



AALBORG UNIVERSITET

Government rationales and the territorial stigmatization of the Danish ghetto

Thesis Spring, 2019
Ida Ries Waaddegaard
Student-ID: 20163137

Supervisor: Steffen Jensen
Submission date: May 31st 2019
Characters: 135.586

Global Refugee Studies
Department of Culture and Global studies
Aalborg University, Copenhagen

Table of Content

ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION	4
THESIS AIMS, PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTION.....	5
DEEPENING OF AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
THE POLICY UNDER SCRUTINY	7
SUMMARY AND STRUCTURE OF THESIS.....	10
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	11
INTRODUCTION	11
THE TRADITION OF POSTSTRUCTURALISM	11
DISCURSIVE APPROACH TO POLICY ANALYSIS	12
GOVERNMENTALITY; GOVERNANCE AND POWER.....	14
TERRITORIAL STIGMATIZATION	15
WHAT’S THE PROBLEM REPRESENTED TO BE? AS METHOD	16
DATA COLLECTION AND EMPIRICAL MATERIAL.....	19
MY EMPIRICAL MATERIAL OF ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH.....	19
CHAPTER 2.	22
THE CONSTRUCTION OF GHETTO AND PARALLEL SOCIETIES	22
INTRODUCTION	22
FOUR CORE REPRESENTATIONS OF ‘PROBLEMS’ IN THE 2030 STRATEGY	24
1. PARALLEL SOCIETIES AS CORE PROBLEMATIZATION.....	25
2. ‘NON- WESTERN BACKGROUND’ AS CORE PROBLEMATIZATION	28
3. ‘BAD PARENTING’ AS CORE PROBLEMATIZATION.....	29
4. ‘UNSAFE AND CRIMINAL AREAS’ AS CORE PROBLEMATIZATION	31
SUMMARY OF CHAPTER	33
CHAPTER 3. ASSUMPTIONS AND RATIONALES IN THE 2030 STRATEGY	34
INTRODUCTION	34
FORMS OF GOVERNANCE – A NEOLIBERAL RATIONALITY AND NOTIONS OF UNIVERSALISM.....	34
THE INDIVIDUALIZATION OF RESPONSIBILITY	35
SOCIAL EXCLUSION OF WELFARE-RECIPIENTS	38
THE TERRITORIAL STIGMATIZATION OF THE GHETTO.....	39
THE ANTAGONISM OF THE GHETTO VS. DANISH SOCIETY.....	40
CHAPTER 4. PERSPECTIVES FROM THE GHETTO	43
INTRODUCTION	43
PARALLEL SOCIETIES	43
MICRO-LEVEL EFFECTS OF DISCURSIVELY CONSTRUCTED SUBJECTS	44
UNWANTED AREAS OR SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS	45
BAD PARENTING?	47
THE CASE OF EMAN.....	48
THE INTERNALIZATION OF THE STIGMA – THE SECOND-G	50
CRIMINAL ACTIVITY	51
DISCURSIVE DOMINANCE.....	52
SUMMARY OF CHAPTER	53
CONCLUSIONS	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY	57

ABSTRACT

This thesis arises out of an interest in political power and forms of governance expressed within the Government strategy “A Denmark without parallel-societies – no ghettos in 2030”. This strategy is the most far-reaching to be presented since the first in 1994 because of its explicit goal of a total eradication of ghettos by 2030. The significance of the strategy against so-called ‘parallel societies’ has been widely criticized both in the media, nationally, and internationally, and from various fields within the academics, despite a broad political consensus.

I aim at conducting a critical policy analysis of the strategy to explore and in depth examine embedded government rationales and conceptual logics. I’m interested in how politics discursively construct certain issues as particular kinds of ‘problems’ through representations of problems. This analysis is utilized with the *What’s the problem represented to be?* –approach (WPR) developed by Carl Bacchi. I further examine imbedded government rationales and logics through a Governmentality-perspective presented by Michel Foucault and to supplement the critical policy analysis the thesis further examines processes of territorial stigmatization and examine how the political rationale and conceptual logics resonate with research from the ghetto areas.

The study argues that the government strategy constructs a discourse of the Danish ghetto areas as unwanted unsafe place, which are characterized by problems of a failed integration. The government strategy articulates a dominant discourse of the Danish ghetto areas having massive challenges with parallel societies, counter-cultures, irresponsible parents, crime and violence because of ethnicity; explicitly individuals with a non-western background. Through a critical discussion of data material from three ethnographic studies, I challenge the government discourse and these taken- for granted assumptions and present concrete examples from everyday life in the ghetto which reflect a more nuanced and complex picture of the lives in the ghettos.

Keywords: WPR, Governmentality, territorial stigmatization, policy analysis, discourse

INTRODUCTION

Around the country, there are parallel societies. Many people sharing the same problems, lump together. This creates a negative spiral. A counterculture. Where you do not take the necessary responsibility, you do not participate or use the opportunities we have in Denmark – but you stand outside.

There are holes in the map of Denmark. It worries me deeply.

Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen, New Year's speech, January 2018. (translated from Danish by author¹)

On 1 January 2018, the Danish Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen held his New Year's Speech as expected, and in very explicit terms, he presented the first of several arguments to follow, behind the launching of the Government strategy "*One Denmark without parallel societies - No Ghettos by 2030*", henceforth referred to as 'the 2030 strategy'. The 2030 strategy was presented to the public on 1 March 2018 in one of the so-called 'hard ghetto-areas', Mjølnerparken², in Copenhagen. A social housing area is classified as either 'vulnerable', 'ghetto', or 'hard ghetto' area, as I will describe further on. The strategy was later that year politically adopted by a majority in the Parliament on 22 November 2018³ under the heading: "*The Government wants a coherent Denmark. (2030, 2018:4, translated from Danish)*

The significance of the strategy against so-called 'parallel societies' and the general aim of eradicating all ghettos by 2030 has been widely criticised both in the media, nationally, and internationally, and from various fields within the academics, despite broad political consensus. Originally described as an 'immediate and necessary response' to the severe challenges and problems

¹ Throughout the thesis, all my citations from the 2030 strategy is translated from Danish by Author. Henceforth indicated with 'translated from Danish'. There exists no official English version of the strategy.

² Mjølnerparken is classified as 'hard ghetto area' with a proportion of 'non-western' residents of 82.6% and have listed as ghetto for more than 5 years.

³ The 2030 strategy were accepted by majority with VLAKE Government, supported by The Social Democrats, The Danish Folk Party and Socialist Folk Party.

in the so-called Danish ghetto-areas, the 22 specific initiatives are wide-ranging policy measures and interventions.

The general aim of the 2030 strategy is to eradicate all ghettos by 2030 and preventing the emergence of parallel societies. This goal reflects an understanding of the ghettos and the assumed parallel societies as an opposition to the Danish society. It has been criticized for its normative connotations and ‘taken-for-granted’ assertions of their existence. The conception of the Danish society and the parallel societies as oppositions seems to insinuate the impossibility of the integration of the parallel society into the Danish society. The Danish society thus appears as solid and fixed, and therefore substantiates the assertion, that the ghettos and assumed parallel societies are impossible to integrate and therefore must be eradicated, and this before 2030.

THESIS AIMS, PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTION

This thesis arises out of an interest in political power and how this is expressed within the Danish Government policy against parallel societies. I aim at critically analyzing the Danish policy strategy ‘*A Denmark without parallel societies - no Ghettos by 2030*’, to explore and in depth examine underlying political rationales and logics. I am interested in how policies discursively construct certain issues as particular kinds of ‘problems’. I approach this specific strategy with an interest in understanding upon what rationales and logics the concrete proposals are built. I read and understand the government strategy against parallel societies with a curious mind and a critical perspective on the premises of the entire strategic goal to eradicate all ghettos by 2030. Moreover, I have an interest in analyzing how conceptual logics and political rationales resonate with existing research related to the everyday practices of life in the ghetto areas and the so-called parallel societies. I therefore ask this specific **Research question:**

What political discourse is articulated in the 2030 strategy and how does this discourse resonate with life in the ghetto areas interpellated by the discourse?

One fruitful way to answer my research questions is presented by the Australian scientist Carol Bacchi. Therefore, I have chosen to apply the methodological framework of the *What's the problem represented to be?* -approach, hereafter referred to as WPR approach. With inspiration and influence from Michel Foucault, Bacchi developed a specific methodological approach to critical policy analysis that combines the logics of Foucault's Governmentality approach with critical discourse analysis. This will be explained in detail in chapter 2. The essential purpose of the WPR approach is to focus on *representations* of 'problems' rather on the effectiveness of the policy as a solution. (Bacchi, 2009) With the purpose of examining the immediate 'invisible' forms of governance embedded in the political rationales of the 2030 strategy, I set out to conduct a discourse analysis of the policy material within the methodological framework of the WPR-approach. This specific kind of policy analysis work backwards by focusing on how problems are discursively constructed through representations of 'problems'. Furthermore, the WPR approach encourages us to critically question the taken-for-granted assumptions and assertions that underpin the political discourse that emerges. Instead of analyzing the proposals for change as 'problems', I address them as *representations* of problems. This thesis thus combines the methodological framework of the WPR method with a multiple case study design of existing ethnographic research from three ghetto areas.

I have developed these two sub-questions to guide my policy analysis:

- 1) *What forms of governance-mentality and political rationales underpins the discourse of the 2030 strategy?*
- 2) *What is left 'unproblematic' in this political rationale and what are the effects and possible consequences?*

Deepening of aims and research questions

The WPR approach allow me to identify the representations of 'problems' in the strategy to examine them one by one, its implications, effects, the silences they involve, the issues they leave unproblematic and how these 'problematizations' are reproduced and contested. What are the assumptions and rationalities (conceptual logics) on which the representations of problems are based. I set out to explore what political narrative of the ghetto and parallel societies that unfolds and its

characteristics and meanings being ascribed to it in a certain discursive practice utilized with the WPR- approach (Bacchi, 2009).

To examine how the government's narrative resonates with existing research of ethnographic studies from three ghettos in Denmark, I combine the theoretical lens of Governmentality, originally presented by Michel Foucault with the theoretical lens of territorial stigmatization, originally presented by Loïc Wacquant (Wacquant, 2009, Bacchi & Godwin, 2016). The theoretical framework thus utilizes an analysis of the effects of discourse and forms of governance identified in the policy material. Governmentality is used as a critical analytic perspective to policy analysis and utilized methodologically within the framework of the WPR-approach. This theoretical framework thus allows me to provide answers to both of my research questions.

To my knowledge, there exists no such analysis of the 2030 strategy as I conduct in this thesis. The strategy has been target of much debate and criticism, but no policy analysis of the strategy and the political discourse has been made yet. In the years to come, maybe more will be produced. This specific discourse analysis of the strategy in combination with existing ethnographic work conducted in three ghetto-areas in Denmark is unique. It adds to an already existing literature on the Danish ghetto term by bringing the policy into a critical conversation with existing ethnographic material. Too much discussion about the policy is characterized by either being for or against the policy. This black and white discussion tends to obscure the complex issues of life in the so-called ghetto. The body of existing literature comprises work from various fields of academics, the media and public debates.

