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Abstract

Immigration is a phenomena with increasing importance today, with a larger number of immigrants coming to Europe than in several decades. How nation states in Europe handle this is essential for the development of their respective society as well as for international relations and the shaping of public opinion around the globe. A crucial question is how immigrant's, with the inevitable culture that comes with them, are perceived; are they seen as individuals that could bring possible benefits to the destination state, or rather as something to be overcome once integrated to the society?

Sweden and Britain are two states with a history of having a multicultural approach towards immigrants. Multiculturalism in the meaning of state-minority relations that allow and celebrate differences in cultures and facilitates the distinctive practises and rights of these cultures. It is essentially seen as a liberal alternative towards assimilation. On the other side of multiculturalism civic integration is found, with the view that immigrants should adjust to the culture of their destination state once immigrated. Kymlicka and Banting argue that a liberal form of civic integration is becoming of importance in many nations, compatible and layered on top of existing multicultural policies. Joppke on the other hand, argues that multiculturalism is failing throughout Europe, blamed for segregation and extremism.

This study of political discourse shows that Sweden is a state with relatively similar discourse as their high score on MCP index indicates. Differences due to spokespersons can be detected but the overall result is showing consistently multicultural values. In Britain on the other hand the story is not as solid. Government representatives are not as consistent with one and other, all dimensions of the scale detected. In both states, however more frequently in Britain – statements are inconclusive. The British representatives of the government claim incompatible aspects of multiculturalism and civic integration. This is believed to be due to populist reasons, in so called mainstream politics, something the Prime Minister of Britain has been accused for before, both from opposition and scholars.

Important findings concerning that assumptions made on the failure of multiculturalism, is detected to be precipitous. It is reasonable to believe that this could be detected in other European countries as well, why further research is necessary.
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1. Introduction

Since World War II, immigration has been drastically increasing in Europe. It is a comprehensive element affecting political, as well as cultural and economic spheres. Primarily western industrialized democracies are the final destination for millions of immigrants from less developed countries. Ever since immigration came to the centre of European politics it has been a political debate with divided views on multiple questions related to the issue; how a nation state should act upon the massive immigration; in what way immigrants are best integrated; how immigrants are valued based on their culture, which all together is characterised by diversity.\[1\]

Since the trend of immigration is on the uprising, these questions are very relevant. Relevant in the matter of looking at how the immigrants cultures are perceived. The way immigrants, and their cultures are perceived is likely to affect the way they are treated and integrated in their destination country. Therefore, it is also a necessary starting point when investigating these types of questions.

Immigration as well as integration generates public debate and attention, especially among the elite decision-makers – the government leaders. According to many scholars the public opinion is closely connected to the opinion of the leaders. For instance, Baum and Potter present the theory of the relationship between public opinion and elite leaders, explaining it with the role of the media. The media gets its information primarily from political leaders, to account for the supply of information. However, the information given to the media is often pre-packed and comes with a certain framing that the elite politicians prefer the media to present to the public. On the other hand, the media relies on the public's demand since they are essentially the consumers of the given information, wishing for unframed information.\[2\]

Based on the views that the public is affected by its political leaders, it is interesting to investigate the opinion of those elite individuals, as well as what and who they claim to represent, in a systematic study. If a party or a government claims to be an advocate for a certain ideology it is clearly of importance to investigate in a systematic study of what is said by the political leaders is coherent with the outspoken ambition of the government. In

---

comparing the rhetoric used to talk about multiculturalism and to what extent that is within a positive or negative connotation.

Are immigrants in Europe seen as individuals that possibly bring benefits in economic, social and cultural matters due to their different perspectives and experiences? Is it perceived as the nation state can benefit from immigrants language and culture? Are their cultures celebrated in ways that are perceived as something desirable to preserve or are their cultures rather seen as something to overcome; something to be changed into the lines of the general values of the nation state they immigrated to? This area of research is the area where this study aims to contribute with a systematic investigation of the European discourse in the multicultural matter.

There has been a large interest in questions concerning integration approach in Europe in the recent decade, both academically and publicly. One influential idea is the one about a general backlash against multiculturalism, and the so called failure of multiculturalism. Joppke for instance, represents the idea that a more mandatory and coercive force of civic integration is on the uprising in most places in Europe. Despite the large interest devoted to the issue, the discourse in has not been investigated systematically, particularly not in the recent turbulent years of mass immigration to Europe. The discourse underpins the cohesion of the entire society and likely the degree of policies regulating multiple cultures towards multicultural or civic integration ideals. However, this is still little understood. In addition, there is an absence of comparative work comparing regarding the discourse presented by the elite political leaders. Hence, there are still some unsolved questions, such as what a systematic investigation of the matter would result in. I therefore seek to compare the discourse concerning multiculturalism in Sweden and Britain, aiming to find out if there are any substantial differences in the approaches to multiculturalism. Asking the question if the assumptions made, of ideological differences between the two countries, are real in the discourse.

1.1. Case selection

Sweden and Britain both had a linguistically and relatively culturally homogeneous
population historically, but in similar matters they grew more multicultural post World War II\(^4\). Previous research often identifies specifically Sweden and Britain as states with a multicultural approach. The term multiculturalism is often used in contexts of recent change in Western states and refers primarily to states attempts to integrate people with different cultural background and to make sure they can live in accordance with their respective culture and lifestyle. Ideologically multiculturalism is more or less a liberal alternative to assimilation\(^5\).

The multiculturalism approach adopted by Britain has been supported by several scholars. For instance, Favell claims that Britain sees integration as managing relations between majority and minority in order to allow people to live by their cultures\(^6\). Hargreaves arrives at similar conclusions, claiming that the policy makers in Britain tend to accept race and ethnicity when they adopt an approach regulation on how to handle multiple cultures and relations. Britain thereby cultivated multiculturalism in order to integrate immigrants and acknowledge their cultural, religious and social differences from the native population\(^7\).

As for Sweden, Ålund refers to the country as an expressively multi-ethnic society and claims that the integration within the borders is associated with modern development\(^8\). Similarly Runblom refers to Sweden as one of the countries with the most tendencies towards multiculturalism in the world, and a place where the term multiculturalism has a positive connotation, differentiating itself from many other European countries where the connotation is rather negative\(^9\).

The Multicultural Policy Index (MCP) is a specially designed index to measure the extent to which policies within a state can be addressed as multicultural. It is relevant in this study due to the facilitation to compare political discourse to reality of policies. Both Sweden and

---

Britain lie in the very top of this index, with a number of 7 and 5.5 out of 8; 8 being full multicultural policies\textsuperscript{10}.

In Britain the index was unchanged between 2000 and 2010, that is with a rating of 5.5 out of 8, and in Sweden it actually rose from 5 to 7. The unchanged score of Britain might seem surprising considering the rhetoric used by the political elite in Britain the previous decade. This in particular since Tony Blair's declaration of war against terrorism in 2005 and its unintentional consequences for alienating British Muslims\textsuperscript{11}. Something that some researchers claim that the current Prime Minister David Cameron leverage. For instance, Malik contends that Cameron uses multiculturalism to fuel his success in his 'mainstream politics', using it to divide the population\textsuperscript{12}. This statement is made without any reference to actual scenarios or statements by Cameron, which is an additional reason why it is of use to investigate it further. Sweden on the other hand, being widely recognized as the country of tolerance and acceptance is on the contrary a more likely case to have a discourse in which multiculturalism is widely referred to as something positive\textsuperscript{13}.

