Swedish welfare state*. [online]  
Available at: <https://www.economist.com/europe/2017/06/08/immigration-is-changing-the-swedish-welfare-state> [Accessed 14 May 2019].

Wæver, Ole. 2014, Securitization theory – international relations. [online].  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wQ07tWOzE\\_c](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wQ07tWOzE_c) [Accessed 18 nov 2018].



# Appendix

## Bilaga A 2013

”– Folkhemstanken är något som verkligen tilltalar mig, det känns som att alla gett upp den. Jag förstår inte att socialdemokratin gjort det. Kärnan i folkhemstanken är sammanhållning, att vi bygger något tillsammans. Det var det som gjorde att det fanns en legitimitet och acceptans för de gigantiska sociala reformerna i Sverige.

– Nu har det svenska samhället splittrats – genom internationaliseringen, genom massinvandringen och genom att marxister och liberaler tagit över och övergett den socialkonservatism som genomsyrade alla partier före 1968”  
(Dagenssamhalle.se, 2013).

## Bilaga B 2013

*Är det rasistiskt att säga aphelveten om människor?*

– Det beror helt och hållet på vad man har för utgångspunkt för att man säger så, säger Åkesson till SVT:s Kristina Lagerström efter dagens vårtal på Långholmen.

*Du menar att det inte behöver vara rasistiskt?*

– När det gäller den historien har vår gruppledning i riksdagen gjort ett väldigt tydligt uttalande som jag ställer mig bakom. Jag har fullt förtroende för de som gjort det uttalandet.

*Men vad säger du om ett uttryck som aphelveten?*

– Jag säger ingenting annat än vad vår gruppledning i Sveriges riksdag har sagt. Jag ställer mig bakom det uttalandet och har fullt förtroende för de som har gjort det uttalandet.

*Tar du avstånd från det uttrycket?*

– Jag har inget annat uttalande än det uttalande som vår gruppledning i Sveriges riksdag har gjort. Jag ställer mig bakom det uttalandet och jag har fullt förtroende för de som har gjort det uttalandet.

## Bilaga C 2015

**Enligt Brottsförebyggande rådet har statistiken för våldsbrott inte ökat nämnvärt sedan sjuttioalet. Hur tycker du att din retorik rimmar med det?**

”Jag tycker dels att, att ... mm ... Våldigt många människor upplever en situation i dag där man har en annan karaktär på brottsligheten. Den här typen av förortsupplopp är ett förhållandevis nytt fenomen i Sverige. Den här typen av gängkriminalitet och organiserad brottslighet är också förhållandevis nytt” (Aftonbladet, 2015).

## Bilaga D 2018

– Vi lyfter inte orsaken till att invandrare inte får jobb. Det är för att de inte är svenskar och de passar inte in i Sverige” (Aftonbladet.se 2018).