The policy under scrutiny

The government strategy "*One Denmark without parallel societies - No Ghettos by 2030*", is the sixth to be approved since the first were produced and accepted by a Social Democratic Government in 1994, then in 2000, 2004, 2010, 2013 and latest in 2018. For 30 years Denmark have had a tradition with area-based politically defined interventions in the social housing areas as a response to the social problems and needs for integration and employment efforts. Most of the social housing areas were built in the 1960's as modern family apartments as an alternative to a life in the city, but since, many

have developed into ‘socially deprived areas’, which I elucidate further on. For almost 30 years the social housing areas have been subject to various political fights and several programs and measurements, of changing governments and political agendas (Landsbyggefondens.dk)

Since the 2000s, it has been politically debated if the ethnic segregation in the social housing areas are threatening the social cohesion, because of the parallel societies that emerge in these areas. It seems that there exists a taken-for-granted assumption and consensus to equate the concept of parallel societies with ‘ethnic segregated immigrant areas’, which isolate themselves and practice other norms and values compared to the wider Danish society. Even the term ‘countercultures’ is used to describe the situation in the social housing areas. Moreover, in general, it seems acceptable to use the term parallel societies when referring to the Danish ghetto areas, thus without any definition or concrete classification of what ‘parallel societies’ empirically means. This appears to be a possible normative state in the Danish political field concerning the social housing areas.(X)

At first, the housing areas were classified as ‘vulnerable housing-estates’, when describing the social problems related to them, and later, by 2010, officially categorized as ghettos. The Ghetto category became a political technicality with the agreement of the strategy of 2010 and the introduction of the official ghetto-list. A concrete political tool to classify the social housing areas. as ‘vulnerable’ or ‘ghetto area’. The ghetto-list is updated and published every year in December. In addition, the term ‘parallel societies’ appear as an accepted category, when referring to the ghettos. Since the 2000’s it’s been widely used by politicians and in the media. In the box below, I have listed the applicable criteria to classify a social housing area as either vulnerable, ghetto or hard-ghetto area. (Landsbyggefondens.dk)

Ghetto-area

A social housing area with at least 1000 residents, where the number of immigrants and their descendants from non-western countries exceed 50%, and where two of the four criteria are met:

1. The proportion of residents aged 18-64 without affiliation to the labor market or education, exceed 40%, as the average over the past 2 years.
2. The proportion of residents convicted of a violation of the Penal Code, the Arms Act or the Act on Euphoriant Substances, amount to at least three times the national average calculated as an average over the past 2 years.
3. The proportion of residents aged 30-59 years who only have a basic education exceeds 60% of all residents in the same age group.
4. The average gross income for taxpayers aged 15-64 in the area (excluding education applicants) is less than 55% of the average gross income for the same group in the region.

Vulnerable housing area

A vulnerable housing area meet two out of four criteria relating to employment and the level of education, crime and income. In addition, a vulnerable housing area with a high proportion of residents with non-western background, qualifies as ghetto-area.

Hard ghetto-area

Housing areas, continually listed on the ghetto-list for 5 years, are characterized as hard ghetto-area. The hard ghetto-areas must submit a 'development-plan' on how to decrease the number of social family apartments to 40% before July 2019.

(Source: Danish Government, 2018)

Right now, as this thesis is being written, the implementation of the accepted measurements and legal agreements concerning the eradication of all ghettos by 2030, is taking place. The Danish social housing organizations and associations are writing and voting for the local agreements of the target areas. All ghetto areas are compelled to produce concrete plans for the implementation of the goal of the 2030 strategy. One of the primary goals is to reduce the number of social family apartments to 40% of the areas, subsequently resulting in agreements and local plans to demolish buildings. In Gellerupparken, the largest ghetto area in Denmark, the local Brabrand housing association and the municipality of Aarhus were on 27 May voting for an acceptance of the local plan, which in short, will totally eradicate 9 buildings (Gellerup.nu). In Mjølnerparken, several of the residents received letters, announcing their termination of lease and informing them on resettlement opportunities. The Danish media is reporting daily on these situations in the ghetto areas (Politiken.dk 2019, Gellerup.nu, Tv2Østjylland.dk).

Summary and structure of thesis

I have presented my aims and interests with this thesis and I have asked a specific research question to achieve my goals of conducting a critical policy analysis of the Danish Government's strategy "*A Denmark without parallel societies - No Ghettos by 2030*". Before I move on to the theoretical and conceptual framework of my analysis, I will present the structure of my thesis.

Chapter 1. Theoretical framework and Methodology

In the following chapter I will elaborate on the theoretical framework and methodology of my thesis. I explain the characteristics and essentials of conducting a critical discourse analysis of a policy, with the WPR approach as both method and theory. The WPR approach combines an analytic attention to forms of governance (Governmentality) and critical discourse analysis. Furthermore, I will elaborate on the specifics of Territorial stigmatization'. Second part of the chapter elaborates on the WPR method and the multiple case-study design before I present my empirical material.

Chapter 2. The construction of ghetto and parallel societies

Here I begin the first part of my analysis. The task here is to use descriptive language that echoes the strategy, to establish what problematizations that articulates from the proposed changes. The problematizations thus become foundation of the entire analysis that unfolds in the following chapters.

Chapter 3. Assumptions and rationales in the 2030 strategy

Based on the identified problematizations, I will here trace what rationales and logics that underpin this strategy and the specific problematizations.. I ask for the knowledges, concepts and political ideas and principles that underpin the problematizations. This chapter 'builds the bridge' to the third part of my analysis where I supplement my policy findings with data from the ethnographic studies from the ghetto areas.

Chapter 4. Voices from the ghetto

The third part of the analysis examines how the imbedded political narrative and logics resonate with existing ethnographic research. My purpose is to challenge the problematizations and the government rationales with research from everyday practices and life in the ghetto.

Chapter 5. Conclusions

CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, I will elaborate on the theoretical framework and the methodological approach I apply to this study. I have developed a framework for my analysis that brings together the analytic perspectives of Governmentality, focusing on governance and power and the discursive approach of policy analysis, utilized with the WPR-approach (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). I have chosen to conduct a critical policy analysis of the Danish Government's 2030 strategy concerning the eradication of all ghettos by 2030, which includes an examination of underlying political rationales and forms of governance embedded in the policy proposal (Danish Government, 2018). Furthermore, I aim at analyzing how the policy's rationales and logics resonate within existing research from three ghettos areas. The policy analysis is thus supplemented with a multiple case study design of existing ethnographic data material. Lastly, in correlation with the second aim of this thesis, to analyze possible effects and implications of the strategy, I supplement my method and theoretical framework with the theory of territorial stigmatization by Loïc Wacquant. An essential point of the WPR approach is that it serves as both method and theory. First, I elaborate on the epistemological position of the thesis before I zoom in on discourse and policy analysis.

The tradition of poststructuralism

I position my thesis in the tradition of post-structuralism and take a relativist approach to my study, understanding knowledge as socially constructed. The constructionist framework thus assumes that power relations and political ideas play a significant role in policy making and that policies cannot be 'neutral', apolitical or 'removed from their context'. A significant way of thinking of policy making frame this thesis, driven by an interest in 'challenging' the normative and 'taken-for-granted' and explore the political nature of a policy and its embedded rationales and logics. The tradition of poststructuralism in policy analysis assumes no truths, no universals and approaches knowledges, discourses and power relations as contingent. Moreover, government rationales and logics are treated as constantly undergoing modification and change. Therefore, I conduct this critical policy analysis upon a fundamental understanding that "*policies are productive (or constitutive) – making "things" come to be*" (Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016:53).

My purpose is then to question deep-seated presuppositions and assumptions that underpin policies to examine the ways in which policies produce and constitute ‘problems’, ‘subjects’, ‘objects’, and even ‘places’ in specific ways. It is important to emphasize that I approach this study analytically, understanding the government policy as discursively constructing certain issues as particular kinds of ‘problems’. By approaching this study of policy analysis within the tradition of social constructivism, I intend to challenge the taken-for-granted notion that ‘policy problems’ are self-evident and simply exist (Bacchi, 2009).

Discursive approach to policy analysis

An essential influence of the constructionist approach to policy analysis is the concept of discourse, which explores the *function of language* in the construction of meaning in policy material. The policy analysis is thus guided by ‘discursive practices’, explicitly by treating the government policy as ‘discourse’. This specific approach to discourse analysis was coined by Michel Foucault. Foucault’s concept of discourse explores the function of language in creation of meaning. His concepts of the discursive production of ‘subjects’, power, and knowledge and the role of discourse in relation to forms of governance and political technicalities has been very influential and have also inspired the fundamental logics and essentials of Bacchi’s WPR approach to policy analysis (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016) An essential point of the concept of discourse that Foucault presents is influenced by a fundamental idea of ‘language as a construction of the social world’, and there exist no objective truth or value-neutral language to study policies. Political language is thus perceived as giving meaning to certain ‘problems’, events or concepts and was specifically coined by Bacchi to approach policy as discourse (Bacchi, 2009, Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016) Carol Bacchi argues for the necessity of approaching policies as discourse, understanding that policies *make* problems rather than *addressing* problems that ‘exist’ (Bacchi, 2016:17). A critical policy analysis within the WPR-approach thus challenges the taken-for-granted perspectives of the role of government as ‘solving problems’. The WPR approach is perceived as;

“an analytic strategy that puts in question the common view that the role of governments is to solve problems that sit outside them, wanting to be “addressed”. Rather it considers how governmental practices, understood broadly, produce “problems” as particular kinds of problems” (Bacch, 2009:).

The discursive construction of subjects and this conceptualization of power as productive is a helpful analytic approach to examine how policies *shape* particular kinds of subjects, thus making them governable. This approach assumes subjects as discursively constructed, thus implying that a certain kind of political discourse produces certain kinds of subjects. This process of discursively constructing subjects is termed ‘subjectification’. Foucault’s concept will thus become a central element of my policy analysis regarding the examination of embedded rationales and forms of governance in the strategy. More specifically, when examining the effects of the rationales and logics that underpin the problematizations in the 2030 strategy.

The particular approach chosen to conduct this critical policy analysis is thus ‘framed’ by the WPR approach by Bacchi. The analytic task in the WPR-approach is to identify certain *representations* of ‘problems’ in the policy material. The identified problematizations will thus be examined to trace out the underlying assumptions and conceptual premises that underpin the policy under scrutiny (Bacchi, 2009:17). The WPR-approach is thus applied as both method and theory in my thesis.

The essential points of the WPR approach as method will be elaborated on later in this chapter. First, I zoom in on the essential points of the WPR approach as theoretical framework for my analysis. The WPR approach explicitly draws attention to the power relations embedded in the discourse, focusing on the possible disruption and possible interpretation and contestation. Perhaps the most relevant feature of this approach is Bacchi’s focus on how ‘problems’ are constructed in a certain way, thus ‘silencing’ other possible ‘meanings’. This process of producing issues as ‘problems’ obscures the fact that other issues are simply just accepted as ‘that’s the way things are’. The focus on the silences is highly relevant and important for my analysis of the 2030 strategy. In the third part of my analysis, in chapter 4, I have decided to supplement my policy analysis with ethnographic research material, with the intention of elucidating some of the ‘issues’ in the policy that are left unproblematic or just ‘left as universal’ or as ‘naturals’ (Bacchi, 2009:66). I will use the ethnographic studies to discuss what I think is left unproblematic in the discourse and present a new perspective, the micro-level of analysis with experiences from the ghetto areas.

Before I zoom in on the essentials of the WPR method, I elaborate on the second theoretical framework of the WPR method of discourse policy analysis, influenced and inspired by Foucault, focusing on government and governance rationales.