1.2. Research question

The purpose of the study is to highlight possible differences in the political discourse in Sweden and Britain. In addition, Sweden is assumed to be a most likely case of having a non-hostile and positive discourse concerning multiculturalism in relation to immigration while Britain is presumed to be a least likely case of having a positive discourse towards multiculturalism. The explicit research question is therefore: “How does the political discourse look in Sweden and Britain, concerning multiculturalism and civic integration?”

To answer the research question following questions must be addressed:

- Is the concept of multiculturalism or civic integration mainly addressed in a positive or negative connotation by respective government?

\textsuperscript{10} Kymlicka, Will & Banting, Keith. 2013. \textit{Is there really a retreat from multiculturalism policies? New evidence from the multiculturalism policy index}. Comparative European Politics. Vol.11, No.5. 577-598.


\textsuperscript{13} Reinfeldt, Fredrik. 2013-10-10. \textit{Global Conversation}. 
How do the governments frame the positive or negative aspects? (what is the problem, the background, and solution to the problem?)

What actions do the political leaders for the government’s claim to have undertaken, which are in line with the ideal type of multiculturalism, or the opposite?

1.3. Delimits
Multiculturalism can be seen in a broader sense than the one connected to immigration. However, this study is delimited to the use of multiculturalism and civic integration as concepts in relation to immigration. It is thereby not limited to the actual wording, but to the meaning of it. The material used in the study consists of immigration debates, pleadings, speeches and other relevant and comparable material.

This study aims to investigate the discourse in the year of 2015. It was a year when Europe experienced a large wave of immigration, a similar amount of migration in Europe has not figured since World War II. This is a factor contributing to the time limit. Multiculturalism was during 2015 often used in relation to immigration and integration. The limits of it in relation to immigration and year 2015 is therefore both practically and with relevance to the statements. MCP Index latest measurement was made in 2010. I argue, due to the relative close proximity in time, that the measurements made in 2010 are still relevant for the discourse in 2015. In addition, the discourse of 2015 can likely give a hint on where the multicultural policies, and ways of integration, are heading.

2. Method
In this part I will firstly argue that multiculturalism is a concept with many meanings and interpretations. Some refer to multiculturalism as reality based policies while others refer to it as an ideology. Some refer to it as normative, some as factual. I will argue that these differentiating definitions all lie on the same grounds, which will be formulated in the section about the ideal types. Another source of discord is the question whether multiculturalism is desired or something that only leads to harm and undesirable consequences if adopted by a nation state. Since this is the matter in focus for the purpose of this study, I will have a discussion about this as well as presenting in more detail one accredited and relatively straightforward definition; the MCP index. That will lead us to the framework of this study,
and the exact methods that will be used to find the answer to the question about how governments in Sweden and Britain are presenting their political discourse.

2.1. MCP Index

The MCP Index is an especially designed index to measure to what extent policies within a state can be addressed as multicultural – multiculturalism referred to as prevalence of certain policies where liberal states made a choice to go beyond anti-discrimination, and implement positive freedom for minorities. The eight indicators given to mark the index for immigrant minorities are:

“1. Constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels
2. The adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum
3. The inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing
4. Exemptions from dress codes, either by statute or by court cases
5. Allowing of dual citizenship
6. The funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities
7. The funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction
8. Affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.”"14

The creators of MCP index, Kymlicka and Banting, recognize the fact that this index cannot be seen as complete and comprehensive, but claim that it gives an indisputable sense of in what direction the possible multicultural policies are aiming15. Index only measures positive MCPs, meaning that there is a possibility that the span is even greater. This is because the states actually implementing negative MCPs are the one's less positive towards multiculturalism in the first place16.

The index presents statistics about Sweden and Britain as well as for 19 other Western states measured at three points of time; 1980, 2000 and 2010. The scale stretches from 0 to 8 – 8 being full multicultural policies. Neither Sweden nor Britain saw a decrease in the MCP index

15 Ibid. p. 577-598.
16 Ibid. p. 585.
between the years of 2000 and 2010. This in spite of a seemingly more hostile discourse environment for immigrants and their cultures in both countries. ‘The war against terrorism’ announced by Tony Blair in the British case. The Swedish environment can also be argued to have become more hostile towards immigration since the entering of the xenophobic party of the Swedish Democrats in the Swedish Parliament in 2010, and before that being in the centre of attention of Swedish politics. What makes the two cases different and interesting to investigate together using the same tool for analysis is the assumed different use of rhetoric. While Britain uses a hostile tone against multiculturalism, Sweden is more careful when addressing immigrant issues and policy. This despite small difference between the two in the MCP index.

2.2. Definitions

No universally accepted definition of MCP exists, and no completely clear line that distinguish MCPs from other similar policies and policy actions\textsuperscript{17}. Bloemraad, Korteweg and Gökçe concretise the difficulties of one single definition of multiculturalism. They mention four different definitions they consider most frequently occurring in the literature; as a demographic description of the society; as an ideology where diversity should be celebrated; policies undertaken by institutions or governments; a normative political theory which sets out principles for governing in heterogeneous societies. The meaning varies from context to context\textsuperscript{18}.

Will Kymlicka on the other hand, makes a connection between liberalism and multiculturalism, meaning that the two are necessarily interconnected but multiculturalism is not an ideology by its own means\textsuperscript{19}. Tariq Modood is not far away in his definitions claiming multiculturalism is not an ideology:

"Multiculturalism is a mode of integration that can be contrasted with other modes, such as assimilation, individualist integration, and cosmopolitanism; and, like the others, it is based on

\textsuperscript{17} Kymlicka, Will & Banting, Keith. 2013. \textit{Is there really a retreat from multiculturalism policies? New evidence from the multiculturalism policy index}. Comparative European Politics. Vol.11, No.5. p. 581.


Another scholar, Malik, addresses multiculturalism as something in which the consequences must be addressed for a comprehensive definition. Some decades ago Europe was embracing multiculturalism and the diversity following immigration. Today a growing number considers multiculturalism to be the root of social problems rather than the solution for them, populist politicians making use of that type of rhetoric where multiculturalism functions as a trigger to fuel extremism. Sometimes multiculturalism is even accused of social isolation, poor integration in society, and even political radicalization.

It is not entirely unproblematic to use cultures to frame the discourse of multiculturalism. Many kinds of groups can have cultures. The kind of culture generally most relevant for multiculturalism is the culture of ethnic groups. Religion and language are included because both are so often a part of given group's ethno culture. Race is more distinct from culture, but minority ethnic groups are often racially distinct from what often is referred to as “national groups”, in Europe and United States contexts.

2.3. Material

The main material is constituted by statements in Parliament and official speeches by government leaders in relevant positions. All material is gathered directly for respective government, in Britain from Hansard and the government's official website, in Sweden from protocols in Sveriges Riksdag and the Social Democrats official website. The authenticity of the documents is important for the reliability of the study. However, it is not perceived as an issue in this study, due to the selection of material is made from solely governments websites and precise transcriptions of statements. The reliability is based on the publicity and accessibility of the material. In addition, both countries had a coalition government for all or parts of 2015, consisting of two parties each. This is however not a basis for selection of material. Instead, the ministerial post is of relevance, due to the purpose of investigating the government view and not specific party views.

The selection of material is made to reflect the current state of the discourse. The statements can be assumed to represent the true view of the governments due to the fact that it is reasonable to believe that in every separate statement, politicians are trying to get their message to the public. The statements are surely well prepared and carefully constructed by the governments to reflect the governments view, ensuring the credibility of this study. With this logic all separate statements are representative by itself. There might be numerous statements equally relevant that could reflect the current state of the discourse, but it does not affect the validity of this study. However, the reasonable objection is if there might be other statements contradicting the results found in this study, which I consider unlikely. The material consists of several varied statements and representatives, to get a really good picture of the standing point of each government. Together, they constitute a comparable, representative discourse. In addition, practical reasons played a part in the selection; being the accessibility and the likeliness that my interpretations of the statements are correct.

### 2.4. Framework for analysis

#### 2.4.1. Ideal types

This study objects to investigate the discourse by using ideal types, to find ideological aspects within a political area. The ideals presented here are general, and chosen because of their relevance. Using the ideal types will help organising the statements of the actors as well as determine if the statement in question does not contain in the constructed ideal types.

Positive aspects of this method are that it makes systematic comparisons easier and facilitates the overview. It brings order to the material, which is possible only since the ideal type are carefully and systematically constructed. Negatively is the possible problem with subjectivity – the questions asked in the analysis tool are steered by my perspective. Subjectivity can also reveal itself in a temptation to stretch the meaning of the statements so it fits into the model; to see the material from the ideal type point of view and not for what it actually is. This would constitute a validity problem and skewed results which must be avoided at all causes. This is handled by constantly having a systematic approach in the selection of material as well as throughout the following analysis. By being transparent while doing this, subjectivity is not a problem.
A second criticism to this type of way of analysing material is that it can be unclear if the framework is a pre-constructed model or a result of the study. If the outcome of the study has the character of a result it is not an analyse tool\textsuperscript{24}. This is not a prevalent issue in this study since the ideal types are made up by general and often used ideas about multiculturalism and civic integration, which makes is very hard to argue that they are a result of the study rather than pre-constructed.

The purpose of the method is to see to what extent the ideal type of multiculturalism is performed in the cases and to examine the relation between ideas and actors. To perform the study and construct the analysis tool properly, a counter part to the ideal type of multiculturalism must exist; something opposite of multiculturalism. This counterpart here is chosen to be civic integration.

**Civic integration** is in a way an alternative to diversity and plurality. Main features include active integration in all areas of society; political, economic and social to the mainstream. Typically including adjusting to, or at least have full respect for, basic democratic and liberal values and employment. For example, requirements of knowledge about the host country's language, history, norms, institutions etc. Kymlicka and Banting claim: “Implicitly if not explicitly, civic integration is presented as if it is incompatible at some deep level with a multicultural approach.”\textsuperscript{25}

The civic integration ideal type asserts that an individual's or a group's attachment to one's origin and culture, whether being origin country, religion, traditions, values etc. is an obstacle to become successfully integrated into the destination state. This is occasionally adverted as civic integration, occasionally with other terms as for instance naturalization or assimilation. The view is that the national identity is not compatible with the immigrant's prior identity. Instead immigrants must surrender, or at least subordinate their prior identity to the national one in the host society. This can be seen in for example banning of dual citizenships, strictness of civic integration test of language and state history, specific dress codes etc\textsuperscript{26}.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid. p. 589.
Civic integration sets out to solve problems of segregation and parallel societies not yet adjusted to the 'mainstream national society'. Here, a parallel to the Dutch case is convenient to illustrate the possible strong and powerful shift from strongly multicultural to hard civic integration with a clear and strenuous focus on high demands on immigrants with severe restrictions. The Dutch case of a more mandatory and coercive force of civic integration Joppke claims is on the uprising in most places in Europe27.

Similarly, De Azevedo and Sannino describe civic integration (although referring to it as assimilation model of integration) by using the French case and the French integration model. They note that civic integration alludes to making immigrants French, in all public areas of life. Their cultural or religious differences normatively should be practised and viewed only in the private sphere. They will have same rights and formal opportunities and since they are assimilated into French citizen, by means of French culture. Their ethnicity and cultural differences play a significantly less important role than in the one of multiculturalism. What is instead essential is that the immigrants adjust to the values and to the behaviour of the host country in order to have these equal rights and opportunities of citizen28.

**Multiculturalism** is a tradition of thinking about cultural pluralism and its relation to minority rights.

“Multiculturalism in society deals with normative and policy responses of recognition, support, and accommodation for ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic, and national groups, generally as minority groups within the borders of a given nation-state.”29

In the ideal of multiculturalism it is defined as a phenomenon that should be celebrated. The phenomena meaning the state and ideas state-minority rights. Essentially multiculturalism is going on the far side of simple civil rights and anti-discrimination and advocates positive freedom for minorities by “public recognition and support for minorities to express their distinct identities and practises”30. Since multiculturalism here is not only about policies,

30 Ibid. p.550-554.
rather about a certain thinking and perceiving that likely lead to a set of multicultural policies which reflect a certain type of state-minority relations, multiculturalism in this sense touches the point of being an ideology.

De Azevedo and Sannino says this about the multicultural model:

“[It] does not follow a model of assimilation, but of equal opportunities for everyone, irrespective of colour and ethnic origin and of cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance. This model is occasionally referred to as "multicultural" or "pluralistic integration." 31

The ones being fond of the concept of multiculturalism would therefore be the ones celebrating its benefits and liberal value. Kymlicka for example strongly associates multiculturalism with liberalism and its core values saying:

“[Multiculturalism] has become increasingly clear that minority rights cannot be subsumed under the category of human rights. Traditional human rights standards are simply unable to resolve some of the most important and controversial questions relating to cultural minorities.” 32

These aspects not being covered in human rights are for example recognized languages, internal boundaries for self-governing regions, educational questions, national or ethnic proportionality in representation etc. This view is not uncommon by advocates of multiculturalism. We return to the specific indicators of this ideal type later in the text.

Liberal civic integration: The ideal types on this scale multiculturalism – civic integration can be viewed as dimensions. This is suitable for a study in this matter due to the fact that rarely a country is only one or the other; full multiculturalism or full civic integration. This is coherent with the whole idea of using ideal types as analytical tools to define certain traits. The ideal types are theoretically possible to achieve but at the same time they are rarely, if ever, found outside of the theory in the real world. This way of thinking is often associated with the sociologist Max Weber's way of using the term, i.e. a form of social construction of the mind 33.

Banting and Kymlicka addresses this in between form of civic integration and multiculturalism in specifically the chosen cases for this study.

“By contrast, some countries with long-standing MCPs – Like Sweden and Britain – have adopted forms of civic integration policies that are more voluntary and pluralistic.”