Governmentality; governance and power

Within the methodological framework of the WPR approach, a government's role in policy production is thus acknowledged as a natural 'influencer' on both the political, social and cultural and economic processes ahead of the policy being produced. Within the discourse analysis of policy production, a policy is perceived as having a role in creating the 'problems' that policy seems to address; the policy is no longer perceived as '*a solution to a specific problem*' within this specific policy analysis using the WPR-method (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). The discourse analysis of policy material further enables the researcher to critically analyze expressions and elements of rule and governance. Governance is accomplished not only through policy but via multiple strategies, technicalities and government measurements aimed at regulating behavior among citizens and groups, or what Foucault calls '*the conduct of conduct*' - including 'self-regulation' (Lemke, 2001).

"Governments play a privileged role because their understandings 'stick' – their versions of 'problems' are formed or constituted in the legislation, reports and technologies used to govern. Hence, these versions of 'problems' take on lives of their own. They exist in the real (Bacchi, 2009:3).

The Governmentality approach of this specific policy analysis is particularly concerned about what processes and practices that constitute 'subjects' as 'governable' through promoting identities that 'perform' behaviors deemed to be desirable (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016:50). In this perspective, policies are perceived as not simply reactions to '*people who exist*'; policies produce certain 'subjects' aiming at making them governable. Policies are then involved in shaping what is possible for people to become, illustrating how power is a productive force (Ibid: 50). An important point to make here is that even policies can produce certain subjects, making them governable; this do not change the fact that individuals can- and they do - negotiate the processes to which they are subjected; "*while governmental practices might seek to create specific types of subjects, it does not mean that they necessarily or completely succeed in doing so. Individuals can and do negotiate the processes to which they are subjected*" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016)

This point is relevant in relation to the part of my analysis that seeks to examine how the political discourse resonates within everyday practices. What subjects does the policy produce, and how can this be illustrated with the ethnographic material?

A last part of the Governmentality approach to policy analysis is that of the political technicalities. Technicalities are understood as ‘tools’ or measurements to govern. An example is the ghetto-list, which is a political officially accepted technicality. This list is politically used to govern social housing areas in Denmark and implicitly intervene and regulate behavior of certain groups of people in the Danish society. The political technicalities rely on a classification or ‘dividing practices’ of i.e. ‘employed vs. unemployed’ ‘non-western vs. ‘western’ categories to shape the conduct of individuals and groups of people. This enables some realities and disable others, which emphasizes the imperative to consider how a policy may produce silences and unproblematic dividing practices. (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, Bacchi, 2009)

Territorial stigmatization

The concept of territorial stigmatization (TS) is external to the WPR approach and presented by Loïc Wacquant. The theory of territorial stigmatization is relevant in my analysis, as I intend to examine how the policy rationales may affect the ghetto areas and their residents. The theory of TS focus on the processes of stigmatizing certain places and how this may have an effect on the individual, in what Wacquant refers to as an ‘internalization of the stigma’ (Wacquant et.al., 2014, Qvotrup & Christensen, 2012)

Wacquant explains the process of territorial stigmatization as whether an area is dangerous and unsafe actually doesn’t matter if first the ‘public stigma’ of that specific place has been established as a dominating discourse (Wacquant, 2008) This is enough, according to Wacquant, to cause severe social and harmful consequences for the individual living in that specific place. He coins this process the ‘internalization of territorial stigma’. Wacquant develops his theory based on his extensive research in the American ghettos and the French Banlieues. For years, he has done research on the ‘ghetto’ in both a European and American context. His extensive research is relevant in a Danish context, even if the definitions (based on American conditions) of the ghetto and hyper-ghetto do not apply in a Danish context to the social housing areas. (Wacquant, 2008, Shultz) I use Wacquant’s work in my analysis when I put the policy into a critical discussion with existing research from the

Danish ghettos. My aim here is not to discuss the definitions of the concept Ghetto and whether it applies to a Danish context. Instead I'm interested in how the policy construct a certain discourse of the Danish ghetto which produces stigmatized housing areas. According to Wacquant this stigmatization of a place thus accidentally lead to an internalization of that stigma among the residents. This is the process he coins territorial stigmatization. This process is my focus when I put the policy findings into a critical discussion with the existing ethnographic material. His theoretical work on territorial stigma and his book on the neoliberal government of social insecurity, of the punishing penal state, I argue also have relevance for my study (Wacquant, 2009)

I supplement studies and theories by Wacquant with the work of Sune Qvotrup Jensen and Ann-Dorte Christensen and their application of the theory of territorial stigmatization to a qualitative study, as an inspiration for my analysis (Qvotrup & Christensen, 2012). They carried out a qualitative analysis of territorial stigmatization in Aalborg East, one of the so-called deprived ghetto areas in Denmark. Their purpose was to examine levels of internalization of stigma in a stigmatized area. Their results illustrate that some of the residents did not internalize the stigma, but they did 'manage it or cope with it'. Sune Qvotrup thus argues that this could be interpreted as a kind of 'coping mechanism'. This is an interesting analysis for my study. I set out to examine how the stigma of the ghetto may resonate with research in the three ethnographies, to see if this influences the individuals who live in a public stigmatized area. Do they internalize, or do they cope or manage as described in Qvotrup's study?

What's the Problem Represented to Be? as Method

In previous sections of this chapter, I have outlined the theoretical framework of my thesis. Now I zoom in on the specifics of the WPR method which guides my analysis. The WPR as method consists of 6 questions, which together constitute a practical analytical tool utilized in this thesis. I have decided not to follow the questions systematically in my analysis, since I want a more 'fluid analysis' that moves back and forth between a micro-level of inquiry in the ghetto areas to a macro-level of investigating government conducts and political logics. But for clarification of the characteristics and elements of the 6 questions to be applied to my material, I present the questions here systematically.

The specific questions that constitute the WPR method are as follows (Bacchi, 2009):

1. *What's the 'problem' represented to be? (in the policy)*

This first question is a clarification exercise (Bacchi 2009: 3) The task here is to work backwards to 'read off' the implied problem in the policy strategy, accepting that the policy 'problem' lies within the process of producing a certain policy document, strategy or text. The purpose here is to identify implicit 'problem' *representation(s)* of the strategy. (Bacchi, 2009:3)

2. *What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?*

This question involves thinking about the ontological and epistemological assumptions and presuppositions that underpin the policy under scrutiny. By examining the underlying assumptions, we can identify '*conceptual logics*' and rationales that underpin this specific representation of a 'problem'. (Bacchi, 2009:5) A key point here is to 'go beyond' the immediate and consider the 'deep-seated cultural values and rationales'. This task is referred to as '*a Foucauldian archeology*' and requires attention to the binaries, dichotomies, key concepts and categories in the policy material that the problematizations rely upon. Governmentality of rationales and technologies is the focus of this question.

3. *How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?*

There are two objectives in this question. First, the task here requires reflection on the specific practices and processes that have contributed to the development of the identified representations of problems. Here we will explore the histories of the contemporary 'problem' representation in order to understand how this representation has been shaped over time and how it has established as a certain discourse with dominance. This question is directly inspired by Foucault's concept of *genealogy*. The second objective of the question is concerned about how knowledge is produced, and how power-relations enable some knowledges to gain status over others. What 'events' have led to this policy to be shaped. We explore the mechanisms and histories of the representations. The next question asks about the silences or what is left unproblematic with these problematizations, logics and rationales.

4. *What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be thought about differently?*

Here, we consider the limits of a representation and ask what fails to be problematized. The task here is to uncover the silences of a representation to highlight simplifications, distortions, and misrepresentations, in order to demonstrate what the policy is leaving out or attempts not to address. “*Specific policies are constrained by the ways in which they represent the 'problem'*” (Bacchi, 2009:13-14)

5. *What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?*

We direct our attention to the effects of ‘the problematizations and remind ourselves that discourse is not just a set of ideas or a particular kind of knowledge or language. Instead, discourses are *'practices with material consequences'*. Hence, some effects function to benefit some people and then harm others, and what can be done about this? (Bacchi, 2009:15) Bacchi presents the three effects that the WPR approach is interested in. These are not to be confused with ‘outcomes’, which more conventional policy analysts measure. (Bacchi, 2009:15)

'Discursive effects'

How certain problematizations in the policy strategy create silences and then ‘close off’ other ways of thinking, thus limiting *'what can be said and thought'*. (Bacchi, 2009:16).

'Subjectification effects'

Policies produce subjects as certain kinds of ‘subjects’, thus making them governable. “*Hence, who we are - how we feel about ourselves and others – is at least to an extent an effect of the subject positions made available in public policies*” (Bacchi, 2009:16) This process is referred to as *'dividing practices'* which create members of targeted groups responsible for ‘the problem’, thus making the problem an individual ‘problem’.

'Lived effects'

‘Lived effects’ should be understood as an “*analytic category, ensures that the ways in which discursive and subjectification effects translate into people's lives form part of the analysis*” (Bacchi, 2016:23). They are referred to as the direct material impact of ‘problem’ representations on people's lives. These effects are what happen ‘in the real’. Bacchi assumes that there are *'real people living*

out there’ affected by the policies, referred to as ‘lived effects’ of the discursive practices. For this reason, my analysis is supplemented with ethnographic research from the ghetto areas, aiming at elucidating on possible ‘lived effects’.

6. How/where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated and defended= How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

The first task here is to identify representations of problems that seem to ‘dominate’. Attention is directed at possible resistance, asking how the dominating discourses can be thought about differently, or thought of as resources for ‘re-problematizations’. Is it possible to trace ‘counter-discourses’ that aim at challenging harmful representations of problems?

Data collection and empirical material

The primary data material for my policy analysis consists of the government strategy “*One Denmark without parallel societies - No Ghettos by 2030*” (Danish Government, 2018). In the first two parts of my analysis when I analyze the problematizations and the underlying assumptions embedded in the policy, this strategy is my primary and only source. When I proceed to the third and fourth part of my analysis, I have also utilized other relevant material relating to the 2030 strategy.

Through classic desk research, I have gathered other relevant material and research related to the policy and in general related to the case of the social housing areas and in specific policy material, debates and research relating to the surrounding political landscape and the Danish public and media debates related to the ghetto areas and parallel societies, in specifics and to integration, migrations, politics among other related themes.

My empirical material of ethnographic research

To answer my research question and explore how the policy resonate with existing ethnographic research I have chosen three relevant studies to supplement and accomplish my analysis. Bacchi’s WPR approach does not offer a method for supplementing one’s policy analysis with ethnographic or qualitative material. Instead, I have followed the ‘principles’ of a multiple case-study design. According to Cresswell, a case study research design involves a study of an issue explored through

one or more cases within a bounded system. A bounded system could be a context or an issue. In my thesis, the bounded system is that of the ghetto areas in Denmark. I have therefore decided to use three different cases that all - although in different ways - concern experiences and everyday life and practices in a ghetto area in Denmark. An essential point of conducting research within a multiple case study design is to choose several cases that illustrate and analyze the same issue, phenomena or case. In my thesis, the Danish ghetto is the case, and I have chosen three qualitative research studies for my design, which each used ethnographic fieldwork to study the ghetto. I will present a short summary of the main conclusions of the three works.