Here they are referring to a “multicultural form of civic integration”. This is a liberal version of civic integration, usually layered on top of older multicultural policies. Somewhat contradicting Banting and Kymlicka argue that multiculturalism and a liberal form of civic integration is actually compatible. They claim that when looking historically, mainly on Canada and Australia, liberal civic integration policies have been layered over the older multicultural one's creating a type of 'multicultural integration' resting on liberal values of freedom and voluntary. The difference between this liberal type of civic integration and civic integration, described above, is the grounds of obligatory and illiberal approaches. Also a matter of if the integration processes and policies are a matter of duties or rights for immigrants. Banting and Kymlicka strongly argue that these types of liberal civic integration policies are increasing in the major part of European countries.

2.4.2. Indicators

Specific indicators are presented in order to make the study transparent and systematic.

- What is the main message of the statement the speaker wants the listener to get?

Is the main message completely, mainly or partly advocating or criticizing multiculturalism or civic integration? Based on the aspects described in the ideal types above.

- Is the statement relating to specific situations, possible scenarios or specific persons from a minority culture coexisting within national borders? If yes, how are they presented?

Does the statement say anything about how people should act individually upon the phenomena presented? Does it say anything about governments' normative action upon the...
situations?

- How is multiculturalism and/or immigrants generally spoken of? In relation to what broader aspects?

Immigrants coming explicitly or implicitly with cultures from their origin etc. (see culture definition above). Individuals are here seen as bearer of cultures. In relation to crime, economic decline, non-beneficial scenarios or positive diversity, cultural enrichment and labour force?

Here is multiculturalism as a concept rather than a term, meaning it can be referred to as cultural diversity, integration, separate ways of living (with reference to ethnicity, religion and language) etc. The naming of the concept can also be used to draw conclusions about their interpretations of it.

- Is the statement referring to any of the eight indicators of the MCP index?

Are the indicators presented as something normative or to be avoided? Should the society look or change towards or against the multicultural indicators?

Multiple features must be considered when addressing the indicators. Firstly, are there any hidden relations that could possibly affect what is being said? Is the speaker for instance obliged to any external part at the time of the statement? Or is the speaker claiming to represent someone else than oneself? Secondly, the tone and body language can show a lot about the meaning and the message. Same goes for the precise wording of the information. Would a different wording of the same information have resulted in a different discourse being privileged? The statement must also be considered in terms of the context in which it is made, for example counterpart of the potential debate or answer to a certain question. The starting point for each statement will always be to approach it from the previous description of the concepts/ideal types.

If a statement has some features or parts that fits in both the multiculturalism and civic integration it cannot be pre-assumed that it is in the middle of the scale; liberal civic integration. This because mixing two extremes, multiculturalism and civic integration does not necessarily make liberal civic integration. Although it is possible to combine
multiculturalism with more liberal features of civic integration policies, layered over pre-existing multicultural policies, as Kymlicka and Banting puts it. It can not be excluded that the rhetoric is non-coherent and used for populist purposes, which is not a reliable basis for arguing that the discourse is in the mid-range of the scale.

The way of reacting to this seemingly paradoxical statements is instead to looking at the straggled statements in relation to another. If the statements are directly connected and refer to the previous it can be seen as liberal civic integration. For example, a statement like “it is important that minorities are protected, but they also need to respect the state law” will be categorised as liberal civic integration. If on the other hand, a statements as “it is important that minorities are protected” and “there is no room for minorities to affect the praxis by law” will be seen as incoherent.

Lastly, reality is rarely completely conclusive with theory, therefore the indicators might not always be applicable, that is not seen as a sign of bad indicators, rather the opposite.

3. Political discourse in Sweden

In Sweden, the issue of integration is a common subject in many contexts, debates as well as live speeches and hearings. It is a question that pervades the Swedish political discourse not solely in immigration and integration matters. Stefan Löfven is the main representative for the Swedish government, hence the focus on his statements. Although, Löfven's statements are in general similar, sometimes by exact wording, which is why very similar statements are not repeated. It is also a valid reason why other ministers is of large interest as well. The ministers chosen here are relevant due to their respective responsibility in the Swedish government. They are responsible for how and in what contexts immigration is addressed, in education, employment and democratic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement – Political leader and date</th>
<th>Indicator 1 – Main message</th>
<th>Indicator 2 – Specific situation</th>
<th>Indicator 3 – Generally speaking</th>
<th>Indicator 4 – Relation to MCP index indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Key Points</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Integration in relation to the labour market is mainly addressed. Integration in the workforce is implicitly seen by Löfven as crucial for the overall social integration. The main message is that the solution is reforms helping immigrants to establish, problem being immigrants cannot get a job in Sweden with the background that they have low education. The reforms suggested are education in the Swedish language, subsidized employment forms and validation of competence. Focus is here on what Sweden can do in the labour market, to help immigrants integrate in society. It seems to be for the sake of the immigrant's rather than for Sweden, hence it is not to impose guilt upon immigrants to learn and integrate, as is more of the case in civic integration. Löfven is advocating Sweden's role in creating opportunities for immigrants, to be able to work. These are all signs of liberal civic integration.

No specific situation is mentioned and the eight MCP indicators are only moderately highlighted, consequently these indicators are not applicable. However, much is said in general about immigrant’s ability. One aspect in focus is what immigrants can bring in terms of desirable labour to Sweden's workforce. Another is Sweden's (primarily government and
parties of the labour market) responsibility to actualize job opportunities. This is referred as a “strengthening message” for the Swedish model.

Generally speaking, Löfven addresses immigrants in multiple ways, seemingly inconclusive. Multicultural in the sense of seeing values in people from other cultures in terms of desirable workforce. Liberal civic integration in the sense of integration being a two-way street with responsibilities of both host-society and immigrant and the extensive language education, not clear if this should be mandatory or voluntary.

**Statement 2:** Prime Minister Stefan Löfven. Speech in Government Statement 2016. 15-09-2015.

Main message is addressing the rights of immigrants, rather than the duties. Immigrants have a right to early Swedish language training, validation of their competence and fast tracks into the labour market. Second focus is that refugees have a right to start new lives in Sweden, which will change Sweden in terms of demographic development. This is coded as multiculturalism due to the fact that it is accepted, and even partly celebrated, and that Sweden is changing because of immigration. If by contrast, it was a sign of civic integration this would not be addressed due to the assumed or desirable assimilation of immigrant into a “general Swedish citizen”, not differentiating themselves in terms of cultures, experiences or perspectives. These people are referred to by Löfven “what is now a challenge, will be an asset for Sweden” [my translation]. The right to work, not the duty, is strongly emphasized. The integration methods refereed to is mainly liberal civic integration.

Specific situations are referred to in terms of hate crimes, specifically towards religious groups and Romani people. This is explained to happen due to the prejudice of nationals. This discrimination of cultures, sometimes in terms of religious communities, is strongly condemned by Löfven. This touches upon anti-discrimination which is not investigated here, although the right to practise their culture makes the statement coded as multiculturalism. Löfven also talks in very general terms: “In Sweden you have a right to be precisely who you are. It should be safe for everyone, no matter sex, identity or expression, ethnic belonging, religion or other belief system” [my translation]. Emphasized is the shared responsibility to stand up for this right, and everyone's equal value in everyday life.
MCP indicators are not specifically addressed. When possibly addressed, it is too implicit to draw conclusion upon.


The main message is clearly the importance of entering the labour market for newly arrived immigrants to Sweden, not very surprising coming from the minister of Employment. Also mapping of immigrant’s competences is central, these combined make up a mainly liberal civic integration approach to immigrants.

In this statement, what touches the research question in the clearest way is the claim that Sweden is changing due to immigration. Johansson: “Sweden is on the edge of a major construction of society” [my translation], this is because of the change in reality that Sweden is adapting to. Message is that this is a positive process and brings big opportunities. In the way how immigrants with their cultures are here generally presented, it is clear that they are resources that will change Sweden for the better.

Due to Johannsons seemingly limited view in her position, MCP indicators and specific situations are not addressed.

**Statement 4:** Prime Minister Stefan Löfven. Speech to *Fredens ring* (manifestation for everyone's equal value) 2015-02-27.

Main message from Löfven is to defend certain values, identified as national Swedish values. Here the context needs to be addressed, which likely affected the focus and partly the actual content in the statement.

Löfven claims that regardless of religion and culture, people in Sweden share the same values. Since this is made without further basis it can be assumed that Löfven is of opinion that once immigrated to Sweden, Swedish values are adopted – a sign of civic integration. This could be in relation to Swedish-born religious people, although I make the assumption it implicitly concerns both immigrated and Swedish-born individuals.

Löfven addresses MCP indicator 4, concerning exemptions from dress codes when he condemns people not accepting various types of covering clothes, primarily worn by
Muslims. This is therefore coded as multiculturalism, even if it is an abstract features of the statement.

In conclusion, this statement could be viewed as inconclusive as a whole, due to its apparent civic integration approach in relation to advocating a multicultural policy, addressing the right for immigrants to practise their culture in terms of dress codes. It is also probable that Löfven claims that immigrants have the right to do so, i.e. until they clash with national values. Dress codes not perceived as doing so, and are therefore a right immigrants are allowed to enjoy. Although, when looking at the specific indicators alone, they are not inconclusive. The order of the statements, and the way they are not clearly connected makes up a splintery speech yes, but not enough to code it as inconclusive.


Johansson makes the main point that his opponent, from the Swedish Democrat Party (SD), is wrong and that the view of these people are not to be recognized. Essentially, he says that his opponents view is simplified and that their basic normative view on society is that in Sweden, only Swedish people are allowed. That is, Swedish defined Swedish by themselves (i.e. SD) and the rest is unwanted. In addition, Johansson mentions the discussion held in Sweden, mostly and initially by SD, about what types of identity one can have, referring to a debate about Jews incompatibility with being Swedish. This, implicitly, is said by Johansson to be wrong. This because the main message of proving his opponent wrong in all matters. It is very clear that Johansson does not share this view.

The situation when the opponent party were having the debate that one can not mix certain cultures with Swedish nationality, is referred to again by Johansson. When having a negative tone towards this view, it clearly shows multicultural values. The only feature possibly showing an inclination towards liberal civic integration is the fact that, in one way, Johansson de-emphasizes the importance of identities, in trying to prove the opponent wrong in his categorization of identities. However, the main point is that individuals from other cultures can be equally Swedish as Swedish-born persons, therefore coding will be mainly towards multiculturalism. This holds even for generally speaking of cultures and immigrants. Johansson refers to a situation, but it is representing for the entire view he has about the
matter. He is not just referring to Jews specifically being able to be Swedish but to all religions and cultures, hence the general aspect. MCP indicators are not addressed.


In this statement Romson is appointed to answer a question concerning how to face the refugee crisis and the current actions undertaken by the government. Firstly she, like most others regardless of party, foregrounds the major challenge facing Sweden and Europe. She says that the primary task for all government representatives is facing this challenge. Then she talks solely in lines of multiculturalism, claiming this will undoubtedly change Sweden. Adding to that, when settled, it will be a good change towards diversity with more people contributing to welfare. This is the main message of the statement. The statement is coded multiculturalism, both due to the celebrating of diversity and the claiming immigration will change Sweden and for the better of society. This in generally spoken of, seemingly referring to all immigrants.

In the question directly asked concerning the voluntary actions for refugees, which should be considered in the answer, and Romson answers that the engagement by Swedish people does for refugees and immigrants are fantastic. Likely she could not have said anything else in that situation, even if it was of her actual opinion. Even so, she emphasizes the importance of that type of engagement in the specific situation of Sweden. Secondly, Romson talks about the governments role in the challenge, and that it is already well but need to get better, “up-scale” she calls it. Painting a picture of government employees working hard to meet these needs of immigrants.

In both these scenarios illustrated, she refers to the aspect of multiculturalism which emphasizes the two-way responsibility, i.e. Sweden's responsibility to immigrants and vice versa. Nothing is said about MCP indicators.

Hadzialic's approach shows civic integration in the strong emphasize on learning Swedish from day one in Sweden. It is enhanced by the fact that she, unlike many party colleagues, does not talk about it in relation to economic integration (i.e. employment attraction). Solely the social integration in the civil society is referred to. In addition, Hadzialic talks about the importance of immigrants learning about the Swedish society. It is unclear if this should be mandatory or voluntary in her statement, therefore the distinction between liberal and illiberal civic integration cannot be proven.

On the other hand, multiculturalism can be detected in the saying that the huge amount newly arrived in Sweden, i.e. immigrants, are coming to Sweden with differentiating experiences and educational backgrounds. This is multiculturalism due to the fact that Hadzialic puts it with a positive connotation, saying that Sweden and Swedish people should take advantage of this, and benefit from it to enhance our well being and economy.

Thirdly, she bring up the question on extremism. She puts this very close to her saying about immigrants, too close for it to be without significance or without her making a connection between the two. This in relation to civic education, in terms of Swedish education, to creating extremism. What type of extremism is not mentioned. To turn the argument around, the statement can be perceived as without eduction on Swedish society and language a risk for extremism prevails, which cannot in any sense be perceived as something positive by the Swedish government. Hadzialic says following: “[civic education] stands for compassion and builds stable societies” [my translation]. This third point I am making would contradict the multicultural and, if so, the potential liberal civic integration aspects. Due to the negative connotation towards immigrants, they are generally spoken of in relation of extremism. Nothing is said about MCP indicators. However, this statement shows a tendency to straggling, with the many different places the statement can reveal itself among the lines of the ideal types. Hence, it is partly coded as inconclusive.

In this debate Bah Kuhnke is one of few talking explicitly about culture. Being the minister of Culture and Democracy that is hardly surprising. What makes this statement worth analysing is the reference to different people living by a culture, and culture as a meeting point for individuals. This is solely positive according to Bah Kuhnke. Implicitly it is not only about the physical meeting, but the meeting generating mutual understanding and tolerance towards other cultural groups.