The first case study is written by Mette Louise E. Johansen. The study is her PhD; "*In The Borderland – Palestinian Parents navigating Danish Welfare State Interventions*" (original title)(Johansen, 2013). Johansen conducted fieldwork in the Danish ghetto Gellerupparken in 2009 and 2010, where she lived with a Palestinian family while conducting fieldwork and. Her PhD is the most extensive and interesting work I have read in a long time. The stories she tells and the analysis she presents of the life in a ghetto, between police control, social workers, crime, neighbors, families, stigma and prejudices.

The second work I have chosen is the Danish book '*The fight over Vollsmose*' (translated by Author; Kampen om Vollsmose) which was edited by Helle Lykke Nielsen (Nielsen, 2019). The book was published in April 2019 and is a collection of 11 chapters written by 10 different authors, who in various ways have conducted research and fieldwork in and around Vollsmose. The book is an interesting read and give another and more nuanced picture of complex issues of a life in this ghetto area. Especially related to the stigma of insecurity and crime being ascribed to this housing area.

The last case is the book "*Co-existence – everyday life and neighborhood in a multiethnic housing area*" (Translated by Author; Sameksistens – Hverdagliv og naboskab i et multietnisk boligområde) written by Tina Gudrun Jensen (Jensen, 2016). She conducted fieldwork and interviews in 2010-11 in a multiethnic housing area based in Copenhagen but referred to under the pseudonym 'Grønnevang'. The book is a part of a larger research-group (SOCED) focusing on 'social cohesion and ethnic diversity'. The specific results presented in this book are based on her fieldwork in 2010 and 2011. I have chosen this book as part of my empirical material, based on the variety of everyday

life experiences and the daily encounters between different ethnic groups of both conflicts and friendships.

CHAPTER 2.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF GHETTO AND PARALLEL SOCIETIES

Introduction

This chapter begins the critical policy analysis of the 2030 strategy. The first task is a clarification exercise and the purpose here is to, in a descriptive language, examine what is being proposed as changes in the policy material. The identification of the changes is a clarification exercise and it is quite straightforward. Recall that by applying a WPR approach, one sets out to examine the policy material within an understanding that policies: "... do not *address* problems that exist; rather, they *produce* "problems" as particular sorts of problems" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016:16). The task here is an exploration of how the strategy gives shape and meaning to certain issues, conditions or 'phenomena' by discursively constructing them as particular kinds of 'problems'. Bacchi coins the term 'problem representation' or 'problematization' to refer to these discursively constructs of 'problems'. In the following I will present the 4 core representations of 'problems' which I identified in my analysis of the material. The 'problem representations', I will explain, are the 'baseline' for the entire policy analysis that will unfold in the following chapters.

In the table below, I have listed the 4 'overall' proposals for change that the Government present in the 2030 strategy. In total the 4 overall changes consist of 22 specific initiatives to be implemented between 2019 and 2026. The proposed changes are listed the same way as they appear in the 2030 strategy, only translated and arranged by me in the table for a better overall view of the 'headlines' of the initiatives. Recall that the WPR approach understands a policy 'problem' as a certain way of *representing* a 'problem', rather than an actual 'problem' in need of fixing.

I have listed the proposed changes of the 2030 strategy in the table below, which gives the reader an overview of the overall proposed changes I have used in my analysis of the representations of 'problems'.

Proposal for change listed as overall initiative in the 2030 strategy	Description of initiative
Physical demolition and rebuilding of ‘deprived’ housing-estates	<p>Change the vulnerable social housing areas to become ‘ordinary towns’. Reduce the number of family-apartments.</p> <p>Possible to demolish buildings and entire ghetto-areas.</p> <p>Tenants can be terminated in case of privatization and sell-off of buildings.</p>
Stricter regulation of composition of residents	<p>Individuals who receive unemployment benefits are restricted to move into ghetto-areas; if they do anyway, the benefits will be reduced to the level of integration benefits.</p> <p>All individuals already receiving integration benefits are restricted to move into a ghetto-area. In cases of family reunification, if the one part lives in a ghetto-area or a vulnerable social housing area, the reunification application is rejected.</p>
More visible police, ‘special penalty zones’ and higher penalty to prevent crime and insecure areas	<p>In areas with a high rate of crime related activities, special ‘penalty-zones’ can be established. This means that the penalties can be higher, compared to the same crime committed outside these zones.</p> <p>All criminals out of the ghettos.</p>
‘A better start in life’ for all children	<p>All children living in either a vulnerable social housing area or ghetto-area, must attend daycare from they turn 1 year. A daycare where they can learn Danish is mandated. The daycare is only allowed to accept maximum 30pct. of children from vulnerable social housing areas. Parents can be economically sanctioned if they violate the guidelines.</p> <p>Mandated language test. Better composition of students at the high schools. Penalties to poorly performing schools. Criminalization of ‘re-educational trips’. Stricter punishment in case of domestic violence.</p>

- *The listed proposals in the table is translated from Danish by author from the 2030 strategy, 2018 (Danish Government, 2018).*

Based on the overall proposed changes listed above, the 4 ‘representations of problems’ will be described in turn and illustrated with relevant extracts and quotes from the 2030 strategy. The problematizations I have identified as core or central encompass several other interrelated ideas and

narratives, recalling that policies are not straightforward and clearly defined. Thus, the complexity and the multiple ‘problems’ in the policy texts may sometimes overlap or ‘be nested within each other’. As I will illustrate in the following, the four core representations thus articulate upon a set of other interrelated ‘representations of ‘problems’– they operate in reinforcing ways to give shape to a certain representation, which then articulates with dominance. Some of the representations will be explicit and other articulate in more implicit ways, thus requiring me to ‘work backwards’ from the ‘listed proposals’ or arguments, to reveal them. They should, nevertheless, be present in the policy material. In this chapter, I only use descriptive language which echoes the language of the Government policy texts. I have been very careful not to refer to any secondary literature that critique or analyze the Government discourse and embedded rationales. My primary aim here is to identify, describe, and classify the problematizations found in the 2030 strategy.

This process is the foundation for the entire critical policy analysis which will unfold in the next chapters.

Four core representations of ‘problems’ in the 2030 strategy

My analysis revealed four core presentations as central, constituting a very clear pattern of the ‘embedded rationale’ of the strategy. Throughout the entire material, the Government uses very explicit language when referring to the ‘problems’ which they propose as changes, thus constituting these four:

1. Parallel societies
2. ‘Non-western’ background
3. Unsafe areas and criminal activity
4. ‘Bad parenting’ – ‘problematic individual behavior’

While there are several problematizations throughout the entire strategy, they all seem to be derived from or related to these 4 central representations. For example, the strategy reveals a problematizations of ‘violence’ and ‘social control’, but they are typically conceived as examples of kinds of ‘bad parenting’ or as a problem related to the ‘non-western background’. Another example

is the problematization of ‘welfare-dependency’ which is often referred to in relation to either ‘parallel societies’ or ‘non-western background’. The welfare-dependency often articulates in relation to ‘social norms and values’ referring to a desired behavior of the individual as an active citizen, participating in society and the labor market. These representations discursively articulate as ‘sub-categories’ in relation to the core problematizations, which contribute to construct them as central and with certain dominance/power. These examples of different discursive constructs of ‘problems’, illustrate how the representations of problems are intertwined; either overlapping or are ‘nested together’ (Bacchi, 2009:21). The four core representations are conceived as mutually reinforcing each other, thus creating a very coherent discourse about the ‘problems’ in the 2030 strategy. In the following, I will in turn describe the four problematizations, drawing on extracts from the 2030 strategy.

1. Parallel societies as core problematization

The problematization ‘parallel societies’ is repeated most frequently in the texts and appears with a dominant position and constitute the most obvious explanation for the ‘problems’ in the 2030 strategy. This representation is referred to throughout the entire strategy in different ways, expressed with the quotations I present to substantiate how they constitute. As explained above, the four core representations articulate either by nesting with others or by intertwining. I identified three other ‘problems’ in the 2030 strategy ‘social norms and values’, ‘social cohesion’ and ‘integration’ and ‘ghetto-areas’ which repeatedly ‘nest’ with the core representation ‘parallel society’. The other core representation ‘non-western’ intertwine repeatedly throughout the strategy with ‘parallel society’. Thus, the two problematizations both qualify as central, and the significance of the ‘non-western’ problematization in the material gives shape to the idea and rationales of the strategy. As I will describe in the following, the different ‘problems’ I identify all together give shape to a certain discourse.

The problematization ‘Parallel societies’ are referred to as a ‘counter-culture’ to the Danish society and perceived as something in direct opposition to what the strategy refers to as ‘Denmark’. In different ways, the Government refers to the ghetto-areas in terms of ‘parallel societies’ and ‘counter-cultures’, framing the ghetto-areas in a certain way. Both implicit and explicit arguments articulate different binaries, such as ‘the Danish society vs. ‘parallel society’ and ‘Denmark’ vs. ‘Ghetto’. The Government argues that a negative spiral produces counter-culture in Denmark; thus all ghetto-areas

must be demolished. *“We see social milieus where a negative spiral produce ‘counter-culture. Denmark must continue to be Denmark. Places where the parallel-societies occur must be Denmark again. All ghettos must be eradicated. We must break down all parallel-societies”* (Danish Government, 2018:5, 6).

The concept of culture is never used in relation to Danish society. Culture as concept is only used when explaining how parallel societies are perceived as being isolated areas where people share a ‘counter culture’ to the Danish society. It is not explicitly defined what the Government perceives as ‘Danish culture’. Instead, the strategy refers to Danish values and norms and use the word ‘Denmark’, when explaining what the parallel societies are contrary to. This is an interesting and very relevant observation for my analysis further on. The Government refers to the parallel societies as something ‘fundamentally different’ from Danish values and norms, without explaining, what Danish values and norms entail of concrete meanings.

‘lack of social values and norms’

“Some places we experience a behavior in opposition to those rights, obligations and democratic and liberal values of freedom, upon which the Danish society is built.” - “Citizens in parallel-societies must be fellow-citizens who participate in society – economically and as human beings. As all other Danish citizens”(Danish Government, 2018:7).

This quote illustrates the preferred behavior to build a Danish society. That of democracy and human rights and a shared understanding and respect for values such as freedom. The Government strategy here expresses a ‘desired behavior’ of ‘an active participating’ citizen, both economically and as a human being, thus constructing an idea of what the Government perceives as a necessity for a Denmark without parallel societies. Thus, constructing a problematization of ‘lack of Danish social values and norms’ and an idea of what Danish culture is.

The next quote speaks into something similar implying a ‘Danish culture’, and here explicitly describes who the Government means when they refer to the ‘inactive citizen who does not participate’. Again, a binary opposition thus illustrates what is preferred; The ‘Danish citizen’ vs. ‘citizen with non-western’ background. *“Parallel-societies emerge among people with non-western backgrounds. Too many immigrants and their descendants live without any affiliation to the Danish*

society, Without education. Without job. And without sufficient Danish language skills "(Danish Government, 2018: :4).

Unlike the first quote, here its expressed in very explicit terms whom they refer to when the Government describes who share an undesired behavior, lack of education and employment and lack of language skills, which they think are qualities that fit into the Danish society. This extract illustrates how the 'non-western' immigrants and their descendants are referred to as the group of people who create parallel societies in Denmark qua their insufficient language skills, lack of education and a general lack of affiliation with the Danish society.

Implicitly, the Government expresses that 'Danish values' are a fundamental prerequisite for a coherent Denmark without ghettos and parallel societies. This implicit reference to 'cohesion' brings me to the next 'problem', which nests with the parallel society problematization.