What is the clearest indicator of multicultural values is when speaking of libraries and the use of them. Bah Kuhnke emphasizes the supply of different languages available in the libraries, like Arabic, Persian, Tigrinya, Kurdish etc. and those being valuable for the democratic development of the entire society. Here another multiculturalism point is clear, the development of society due to immigration. Immigration talked about as changing Sweden in a desirable democratic direction by providing various languages, as part of various cultures. She also emphasizes the importance of the libraries being available to immigrants, in terms of opening hours, ways to get there etc. another indicator of multiculturalism. Now in the sense of the host-society's responsibility to enhance immigrants rights.

Lastly, Bah Kuhnke speaks about culture as a living being wanting to live and grow. This implicitly with contributions from all origins, languages, people and cultures. All is very general and does not connect to specifics. The statement refers to the MCP indicator 6, about funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities. No money is explicitly mentioned, but when talking about the society's responsibility to make sure immigrant can take part of cultural activities, and make that culture available in their language so it can cultivate with them, it is a question about state funding. Partly MCP indicator 7 is advocated as well, about funding of bilingual education even though it is not talked about specific instruction it is talk about valuing their mother tongue.

4. Political discourse in Britain

The vast majority of statements in Britain are from specific contexts and narrowly subjects in the broader debate on how to handle and integrate immigrants. Immigration is usually not spoken of in general debates, hence the focus on speeches on related topics by government
representatives. Main focus is often on the difference of refugees and economic migrants and how to detect and keep non asylum seekers out of the Britain. Little is said on what should be done and what to expect from those who are legitimate to stay and make Britain their new home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement – Political leader and date</th>
<th>Indicator 1 – Main message</th>
<th>Indicator 2 – Specific situation</th>
<th>Indicator 3 – Generally speaking</th>
<th>Indicator 4 – Relation to MCP index indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Statement 9**: Prime Minister David Cameron. Speech to the Conservative Party Conference. 2015-10-07.

The context of this statement is just winning a national election. In the very introduction Cameron begins by foregrounding certain people from other cultures than the British national one. Giving very specific scenarios of where these people come from, Kashmir, Iran and Afghanistan, saying that “different journeys, often difficult journeys, all leading here”, and now they have a place in the Conservative party. A very strong positive connotation is detected, both in tone of voice and the way of the loud applause. He uses this way of speaking in terms of actual scenarios of people from other cultures and how they benefit society, not only once, but throughout the speech. If the origin of these people, their experiences and cultures had no significance, it would not make sense to mention their whereabouts. This is
signs of multiculturalism. To use a counter scenario; if leaning more towards civic integration the reasonable statement would be to emphasize the reference to people's adjustments to the British society or their “Britishness” even though their origin, and in that sense point at the good aspects of these people being elected.

About extremism and intolerant institutions and communities within Britain, Cameron says: “To children, British children, going to Pakistan in the summer holidays, before they’ve even started their GCSEs, and forced to marry a man they’ve never met”. Here, connection to other cultures are generally made to extremism, and non desirable values and activities, which could make this section inconclusive concerning how Cameron generally talks about immigrants and their cultures. In addition, an altruistic tone prevails throughout this section of the speech, claiming Britain's values to be the correct values: “And as we do that, we shouldn’t just be saying what’s wrong with these practices; we should be saying what’s right with Britain. Freedom. Democracy. Equality”. Here he is advocating British values for everyone, including immigrants and cultures, in Britain and elsewhere, which is a sign of civic integration. Although, what he is referring to explicitly in this section are brutal things that come with a culture, for example genital mutilation and under age marriage, which is why this statement must be analysed carefully. Civic integration can not be proven in this last scenario, due to the context of what is mentioned in relation to.

More signs of civic integration, less connected to these brutal activities of some cultures, can be detected in less obvious relation to extreme aspect making the statement more reliable in that specific sense. The emphasis on everyone learning British history, bring people together and to be proud over their nation. However, it is not clear if it is with purpose of transforming immigrants to more “national British citizen”, in a civic integration direction, or if it is to learn and develop together, culture by culture. The saying about “many faiths living side by side” points more towards multicultural values, while the emphasis on British history points at civic integration. MCP indicators are not addressed.

**Statement 10:** David Cameron. Prime Minister. Speech on Europe. 2015-11-10.

In this statement Cameron talks about Britain's role in European Union. About diversity he says that the greatest strength Europe has is precisely the diversity in the 28 nation making up
the union. He encourages Britain to celebrate that fact. However, this statement is possibly made with EU references only, meaning celebrating the diversity in European member states and not necessary immigrated diversity in Britain. Regardless he addresses multiculturalism positively in a sense.

“For us, it is not a question of race or background or ethnicity – Britain is one of the most open and cosmopolitan countries on the face of the earth. People from all over the world can find a community of their own right here in Britain.” This is clearly de-emphasizing the importance of cultures, saying it is not of importance. At the same time, he claims, inconclusively, that people from all origins of the world can find themselves suitable communities in the Britain. Undeniable these people come with cultures of their own, and these communities have a mainly positive connotation. Hence, no specific situation is related to in this statement, however in general it is said that multiple cultures exist in Britain and nothing shows for a desire to change that fact, rather the opposite. Also, Britain is referred to as open and cosmopolitan which must be coded as positive connections. That line relates to the fact that multiple communities exist within the states borders, resulting in the undoubtedly positive connotation.

Concerning MCP indicators, the statement possibly addressing number 6, about funding of cultural groups activities. It is not explicit but one can recognize a positive connotation towards the communities from every origin, even though funding is not explicitly mentioned.


Harrington draws many connections to himself, and other honourable persons, being from multicultural lineage. In addition, he claims all Brits have immigrant ascent, which he claims proudly. Solely with basis on that, one could argue his positive views towards multiculturalism.

Perhaps the most revealing line in his statement in the debate is this: “In all seriousness, we are proud of the fact that the Britain is, without any doubt, a multiracial democracy… Most sensible people will be proud of that.”
He makes connections from his own past in a Jewish community. The connections conclude that more than a 100 years ago people were suspicious towards people with different cultures, and that this has not changed until today, referring to today's relevant issue concerning suspiciousness towards Muslim cultures. This connection is made with a specific scenario which is told seemingly with the purpose of proving people who claimed 100 years ago until today that “parts of this country have overwhelming numbers of people who speak different languages, who eat different food and who are taking our jobs at lower pay” are claiming this without any reasonable grounds for referring to it as something bad.

Harrington is connecting to another specific situation when he talks about immigrants he meets when in Office. “One person told me that two or three years ago they were practising as a dentist in Aleppo. One had been a professor of ancient languages at a university. We cannot imagine: it happened like that”. Here immigrants are spoken of both in specific and in general, in relation to high-status professions, which might not be the expected according to Harrington. In general, other relevant issues are also addressed, for instance the possibility of immigrants contributing to Britain's workforce. “Labour shortages have been met with willing, able, hard-working and decent immigrants”, in relation to the fact that there is currently a substantial labour shortage. Furthermore Harrington says: “The policy is that we have obviously welcomed the brightest and the best” does not exactly go hand in hand with previous statements. However, this is not something that Harrington claims to stand behind, but a government policy. Government policies are of importance, but more important are the way multiculturalism is spoken of by the representative.

About religion and culture Harrington makes the illustrative claim that there are no contradictions of being British and being Muslim, which is also saying something generally in lines with ideals of multiculturalism.

Not surprisingly. Harrington's statement is coded exclusively multiculturalism, except MCP indicators, which are not addressed. The only thing showing bits of civic integration is when talking about immigrants learning the English language, something he emphasizes only briefly the importance of.

**Statement 12**: Secretary of State for Education and Minister for Women and Equalities Nicky Morgan. Speech on Sunday Times Festival for Education. 2015-06-18.
The most relevant main point Morgan is making here is when she addresses the importance of British values. She talks generally about shared values of the entire nation as something desirable. She also puts it in connection to features that make Britain great: “Shared values that bind us together as one nation” she says and in addition she makes the reference to shared experience, going against multiculturalism in the aspects of that other experience than the national one is beneficial. Morgan goes towards civic integration in this sense, where the national cultures, values and experiences etc. are of importance, and in extension something everyone, no matter of origin, should adjust to.

Also, like many British MP:s, she speaks about being proud of Britain. About what she loves about Britain, makes her proud, is here in relation to the national values, that she claims to believe that everyone agrees on, the values of equality and equal opportunity. She emphasizes the centrality of these in Britain – a modern and enlightened society. Implicitly she is saying that if we do not all agree on shared national values, it is not a modern and enlighten society, therefore strongly advocating those values and the adjustment to them. This is clearly civic integration, generally speaking, not referring to specific situations or MCP indicators.


Cameron's main message is to control immigration. He, somewhat paradoxical, emphasizes the way he and others are proud of the diversity in Britain, drawing concrete examples to the nation's history when benefited from other cultures, like the West Indians or Asians from East Africa etc. “these people help make our country strong”. He somehow turns this around saying everyone, no matter origin, voted for controlled immigration, which according to Cameron is something positive. This because of economic and fairness reasons. Especially the idea that immigrants push down wages is addressed. Cameron claims to be on the working people's side, implicitly meaning not the immigrant's side. Even though he seems to see some value in immigration, when it is solely for the good of Britain, by addressing the historical benefits. Cameron wants to fill labour shortage with British nationals, rather than immigrants. “We should be getting to a place where we only bring in workers from outside Europe where we have genuine skills shortages or require highly-specialist experts”, i.e. selective immigration. Culture seem to be secondary, academic merits the primary.
English language is addressed as something mandatory, and something that should have higher requirements for people not being English natives. Students and workers in the public sector is specifically referred to. This will be put in law, in the new Immigration Bill. This is a clear sign of civic integration, not seeing much benefits of different cultures and specifying the need of national language.

It could be viewed as Cameron approves of the fact that Britain used to have a multicultural approach before, which they benefited from. However, nowadays this era is over and immigration must be limited, only taking in the very best due to academical reasons. The importance of cultures, perspectives, languages etc. seem to have little importance in today's Britain. Then again, Cameron says: “Britain is one of the most successful multiracial democracies in the world. I am so proud of that. But to sustain that success, immigration needs to be controlled”.

Is this inconclusive, or just a matter of changing perspective with time? One option is that he is speaking in a populist purpose, knowing people want to hear this, even though it does not make perfectly sense. However, due to the order of the statements and the fact that Cameron explicitly says things in line with both multiculturalism and civic integration, the main message is coded as inconclusive. MCP indicators are not addressed.

**Statement 14:** Secretary of State for the Home Department Theresa May. Speech on Conservative Party Conference 2015. 2015-10-06.

The main message May tries to deliver in this speech is that Britain needs controlled immigration, which comes with a clear distinguish between economic migrants and genuine refugees. May sees no place for economic migrants in Britain.

She claims that immigration is threatening the cohesion of society: “Because when immigration is too high, when the pace of change is too fast, it’s impossible to build a cohesive society.” In addition: “And we know that for people in low-paid jobs, wages are forced down even further while some people are forced out of work altogether“. She
emphasizes that the solution is not to manage the consequences for immigration, rather the solution lies in reducing the number of immigrants all together. This clearly shows May's view towards civic integration, not seeing benefits of immigration, solely the opposite with costs in various forms, monetary and social, not addressing any added value of perspectives, language, knowledge or experience.

To strengthen the idea of May, additionally she addresses more specifics. Instead of emphasizing the fact that some are highly educated immigrants, May chooses to emphasize the fact that everyone is not well educated, “not a skilled electrician, engineer or doctor” as she puts it. Focus is here is to put Britain first, even if she initiated the speech with sad stories about refugees and what they are going through. She strengthens her argument with statistics that claims that selective and controlled immigration benefits the economy. Hence, no national interests or benefits with the current level of immigration.

May also addresses a common argument for multiculturalism Britain: “It’s often said – usually by advocates of open-door immigration – that Britain is by definition a country of immigrants. In fact, compared to the countries of the New World and compared to the countries of Europe with their shifting land borders, we have until recently always been a country of remarkable population stability.” Taking the power from that argument into her own views of civic integration. In spite of this, she claims that those immigrating in the previous generations have played an important role of making Britain what it is today, with positive connotations. Still, somewhat inconclusive, Britain still needs to follow an immigration system of British traditions “of gradual, moderate, sensible change”, connecting to traditional conservative values. In this statement May does not address any MCP indicators.

**Statement 15:** Secretary of State for the Home Department Theresa May. Speech on NBPA Conference. 2015-10-22.

Firstly, May is speaking on the National Black Policing Association's conference, which possibly affects her statement. Although, she must still stand behind her statement being the public person that she is. However, likely more emphasis is put on these questions than normally.
The main message of May is advocating diversity in the police force. She specifically refers to diversity of ethnic minority groups, and that those groups should be represented: “The Code of Ethics has a clear focus on diversity and equality”. Concerning the MCP indicators in this statement May touching clearly upon number 8, about affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups. She states her work on “leading work to improve diversity and inclusion in policing”.

At the same time, May is against quotas of representation of ethnic minority groups claiming it would be a mistake to implement positive discrimination. She claims it is not a way to speed up the change, like many who are for positive discrimination, because of the slow process of making laws, and “if it is improve trust and confidence in the police, then such action would be counterproductive, undermining not only credibility and confidence in individual officers, but the public’s expectation that progression in the police is based on merit alone. It is clear that the case for positive discrimination is deeply flawed, and we need to pursue other options if we are to improve diversity in the police.” Instead she wants to increase diversity in terms of supporting officers, transform retention and achieve an open, inclusive and representative culture. She is referring to several specific persons that she met, to strengthen the broader and general claims she is making. Although May does not approve of certain affirmative actions for minorities, other types of actions increasing diversity is advocated. All of these aspects lead up to a coding as multiculturalism.

Statement 16: Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government Eric Pickles.
Coexist House speech. 2015-02-15.

This statement is made in context of being from a spokesperson from the department responsible for integration. The main point is to advocate tolerance, specifically towards religious views. He brings up scenarios in history that he claims helped Britain to be more tolerant and politically free. Specific people are the ones addressed as the ones that helped Britain become the great nation it is today – multiculturalism views. Pickles claims, also in line with multiculturalism, that we can learn from this history, but he also criticizes the fact that sometimes people choose not to do so. It seems like Pickles himself is of a multiculturalism view, but the people he is talking to, i.e. British citizen, are of a more civic
integration view by not acknowledging the benefits of other cultures. Here he actually makes the connection to fundamentalism, although not connecting it to multiculturalism, like many others in the British government, but as a danger coming from the ignorance of multiculturalism values.