Indeed, the repeated references to 'Danish values and norms' is a way of expressing a desired goal for the integration of the non-western individuals, instead of isolating in parallel societies, creating 'counter-cultures'.

'integration' and 'social cohesion'

Another 'problem' in the policy material is the bad or failed 'integration' of immigrants and their descendants. This problematization is often expressed implicitly and in relation to the other problematizations. Here, in relation to the 'problem' 'social cohesion', I thus elaborate on the two as mutually reinforcing.

"In decades, we have accepted too many refugees and family reunifications, who haven't been integrated in the Danish society. We allowed them to 'huddle together' in ghetto areas without any contact to the Danish society whatsoever. Even after years in Denmark, because the demands, to integrate and become a part of the Danish community, have been insufficient." (Danish Government, 2018:5)

This quote illustrates how 'failed integration' is perceived as a prerequisite for the emergence of parallel societies. Here the 'problem' integration is linked to 'parallel society', expressing an insufficient integration process. An interesting thing becomes apparent in this quotation. The

Government expresses a concern for their responsibility as Government, for a failed integration “*we allowed them to huddle together*” (my emphasis). This is an interesting shift, from focusing on the individuals responsible for certain developments of problems, to that of the Government’s responsibility. The ambiguity of where the responsibility lies for the failed integration, becomes apparent here. Is it on the Danish Government or the individual? “*Once and for all, we must deal with the huge problem of integration, where a group of immigrants and their descendants haven’t accepted Danish values and norms, instead they isolate in parallel societies*” (Danish Government, 2018:6).

Beside the problems with integration, the Government expresses a concern for the Danish social cohesion and the general balance in society as jeopardized by the emergence of parallel societies. “*Parallel societies are a great load on the social cohesion, for the society, and for the individual*” (Danish Government, 2018:5). The correlation that the Government expresses between the social cohesion and integration support a more general picture of the ‘problems’ with ghettos and parallel societies in relation to the surrounding Danish society. First, the different arguments/expressions of problems with social cohesion and integration give shape to the Government’s perception of a shared responsibility between the Government and the individual. Secondly, this reflects a general connection between the ghettos and parallel societies and how the social cohesion is being threatened by this development. This ambiguity of responsibility will be analyzed in detail in the next chapter, where I examine the rationales and logics that underpin these problematizations.

2. ‘Non- western background’ as core problematization

The ‘non-western background’ problematization is the second core problematization found in the policy material. As explained above, it becomes evident in the strategy that, due to the tendency of non-westerners grouping together in ghetto and vulnerable housing-areas, it justifies for the emergence of parallel societies in the ghetto-areas. As illustrated with the ‘parallel society’ problematization, the non-western category is constructed throughout the text in connection to the same problems of ‘lack of social values and norms’ and lack of ‘integration’. It becomes obvious for the reader that the non-western problematization is discursively articulated with dominance in relation to all of the four core problematizations; parallel societies, bad parenting, and criminal and unsafe

ghetto-areas. The non-western problematizations reunite all of the four problematizations by either intertwining or nesting, and thus reveals a central political discourse in the 2030 strategy.

Parallel societies

As I illustrated in the previous section, the two core problematizations parallel society and non-western intertwine several times in the material, emphasizing the dominance of them both. *"About 15 pct. of all families with a non-western background share several characteristics that indicates, that they live in isolation from the rest of the Danish society"* (Danish Government, 2018:5). The 'problems' are presented with reference to both parallel societies and isolation and non-western background.

Furthermore, these people who share a non-western background originally come from societies with a fundamentally different set of values. *"Most of the citizens with a non-western-background originally comes from societies that share some fundamentally different sets of values than the Danish"* (Danish Government, 2018:7).

It seems that the Government perceives the group of individuals with a non-western background as one of the central problems that causes the emergence of parallel societies, explicitly expressed in the above stated argument. In implicit terms, also referring to the argument that the lack of Danish values and norms can cause the emergence of parallel societies qua their non-western background. The non-western problematization is further discursively connected to the 'problems' 'social control' and 'criminal activity' and 'violence'. These 'problems' have also been articulated in relation to the parallel society.

3. 'Bad parenting' as core problematization

The problematization 'bad parenting' constitutes several problematizations of the parent referred to as 'irresponsible' or 'wrong' due to an idea of 'them' rejecting Danish values and norms, thus discursively constructing the 'bad parent' category. The representation of the problem is also articulated in relation to the core representation of 'parallel society' and in relation to 'non-western background', thus some of the same ideas and rationales being shared. In various ways, the Government necessitates a response to 'bad parenting' in the ghetto-areas and parallel societies, both

in explicit and implicit terms; *“There are parents in the parallel societies who do not take responsibility, and they leave the children unattended. This may harm the child”*(Danish Government, 2018:27).

The fourth overall proposal for change is that of ‘bad parenting’ by addressing the Governments discursive problematization of social problems relating to migrants’ children’s well-being within the parallel societies. The problem with ‘bad parenting’ is based upon different norms of what a parent should be in a Danish context. In both implicit and explicit terms, the Government describes an image of the ‘non-western’ parent as irresponsible. Furthermore, by presenting the responsibility of the parent in terms of ‘insufficient, not-Danish’, ‘unacceptable behavior’ and ‘violence’, an explicit expression relating to ‘harming the child’ is referred to in relation to ‘social control’ and domestic violence’; *“social control, honor-related conflicts and violence is completely unacceptable. As society, we can’t tolerate it. Especially not when it affects children and women. Domestic violence can have far-reaching consequences for the children and their development”* (Danish Government, 2018:29) I identify other expressions, referring to the ‘social wellbeing’ of the child in relation to ‘Danish values and norms’ and the responsibility of the parent; *“it’s an essential part of the parenthood to ensure that the children attend school and actively participate in the lectures. This is the foundation for a good child- and adulthood”* (Danish Government, 2018:27).

And upon the preferred and desired Danish values and norms; *“The Government wishes to ensure that all children in the ghetto-areas and vulnerable housing-estates can have a good childhood and an ‘age-appropriate language’. Furthermore, from early childhood, they must be surrounded by values such as equality, community and ‘co-determination and co-responsibility ”*(Danish Government, 2018:24)

There is a risk that children growing up in the housing-estates can live an isolated life and even create ‘mini-parallel societies’ in the daycare centers they attend, because of the composition of residents in the housing-estates and a lack of regulation in this field. *“A high proportion of children living in the housing-estates gives them bad prerequisites for contact to Danish values and norms, thus the daycare center can even create a mini-parallel society“* (Danish Government, 2018:25).

The last argument that constitutes the ‘bad parenting’ problematization relates to the responsibility

of the Government in relation to the children in the ghetto-areas. In the strategy, it is explicitly expressed that as a society we have a responsibility for those who have been abandoned; *“As society we have a responsibility for the children who have been neglected. We must ensure that the perpetrator is held accountable for his/her actions. Therefore, we do not accept domestic violence”* (Danish Government, 2018:29).

Again, the Government expresses a responsibility as society while simultaneously arguing for the responsibility of the parent. A central proposal in the strategy is punishment of the parents who fail to adjust to the responsibilities they have as parents. *“Parents who fail to their responsibilities will experience that they ‘lose the children’s-check’ for a period. A criminalization of parents is necessary if children are sent on re-educational journey. In general, the focus and punishment will be stricter towards domestic violence, furthermore towards Government officials who fail their duty to notify Government officials in case of violence and other social problems”* (Danish Government, 2018:8).

A central point here is that, compared to parents in the wider Danish society, parents living in the ghetto and vulnerable housing-estates, are subject to other measurements and regulations in their private lives, concerning the wellbeing of their children. The decision on mandatory daycare for children from 1 years old, only adhere to parents living in the ghetto and vulnerable housing-estates. No such law applies for parents living outside these areas.

4. ‘Unsafe and criminal areas’ as core problematization

A central focus in the strategy concerns the ghettos as unsafe and insecure places for residents and for the surrounding community. Both implicitly and explicitly, the Government presents a list of proposals to manage the ‘feelings of insecurity’ in the ghetto and vulnerable housing-estates. I understand this problematization as central because it involves references to embedded rationales and ideas concerning the justification of some of the social problems within the ghetto areas. The ‘problem’ is in various ways referred in a similar language to this quote;

“We won’t accept that gangs and criminals create insecurity and harass the residents in the vulnerable housing-estates. We continue the fight against criminals in the parallel societies. The feeling of insecurity must not be perceived as natural, thus frightening the citizens who participate actively in the society, and scare them away. We must be strict and consistent toward criminals in the vulnerable housing-estates” (Danish Government, 2018:8).

Violence and security seems to be discursively constructed with the problematization of non-western individuals and parallel societies. It seems that the Government discursively constructs a connection between the place, as a physical place, and the problematization of violence and residents' feelings of being insecure in the ghetto-areas. The point here is that the ghetto as an area becomes an explanation for some of the social problems the Government intends to address. Moreover, the discursively constructed correlation between non-western individuals and unsafe ghettos is supporting the dominant narrative and the rationales that non-western individuals huddle together, thus creating insecure and unsafe ghetto-areas and parallel societies. The Government states: "*Some of the housing organizations have several experiences with residents who commit criminal acts and cause general insecurity in the area. It is a problem for the citizens in the housing-estates. Furthermore, it is inhibitory to attract new resourceful residents to the areas. If the parallel societies must break, it is necessary to do more to prevent the criminal citizens living in the housing-estates*" (Danish Government, 2018:23).

In different terms, the problematization of the ghetto as a criminal place articulates in connection to 'the criminal individual'. "*We support the visible police effort in the special vulnerable housing-estates. We make it easier to expose residents who commit crimes in and around their vulnerable housing-estates – and make it even more difficult for criminals to move into these areas*" (Danish Government, 2018:8). Thus, the explanation for criminal activity is here explained with the argument of the ghetto as place.

A central argument of the strategy is that a solution to the 'problems' is to totally eradicate the ghetto areas and 'start over'. This argument is constructed as an unmistakable and very concrete proposal for change by the Government; "*In some of the ghetto areas, the challenges with parallel societies, crime, and insecurity is so massive that the only solution, politically and economically, is a total demolition of buildings and start over*" (Danish Government, 2018:14.) In general, this is the overall aim of the 2030 strategy, to eradicate housing-areas, by demolition and rebuilding. This becomes very perceptible with this expression. In similar ways as the other problematizations have nested with problems such as 'values and norms', 'active citizens', and/or 'parallel societies', the problematization with criminal areas and individuals again emphasizes and illustrates the by Government proposed problems; "*the initiatives provide prevention and break down of parallel*

societies, by increasing the incitements to employment, strategies against gangs and criminal youth in touch with the law and strengthen the work with those who do not respect the Danish democracy and Danish values” (Danish Government, 2018:33).

Summary of chapter

In this chapter, I have identified four discursive articulations of core problematizations in the Danish Government strategy “*A Denmark Without parallel societies – no Ghettos by 2030*”, and in doing so, illustrated how the Government understands and ‘thinks about’ various issues or challenges in a certain way, as particular kinds of ‘problems’ related to the Danish ghetto-areas and vulnerable housing-estates. The texts revealed a central and dominant connection between the two core problematizations ‘parallel societies’ and ‘non-western’. The analysis found that the Government strategy represents the Danish ghetto areas counter-cultures and parallel societies with high rates of criminal activity, social control and significantly irresponsible parents. Explicitly, it is described in the strategy how the Danish ghetto areas cause a threat to the Danish society’s cohesion which reflects a general failed integration of groups of ‘non-western individuals.

My analysis also confirmed that the problematizations intertwine and mutually reinforce each other when they overlap and nest together. This interrelatedness of the problematizations creates a consistent and coherent discourse about the problems in the Danish ghetto areas. In doing so, the 2030 strategy actively constructs these problems in a certain way. My analysis thus reveals a coherent and dominant discourse of the Danish ghettos areas as unwanted and impossible to integrate into the wider society. The political response is a total eradication of all ghetto areas and parallel societies before the year 2030. Besides the coherence of the discourse, there may be ambiguities or points of tension in the identified discourse. In the next chapter, I will continue the analysis with a critical examination of the strategy, based on the findings described in this chapter. I will examine what assumptions and rationales that underpin this political discourse. In the following chapters, my findings will be supported with the empirical material from ‘the ghetto-areas’.

CHAPTER 3. ASSUMPTIONS AND RATIONALES IN THE 2030 STRATEGY

Introduction

Moving on from the descriptive part of my analysis, I continue to critically examine the assumptions that underpin the discourse. The analytic task from now on is to tease out the conceptual premises; assumptions or presuppositions that underpin the four core problematizations identified in the previous chapter. My aim here is to elucidate dominating principles and political ideas and reflect upon the practices and political technicalities that sustain them (Bacchi, 2009). My analysis has been focusing on the binaries and the subjectifications that emanate. This analysis of the assumptions and principles that underpin the Government's strategy, enables me to answer my sub-question "*What forms of governance-mentality and political rationales underpin the discourse of the 2030 strategy?*"

Forms of governance – A neoliberal rationality and notions of universalism

Conducting a policy analysis through the lens of a Foucauldian Governmentality-approach utilized with the WPR-approach, I am interested in what forms of government-mentalities and principles that underpin the identified discourse. The essential task here is to examine how things come to happen and not why it happens (Bacchi, 2009:5). My analysis of the 2030 strategy is based on a search for subjects, binaries, key concepts and categories which all together establish upon what political rationales, assumptions and principles the discourse articulates.

I identify some central principles and conceptual logics in the strategy, which reflect the essentials of a neoliberal governance, notions of universalism and some ethnic-based rationales. "*A central aim of a neoliberal Governmentality is the 'strategic creation of social conditions that encourage and necessitate the production of 'Homo economicus', a specific form of subjectivity constituted as a free and autonomous of self-interest'*" (Hamann, 2009). The neoliberal subject is perceived as an individual who is morally responsible for navigating the social realm, by using rational choice. A central principle of the neoliberal mentality is the individualization of responsibility and in the modern neoliberal state, there is a strong emphasis on punishment, control and regulation of citizens. What Foucault refer to as 'the conduct of conduct' (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). Beside this neoliberal understanding of the individual notions of universalism can be traced in the policy material. This notion of universalisms relates to the assumption of the 'bad parent', and an emphasis on the 'child's

rights' concerning their upbringing, schooling and general well-being. The parents are expected to act according to this universal understanding of the child's rights. (Danish Government, 2018). Another rationale is an ethnic-based logic which articulates regarding the argumentation of the emergence of parallel societies. Furthermore, is it used as an explanation for social problems and crime related activities related to the ghetto areas. The ethnic-based logic underpins the central dominant problematization of the non-western subject. The non-western subject articulates as a binary to what is defined as 'Danish values and norms', thus establishing, what is perceived as an undesirable subject, in explicit terms regarding the lack of Danish values, norms and culture. I return to this ethnic-based, first I will elaborate on the essentials of a neoliberal and universal Governmentality and how this is articulated in the policy material (Lemke, 2001)

The individualization of responsibility

“The neo-liberal forms of government feature not only direct intervention by means of empowered and specialized state apparatuses, but also characteristically develop indirect techniques for leading and controlling individuals without at the same time being responsible for them. The strategy of rendering individual subjects ‘responsible’ (and collectives, such as families, associations, etc.) entails shifting the responsibility for social risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, etc., and for life in society into the domain for which the individual is responsible and transforming it into a problem of ‘self-care’ “ (Lemke, 2001:201).

The quote by Thomas Lemke is perfectly illustrating one of the dominating features of the neoliberal government rationale and government practices, which I identify to be present in the 2030 strategy. First, the individualization of responsibility and a government interventionist principle that develop indirect techniques and measurement *to regulate and control individuals without at the same time being responsible for them*. This logic of responsibility is very central in the policy material of my analysis, which I will illustrate with examples. By discursively constructing subjects and objects as governable, the strategy thus make it possible to control and regulate a certain desirable behavior.

The neoliberal principle of individualization of responsibility articulates in various ways when the strategy target individual behavior as a 'problem' thus constituting a problematization on the behavioral level. An essential element of this neoliberal form of governance rationality, expect the individual to 'self-care' and to act responsible and participate thus making the individual fully responsible for their behavior (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, Hamann, 2009, Lemke, 2001).

I explained this desirable behavior with the problematization ‘Bad Parenting’ in the previous chapter. Explicitly illustrated here *“parents who do not take their responsibility”* (Danish Government, 2018:8) and *“it should be possible to punish parents, who send their children on ‘re-educational journeys’, that cause a severe harm on the well-being of the child and its development.”* (Danish Government, 2018:29). The 2030 strategy discursively constructs the responsible subject vs. irresponsible subject to emphasize the relationship of the state and the expected behavior of the parent, and the individual in general.

The subjectification of i.e. the ‘bad parent’ as a provisional subject is an excellent example of how it becomes possible for the Danish government, with the strategy and its implementation and measurements, to regulate certain groups of individuals. My analysis revealed another aspect of this individualization, the criminalization of the individual as a way of regulating wrong and undesirable behavior. An example of this ‘political rationale’ is exemplified with an emphasis on the necessity of a general criminalization of the parents, who do not adhere to social norms - *“we want to criminalize the parents”* (Danish Government, 2018:8). This explicit goal thus reflects a kind of governance-mentality and a political decision on the ‘criminalization of the individual’. Hamann describes this neoliberal logic *“An individual’s failure to engage in the requisite processes of subjectivation, or what neoliberalism refers to as a “mismanaged life”, is consequently due to the moral failure of that individual”* (Haman, 2009:43).

This rationale of the criminalization of the individual for social problems and behavior involves new mechanisms such as the increasing use of sanctions and behavioral requirements to regulate the behavior of the individual. The policy material reveals an underlying rationale of implementing new measurements and regulations specifically target ethnic groups sharing a non-western background. The neoliberal rationale thus became a matter of ethnicity. The emphasis on the ethnicity of the individual reflects a broader and more general development in the political field in Denmark. A political shift in the Danish migration policies, in general, and regarding the integration of immigrants and their descendants and refugees and the Danish asylum system, has undergone a significant change and especially since the stop of the refugee influx in 2015 (Olwig & Paergaard, 2011). The Danish policies concerning migration and integration has been characterized by a consistent adoption of stricter policies and a general turn towards the prevention of immigration and receiving refugees in specific. This development is also reflected in the policies concerning ghettos areas in Denmark. Since 2010 and the official ghetto-list the policies has been characterized with a focus on limiting the

ghetto areas achieved by more control and regulation of composition of residents and individual punishment, economically.

The current strategy is thus characterized by this general development in the Danish society, and a strong emphasis on the question of ethnicity, articulated with the non-western subject and the parallel societies category, to emphasize this assumption of a threat from non-westerns and the emergence of countercultures to the Danish Society. This also reflect a universal understanding of the Danish society as a fixed and united homogenous society (Jöchnke, 2011) This antagonism may entail a possible consequence if stigmatizing the non-western when perceived as a fundamental negative opposition to the subject category of the Danish citizen and the Danish society in general.

An interesting point is that the measurements concerning the individual is ethnic-based and based on an intention of targeting 'the real problems'. However, the overall goal of the 2030 strategy is a total eradication of all ghetto areas achieved by either rebuilding or selling off apartments in the areas. This however do not only target the groups of residents with non-western background, it also affect ethnic Danes. Considering this development, I argue that the strategy then unintentionally affects all residents in general and not only the groups with non-western background, as stated in the overall aim. According to Wacquant, this development with individual punishment is an expression of the typical aggressive neoliberal state' (Wacquant, 2009) It is characterized with high levels of 'regulation and interventions' on peoples live on an everyday basis. An argument is that the neoliberal state has developed into a 'state of punishment' or as Wacquant argue a penal state that punish and regulate at the bottom of society by economically punishing the poor for being welfare-dependents and just for being poor (Wacquant, 2009) He further explains

"The gradual replacement of a (semi-)welfare state by police and penal sate for which the criminalization of marginality and the punitive containment of dispossessed categories serve as social policy at the lower end of the class and ethnic order" (Wacquant, 2009: 41).

In a neoliberal governance perspective, the welfare state is limited and the individual is expected to care for oneself. The passive reliance on social welfare constructs the problematization of 'welfare-dependency' as a central feature of the problems with the ghetto areas and the isolation in parallel societies. Lemke describes this logic: *"Neo-liberalism is a political rationality that tries to render the social domain economic and to link a reduction in (welfare) state services and security systems to the increasing call for 'personal responsibility' and 'self-care'"* (Lemke, 2001:203). An example

of this is illustrated with the various forms of technicalities that the strategy present to regulate the ‘social domain’ with economic sanctions i.e. by punishment and regulation regarding the welfare-recipients. i.e. of the parents who do not, adhere to the measurements and legislature. The parents are punished economically for their individual responsibilities as parents and for their lack of social responsibility as active participating citizens. Furthermore, this is illustrated with the individuals receiving ‘integration-benefits’ who are prohibited to move into a ghetto-area (Danish Government, 2018).

Social exclusion of welfare-recipients

The regulation of behavior and a general targeting of welfare-recipients reflect a broader and more fundamental notion of the welfare system and the regulation of its size and services.

An essential part of the Danish welfare system, is the extensive social services and national health-care programs. Many of the responsibilities that in other counties are undertaken by family and private organizations are thus assumed by these services, with state support. Through these programs and services the Danish state intervenes directly in people’s private lives, which is widely accepted by the Danish population, who in general have a positive attitude towards public authorities and the Danish state as explained above. (Olwig & Paerregaard, 2011) The Danish welfare system functions and works because the Danish population are willing to pay their taxes and in return they have free access to i.e. health-care and free schooling as two essentials of the welfare-model. Nevertheless, the Danish welfare model is unique, but as I have explored so far, it seems that the essential and very unique aspect of the Danish welfare-model is being limited with the 2030 strategy. The Danish welfare state is based on the universalist ‘Nordic Model’, where welfare services are provided through national agencies which are closely integrated into the public sector and funded by taxation. The right to welfare service are based on the citizenship and not on income or previous employment and contribution to the welfare system (Jöchnke, 2011).

With the 2030 strategy, the regulations of certain welfare-recipients have made it possible to deny or withdraw an individual’s social beneficiary based on residency in a ghetto area or as an economic punishment based on a universal idea of a ‘wrong behavior’.