Focusing of understanding others, with specific focus on religion, Pickles moves forwards speaking of what the government is doing in that purpose. An inter-faith house is created, for all faiths as well as for people with no faith. This to increase understanding, which according to him is a central part for a peaceful coexistence and standing up for bigotry. The aspect here connects to MCP indicator 6, funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities, since the inter-faith house is funded by state money. It is however not obvious if it is also to support these cultural activities or solely for increasing understanding. I argue they go hand in hand, and therefore that Pickles is advocating number 6.

Something clearly speaking for multiculturalism is this quote: “Faith should no longer be treated as a dubious personal hobby that should be hidden from view”, in civic integration these cultural differences should be suppressed or as a minimum be kept from the public's view. Again, he draws the line of connecting anti-multiculturalism to fundamentalism.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Discussion

Both Sweden and Britain restricted their immigration policies during 2015, which can be detected in the statements from the later half of the year. Although reasons for doing so are different. Firstly, we can detect major differences in focus related to the issue. The undergoing view in Sweden is mainly to restrict immigration in order to treat immigrants with dignity. In Britain the focus is rather to restrict immigration to keep economic migrants out, as well as preserving welfare for British citizen. Secondly, the countries differ in the way government leaders generally speak of their state in relation to the rest of the world. In Britain's case, it is mainly about how Britain can gain from an action or decision. In Sweden the main focus is on how to be humane, and how to help the world, as well as on how to help immigrants already in Sweden. In Britain, integration is a minor debate. Britain reveals some cases of
inconclusiveness, often talking in terms of helping refugees, but later shifting focus back to what is best for Britain.

Another difference is the fact that in Swedish debates, immigration and integration is spoken of frequently, integrated in debates not specifically about immigration or integration. Immigrants being considered in most issues, especially social reforms and concerning the labour market. In Britain that does not occur as frequently; when speaking about economic problems or prospects alone, immigration is barely taken into account while in Sweden it would be likely addressed already in the initial pleading.

It is important to notice the consistency in the Swedish statements, that does not occur at the same level in Britain. Government representatives in Sweden are most commonly within the multiculturalism discourse. Liberal civic integration aspects are found in some of the Swedish statements, however they are almost exclusively compatible with what they are saying in the lines of multiculturalism, making up likely examples of what Kymlicka and Banting refers to as liberal civic integration policies layered on top of pre-existing multicultural policies. On the other hand, in the British case a larger inconsistency between the statements is detected. Both between different statement, some coded as full multiculturalism and some as full civic integration, but also within lone statements, where aspects of both multiculturalism and civic integration are observed.

Due to the seemingly tendencies towards inconsistency in the British case, within and between statements, is it hard to see that they speak on basis of ideological grounds. Connecting to the given score of 5,5 in the MCP index, it seems more likely that the contradiction is between practise and rhetoric rather than between practise and ideology. Scholars previously assumed that this is a question mainly about ideology, and that Britain is one of many countries that abandoned the multiculturalism discourse. However, here results show that this does not seem to be the case. Rather Britain has partly multiculturalism views and partly civic integration views. This is interesting due to the fact that the backlash in the most likely case of Britain, is not clear. It is also interesting due to the seemingly incoherent views of the British government, it does not seem to be so monolithic it can be a question solely about ideology, this especially since Britain's discourse is both connecting to
multiculturalism and to civic integration in the more illiberal form, which earlier was argued to be incompatible.

This, partly apparent, inconclusiveness is possibly a sign of British government sometimes trying to appeal to the British people using populist methods, using rhetoric, which does not make perfectly sense when investigated systematically. However, this is not a conclusion that can be drawn solely on basis of this study, more research on the topic in needed. Nevertheless, results show tendencies that the discourse is not completely coherent, in terms of the ideal types of this study.

Responsibility is commonly referred to in both countries. It could likely be a strategic choice of word, reflecting the attempt to win the population's sympathies, securing political influence in spite of massive inflow of immigrants. This responsibility in Sweden manifested in emphasizing the need of taking good care of immigrants, and in Britain the claim to take care of Britain, could be based on raw political necessity to receive acceptance from people in general for the policy carried out. In Britain, this humane emphasis does not seem to be a political necessity in the same way. Furthermore, it also reflects the differentiating views on the responsibility of the host-societies. In Sweden perceived generally more as a two-way responsibility and in Britain emphasis on the immigrants own responsibility, resulting in a more multiculturalism tone in Sweden and a more civic integration tone in Britain, in this specific matter.

When analysing the different statements in Sweden and Britain one has to bear in mind the difference in conditions between the countries. Britain, with its colonial past, undoubtedly is a more diversified country than Sweden and their historic immigration is in quantity unparalleled compared to Sweden. This means, that different cultures since long have prevailed in Britain, while historically it is still something relatively new in Sweden. Also, Sweden is a scarcely populated country, possibly in greater need of population inflow than Britain. These are possibly fundamental factors behind different attitudes behind the statements, possibly reflected in government representatives in Sweden and their more favourable attitude towards immigration than in Britain. However, this does not necessarily correspond with what people in general think of immigration
5.2. Summary

Kymlicka and Bantings research reveals interesting questions, for instance what they claim to be a precipitous assumption of the failure of multiculturalism, or a general backlash from multicultural policies, which they later prove wrong with their empirical investigation using MCP index. This study is motivated by looking at the discourse, rather than the reality of the policies, to see if a backlash of multiculturalism can be detected, arguing that the discourse and the reality of policies are not necessarily connected, but likely affected by each other.

The cases of Sweden and Britain are critical, connecting to assumptions on how these two countries approach multiculturalism and civic integration in the discourse. Sweden considered to be a most likely case to have a multiculturalism discourse while Britain is considered to be a least likely case to a multicultural ideology approach, that is, most likely to have a backlash in the multiculturalism discourse. If there is a backlash in Sweden, it is likely to be in other European countries as well, and if there is no backlash in Britain, it is likely not prevalent in other European countries either.

Using a method of discourse analysis, focusing on ideal types, 16 different statements from government representatives in Sweden and Britain has been systematically investigated. What is interesting to see is that Sweden, consistent with Kymlicka and Banting's research, has a discourse of mainly multiculturalism, but often combined with liberal civic integration views and opinions. Although, there is a variation in the statements, but only one coded as inconclusive. Hence, the backlash towards multiculturalism is not prevalent in Sweden, even if liberal civic integration views are detected.

Findings from this study also include aspects that are not coherent with previous research concerning the failure of multiculturalism, or rather with previous research assumptions. The Britain case does not exactly fit into the general picture of the multicultural discourse, not with a failure of multiculturalism nor with the increase of multicultural policies, with results of a disrupted discourse, showing signs of inconclusiveness. More research needs to be done on these issues, to further clarify the precipitousness of assumptions concerning the ideology and approach towards multicultural and civic integration values. Research could benefit from
other focuses, highlighting these interesting findings. These tendencies could be found in other European cases as well, which have not been seen yet.
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