The situation in Denmark with the social housing areas is thus explained with priority to the individual - specifically the individual with non-western background. This reflects tendencies of social exclusion of groups in society and a further marginalization of the ghettos areas in contrary to the 'favorable' wider Danish society. This social exclusion thus become a very central element of the rationale behind the strategy and reflect notions of 'bio-power'; "*The political rationality of bio-power turns human needs, welfare and desires into the terrain of governance. Bio-power renders life itself governable, making it possible to act not only upon the body, by force, but also upon the subjectivity (soul) of human being*" (N. Rose in Cruishank, 1999:39).

The social problems in the ghetto area are explained with an emphasis on the individual responsibility and what reveals as a central rationale in the strategy, is that this particular form of governance not only addresses the non-western but the poor in general. The place then becomes the target; "*the 'new modern forms of government is marked by 'new methods of power whose operation is not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalization, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatus'*" (Cruishank,1999: 40).

The territorial stigmatization of the ghetto

Following the argument above, and the theory of territorial stigmatization I argue that the social exclusion of individuals based on ethnicity or class can be analyzed as an expression of a general development in the Danish society, of ethnic segregation and marginalization. The social housing area, the so-called ghettos are unwanted, discursively constructed as 'bad unsafe places' in the 2030 strategy in opposition to the Danish modern society. (Wacquant) "*sale off and demolition of buildings and a total remodeling of the social housing areas, will create a more attractive, new and modern housing area that can be integrated to the wider society*" (Danish Government, 2018:14).

The marginalization of the ghettos is explicitly expressed with the quote above, which illustrates how the government perceive the ghettos as impossible to integrate into society, implicitly excluding the area. This is expressed with the consistent reference to the ghettos as '*holes in the map*' (Danish Government, 2018) and several arguments of the ghetto as an opposition to Denmark. This stigmatization of the ghetto areas seems to represent an implicit goal of a general development towards more private housing. Expressed above by arguing, that the eradication of the ghettos will

provide an opportunity to build more modern and renewed housing areas. According to Wacquant this development is targeting the ghetto areas and a general criminalization of poverty utilized with gentrification-projects, which accidentally end up with an even larger group of impoverished citizens, who lives as outcast in unwanted areas, such as the Danish ghetto. (Wacquant, 2009) The ghettos in Denmark are politically perceived as parallel societies and isolated entities of countercultures, violence and insecurity. These negative references to the ghetto in terms of place, represent the ghettos as unwanted areas that must change, rebuild or even demolished (Danish Government, 2018).

A central argument of the 2030 strategy is that the ethnic segregation is an example of self-segregation into ethnic ghettos, limiting contact between themselves and the wider society. This assumption undermines a possible shared sense of belonging and assumptions like that allows for misunderstandings and suspicions to flourish. The discourse of ghettoization in Denmark has fostered this development, of the antagonist opposition of the ghetto and the Danish society. A way of exercising this 'ethnic-rule' over the ghetto areas, the government strategy uses 'spatial' rather than racial categorizations to designate the ghettos and the parallel societies as 'special zones' or 'exceptional spaces of crisis' where exceptional measurements is needed. This is explicitly articulated and exemplified with the implementation of the police 'special penalty -zones' in certain ghetto areas. (Danish Government, 2018).

The antagonism of the ghetto vs. Danish society

The 'problems' I have examined correlate and reveal a political discourse of 'othering' based on some profound ethnic-based logics. A central goal to prevent parallel societies and eradicate ghetto areas may reflect some deeper and very fundamental, 'well-funded' notions of distrusting the 'ethnic communities'(Rytter, Olwig), or a general understanding of Integration as the idea of 'some or something must integrate *into* the Danish society. (Jöchnke, 32) In Danish politics, the term 'integration' has received particular attention in relation to the question of non-western and their descendant's integration *into* the Danish society. The focus have been how immigrants could become part of Denmark and participate in the Danish society, social life on an equal footing with the Danish citizens. (Jöchnke, 2011) This understanding of integration *into*, reflect an underlying understanding of *what* integration means. As I have illustrated with my analysis of the 2030 strategy, it is very clear, what the Danish government think, when they refer to 'a failed integration' of non-westerners. The

‘failed’ part refer to the fact, that the non-westerners have failed to integrate *into* the Danish society. Instead they have clustered in ghetto areas and parallel societies. This understanding reflects what Jöchnke refers to as an absorption of new parts into a pre-existing whole - here the pre-existing whole is the Danish society (Jöchnke, 2011). The idea of an existing whole reflects an understanding of what a society is and what holds the society together. The social cohesion must be balanced and the principles and presuppositions to achieve and secure a balanced cohesion is referred to as a high level of trust, active citizens, participation, feelings of security and an idea of a ‘united homogenous society’. Expressed and substantiated with a variety of arguments and illustrated with the four core problematizations parallel societies, non-western background, bad parenting which I identified.

My analysis reveals a political discourse that rests on some general universal and neoliberal principles of individualization and an embedded ethnic-based logic. This political rationale articulates a dominant discourse that devalue the people living in the ghettos, primarily because of ethnicity. The ethnic-based logic then explains issues with social problems, crime and essential challenges with welfare-dependency. A discourse is not a universal truth and the existence of the discourse may entail tensions and contradictions. Some issues then may seem ‘unproblematic’. The management of the ghettos seems to form a crucial part of the neoliberal governance principles, which have become more punitive in their approach and individualization of responsibility regarding complex social problems (Wacquant, 2009) By reducing the various problems in the ghetto areas to a solution of eradication as the core and overall goal, the entire complexity of the existence of the ghetto and the life of the residents is reduced to a matter of ‘what fits into the Danish state and society’, by the government constructed ‘Danish society’. It becomes very ‘black and white’ in the policy material, as I have tried to illustrate above. This articulation of the ghetto that is impossible to integrate into the Danish society, may reflect as a second and more implicitly goal of the Governments’ strategy; a general privatization of the housing market. Moreover, the focus on ethnicity seems to leave several issues unaddressed or reduced to a matter of individual responsibility, denying society structural challenges (Danish Government, 2018).

As I have examined and elucidated in this and the previous chapter, the problematizations of the 2030 strategy reveal a political reality of the Danish ghettos as an unwanted place that is impossible to integrate into the Danish society. Before I proceed to the last part of my analysis, recall the words of Bacchi; *there exist truths, beside other truths, as there exist no universal truth* (Bacchi, 2009) My

analysis revealed one political truth of the Danish ghetto, expressed in the Government strategy “ *A Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos by 2030*”. I now proceed to the last part of my analysis, where I supplement my findings with existing research from ethnographic studies with the purpose of lifting this ‘black and white’ and universalist perception of the ghetto to another level of inquiry. The micro-level of analysis serves to compliment my findings and give my analysis and discussion a new perspective.

CHAPTER 4. PERSPECTIVES FROM THE GHETTO

Introduction

In this chapter I put my findings into a critical conversation with existing ethnographic material I have chosen for this analysis. Furthermore, I intend to explore possible effects of the political discourse, explicitly with focus on the process of territorial stigmatization. My purpose here is not to examine how this policy *directly* affect the ghetto areas. Instead, I intend to examine how the ethnographic research resonate with the identified political discourse. I examine the ethnographic material in relation to the four core problematizations and the embedded political rationale and assumptions, which will guide the conversation.

Parallel societies

An overall argument of the 2030 strategy is that the massive social challenges in the ghettos areas are caused by failed integration of the non-western immigrants and their descendants. As a result, they have clustered in ethnic isolated entities that emerges as parallel societies. There is an inconsistency in the way the Government refers to the parallel societies throughout the 2030 strategy. Sometimes positioned in direct connection to the ghetto area and sometimes as just a reference without any specific place. The parallel societies are often referred to as entities of isolation among non-western individuals. These entities share other values and norms, than the Danish and in general the government refers to them as isolated and sharing a counterculture.

If parallel societies are perceived as isolated entities of individuals, then they may refer to smaller ‘enclaves’ of individuals living in the ghettos, thus insinuating that the ghettos as place, is object for an emergence of countercultures. What they mean with countercultures is never explained in detail, but referred to as the opposite of Danish values and norms. Recall that I earlier argued, that an underlying assumption of the Governments strategy is that the Danish society is perceived as fixed and a united Danish society sharing Danish values and norms. The argument is that two conflicting cultures exist – parallel society vs. Danish society - which is a threat to the Danish cohesion. It appears a little ‘blurry’ where and what these parallel societies are or how they exist, except from the assertion that they are a threat to the Danish society and articulated in connection to the ghetto areas.

If the premise is then assumed to be the failed integration, then what does this account for. The concept integration has become an important concern for many societies as a growing influx of both immigrants, migrants and refugees. But what does it mean to be integrated and what counts for a failed integration? Following the argument of the government, the failed integration is the root-cause for many of the problems with the ghettos. One approach to an understanding of what the Government refers to, when they address the failed integration is lack of employment, poor education, bad Danish language skills, poor or no contact with the local communities and the wider Danish society.

Micro-level effects of discursively constructed subjects

As my policy analysis revealed the discursively construction of subject and object serves as a way of governing and regulating individual behavior. These constructs may have an effect or they may entail tensions and implications on a micro-level of everyday practice. With the example by Tina Gudrun Jensen I will examine how a subjectification of immigrant becomes a dominant internal categorization of 'one's neighbor' in the residential area, thus re-articulating stereotypes of subject categories. In interviews with the residents in Grønnevang with 'Danes' and the minority groups of immigrants, she experienced how the two groups referred to each other with these external subjectifications. When referring in more broad terms about their experiences with the neighborhood relations and how they interact with each in everyday life practices, they used the categories Danes or immigrants, which referred to their ethnic backgrounds. They ascribed some characteristics or qualities to the categories, but if their acquaintances were more personal, the identification based on ethnicity were specific referring to them as 'the Pakistanis' the Somalis' 'the Turks' etc. because they shared a level of acquaintance (Jensen, 2016: 95-97).

The residents shared an understanding and a necessity of challenging these stereotypes they made of each other, by emphasizing the fact that most of them were wrong. Furthermore, some residents emphasized how important it was to perceive these stereotypes as just examples of an external dominating and stigmatizing discourse of ethnic identities. The residents were focused on the negative process of repeating these stereotyped images of ethnicity that they perceived as being ascribed to them externally and negatively. The resident's perception of the stigmatization of their homes were very much present. In addition, they were very much aware not to accept this stigma by reproducing

it through the ethnic-based references of each other. Instead, they had an intention of referring to each in more friendly terms and without emphasis on ethnicity, by focusing on their social relations as neighbors or even friends (Jensen, 2016:93). Nonetheless, even if the residents when being interviewed articulated a picture of a shared neighborhood of good social relations, which were not restricted to ethnicity, their social relations were characterized by a division of ethnicity (Jensen, 2016:95). An excellent example of how the reference to a group identity was general among the residents, is a situation in an interview with Mustafa, 70 years old, who constantly used the word ‘problem’ when describing how he and his family, not were a ‘problem’ for the Danish society.

“There were never problems. (...) never problems with my family. (...) I do not have any problems with my neighbor. Danes, Arabic, Pakistan, there are no problems. (...) I do not have problems here in Grønnevang. It is all Denmark. There are no problems. When I used to live at Nørrebro, no problems neither” (Jensen, 2016: 98).

Jensen presents similar examples to illustrate the complexities of a multiethnic neighborhood and the influence of the subject categories political concepts affect the everyday life and social practices. They navigate in a field of political decisions and discourses affect them on a local level. They navigate what is being ascribed to them by outside and the internal tensions of how to articulate the difference between the ethnic groups and how they interact in everyday practices.

Unwanted areas or safe neighborhoods

A central argument for the eradication of the ghettos, is the lack of contact to the wider society and a general understanding of homogenous areas, where the compositions of residents, with most non-westerners in general is unsafe and the residents feel insecure. Tina Jensen gives another example to illustrate this complexity of the social relations across ethnicity, that both illustrate levels of distance but also reflect closer relations across ethnicity.

Jensen gives a picture of a neighborhood, where the residents have various perceptions of each other both based one ethnic background but also regarding gender, social class and age. The social relations and the shared neighborhood is characterized with both positive and negative understandings of each other, again based on both ethnicity, class, gender, age. There is a distinction between how the residents articulate their perceptions of each other, and how this plays-out in everyday practices. Jensen emphasizes the importance of ‘casual everyday contact’ and the coincidental and unplanned

social contact that is enabled with the physical places and areas in the neighborhood. i.e. the shared laundry-rooms, the green parks and the bicycle-basement among others, where possible contact is enabled (Jensen, 2016:116). The contact and the social relations are thus represented by coincidence and everyday practices, and the idea of a shared possible isolated counterculture is difficult to spot here. Jensen points out that, there is a distinction in the contact between the ethnic minorities and the Danes, but this is more determined by a general lack of time.

Moreover, her study reveals a tendency among the ethnic Danes and the ethnic minorities, to feel a kind of insecurity about contact to other residents. They used expression such as culture and differences for explanation, why it was difficult to interact cross ethnicity. They all greet when they meet and they all have a sense of belonging to the area and they feel that they 'are good neighbors' because they help each other's if they must. Furthermore, they make 'Smalltalk' when they meet in the laundry room, in the basement etc., but they do not interact more than that. They explain it with a 'cultural difference' and language barriers sometimes (Jensen, 2016:107) Despite these individual experiences of a distinction, most of the residents describe how they have close contacts. Her interview is supplemented with participant observations that revealed a general tendency, that there were discrepancies between what they articulated and what they experienced in everyday practices. An example is how Poul had a close relationship to his neighbor Mohammed and Aisha and they participated in their anniversary and the bachelor party for their daughter (Jensen, 2016:100-111).

She did a general observation of the relevance of the place in these social relations that these residents share a housing area and therefore the context and relations are made possible. This is an expression of positive social relations based on neighborhood. This complexity is not expressed or represented in the policy materiel. Instead the assumption is very much focused on the 'shared countercultures' and the ghettos as a bad place. Jensen's work gave me an insight into the complexities of social relations, ideas of cultures and neighborhood relations in a ghetto area. What I find relevant to highlight with her work, is the attention to possible tensions and conflicts between articulations of cross-ethnic relations and experiences of cross-ethnic relations affected by external stigma and discourse. The importance of acknowledging the differences that exist within different cultures and norms that ethnic groups internally may share others than the Danish. Like the Somali women who meet almost every day at the shared green areas. Another aspect is the question of language, as Jensen describes how language barriers may count for a division between ethnic groups. This do not

necessarily establish countercultures or raise the levels of insecurity in the neighborhood. My point here is that ethnicity as premise for social problems or tension, reduces the complexities.

Bad parenting?

The government emphasizes the relevance of the parent's lack of responsibility. I pursue this assumption with the problematization of the 'bad parent' with the empirical data by Mette-Louise Johansen from Gellerupparken.

A central aspect of the Governmentality approach to study forms of power and governance, is the focus on the technicalities and measurement on a micro-level of analysis (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, Lemke, 2011). As I explained in the previous chapter, the 2030 strategy is dominated by universal and neoliberal understanding of being a Dane 'the right way'. This involves an individual acceptance of sentiments of trust, equality and democratic values. I continue to pursue this rationale a little more here and examine it on a micro-level of practice. An essential point of the Governmentality approach, is that government creates subject as certain kinds of subject, to make them governable. I will discuss here the complexity of this process of subjectification and how by analyzing it, both on the policy level as I have done and in relation to the micro-level, in the everyday life in the ghetto areas, I can elucidate the complexities of this process.

The ghettos as places are shaped by its different actors in this field. The place becomes what it is, through the everyday interactions between the residents, but also the local authorities at place. The ghettos social relations and everyday encounters is also characterized by its marginalized position in society and by the stigma ascribed to it. (Wacquant, Johansen, 2013) The government's rationale in the strategy emphasizes the necessity of a government interventionist approach to the ghetto areas to prevent and 'solve' the problems. Especially concerning the welfare of the children, addressed through the representation of the 'bad parent'. Johansen's PhD is an extensive analysis of the Palestinians families' everyday life and local encounters with their neighbors, local state officials and authorities, social workers, day-care workers and the local police among others. She describes how these families in their everyday lives are affected by the execution of state governance on a local level. This is exemplified with several examples and stories of how the families struggle in these tensions in the field of social relations, control and expectations. Concerning their roles as parents it

becomes very clear, how they sometimes are caught between some universal standards and principles of the child's rights or an expectation to be a parent 'the Danish way' and their personal values and norms. This is a struggle between the best interest of the child, the responsibility of the day-cares staff to report if any concern for the child's well-being and the cooperation between parents and day-care staff. Moreover, the parents are in daily contact with the social workers or local police, local 'fire souls' or local staffs from the youth clubs concerning their children.

The case of Eman

Eman, a mother, has eight children and six sons and her husband suffers from PTSD and severe anxiety and she keeps the household and all their children. Sometimes, she breaks-down and spend weeks inside and their eldest daughter is then in charge of the family and the younger children. Eman is used to have contact with social workers and police concerning her sons contact with youth institutions and prisons. There is an episode with the day-care, where the day-care closes, but they forget Eman's daughter inside. This might be a nightmare for all parents. The day-care worker is very sad about the situation and she apologizes for the situation. Eman accepts and acknowledges that it is human to fail. However, the situation changes, when there is a misunderstanding between the day-care worker and Eman about where her daughter was, when they forgot her. There are tensions, and to shorten the story, it ends up with a meeting between the day-care leader and Eman and her son (he is translating for Eman) The meeting is supposed to clear out the misunderstandings, but it ends with a situation where the day-care leader is 'teaching' Eman about the Danish way of having a conversation and how to have some trust in her and the day-care center. I cannot present the entire conversation here, but a snapshot of it gives a picture of how it went.

(day-care co-leader) Ingrid: But now, we need to find out, how do we move on?

Eman: ... I feel that I am not welcome in the day care center. When I meet Christine, I do not feel welcome.

(daycare-leader) Susanne: Not welcome? I know that Christine's intention with the meeting last week was to talk to you and to meet you [meet your requests], because she was very sorry about what had happened. But instead of talking there has been a lot of anger and bad emotions towards Christine. And ok, it is one thing to be emotional the day that it takes place, but then the next day one should come to one's senses and realize that ok, we must move on. No parents yell at my staff.

(Eman's son) [Mustafa and Eman discuss something in Arabic, they raise their voices and Eman is upset]

Ingrid: [looking at Mustafa] Look, I have to ask your mother if she can find trust in us and let us take care of Hedaia again in the future in this day care center?

Mustafa [does not translate that]: Yes, she can find trust in you, but she is upset because she doesn't feel that Christine will care for Hedaia.

Ingrid: Of course, she will ... This is a day care center. Listen, is your mother willing to give her a chance?

(Johansen, 2013: 25-130)

The conversation ends with an interruption from Mette Louise Johansen, and a new meeting is arranged. Eman lives with a feeling of being misunderstood and not trusted. The day-care leader accuses Eman of not trusting them, and with different expressions she lectures Eman how to behave and have trust in them, because they are a daycare. For the leader, that is an obvious reason for Eman to trust them, that they care for her child. This situation is relevant for my argument of the experience with local execution of the neoliberal governance. As Johansen explains with this situation, is that the emphasis from the day-care leader's side, on the importance of Eman's trust in them, because of her sincere trust in the importance of the institutional care.

“the managers’ and the staffs’ sincere trust in the institutional care – that the staff can do good and should do good – brought with it a requirement that Eman should share in their conviction and participate in the cultivation of this particular state imagination. And Eman’s trust was required to be equally sincere if their collaboration was to continue; there was simply no possible way for the institutional efforts and care of Hedaia to function on the basis of her mistrust. (Johansen, 2013:132)

Johansen analyses this situation in relation to a question of the premise of the trust in the Danish day-care and in general the trust in the welfare state. As I argued in the previous chapter, the Danish welfare state is unique and its existence is based on the levels of trust among the Danish citizens. This trust, is argued in the 2030 strategy, is being threatened by the ghettos and the parallel societies. The situation here with Eman perfectly illustrates this tension of trust – but moreover this example illustrates how the political discourse of a neoliberal governmentality emerges on the local-level between the day-care leader and Eman, a parent with a non-western background living in Gellerupparken, a social housing area, designated ghetto by the official ghetto-list. What happens here, is that the macro-level political governance-discourse is executed on a micro-level of an everyday encounter between a resident in a ghetto area and a day-care staff. Johansen further argues:

“When the managers talked about how we Danes engage in ‘the dialogue’ and ‘drawing a line’ they talked about how to practice trust in a situation of reconciliation. Foregrounding such practices as being particularly Danish engaged them in an ethnification of the concept of trust as a standard of how to act as Danish citizen (Johansen, 2013:135)

The example with Eman and her meeting with the day-care staff just gave an example of how political decisions like the 2030 strategy plays out on a local level of every practices in a ghetto area. This illustrate what I have argued regarding the possible negative effects of the discourse and further served to give one example of an answer to my research question interested in how the political discourse resonated with ethnographic research and what possible implications and effects it might have.

The internalization of the stigma – The second-G

The problematization of the ghetto as unsafe and violent is very dominant in the policy material. The stigmatization of the ghetto as criminal is a very dominant perception both within the policy material, and in understanding Danish public and media. This stigmatization of the ghetto stick, as Bacchi writes. (Chapter 2. page 13) The problem with criminals and violence in the ghettos are presented as a question of culture and ethnicity. Johansen gives an example of how the social stigma ascribed to the ghettos and through subject categories affect the residents and the young boys in Gellerupparken and The Second-G category created by the media and through the government’s ‘anti-ghettoization’ polices from the 2000s and forth. The creation of the second-G is an excellent example of how this discursively construct of the subject ‘The second G’ referring to the ‘violent, middle-east young male’ from the ghetto (Johansen, 2013:105-106)

Johansen describes how the young men in Gellerupparken, coped with the stigma of the second G and their only way to resist this political marginalization, qua their residency in Gellerupparken were through a realization of that stereotype. *“Nevertheless, the conduct of resistance became a paradox, since the only means of denying the vulnerability of marginalization was through the realization of the stereotype of the second-G” (Johansen, 2013:106).*

To resist this stigmatization, they resisted by realizing it. From the perspective of the state, they were troublemakers, but from their own perspective (the subjectivity) they were ‘freedom fighters’. *“But while the young men were becoming troublemakers from the perspective of state agencies, they saw*

themselves as freedom fighters, and this subjectivity was particularly visible among the young Palestinian” (Johansen, 2013:106) .

They saw themselves as Palestinian Fighters, and they perceived their fight as important. The parents just perceived them as foolish children. Nevertheless, this example illustrates the very complex process of external stigmatization of the young men represented with the ‘second-G’ category and the parent’s personal perception of the situation, as just a childish game, aware that their sons were indeed in trouble. As Johansen describes the young men in Gellerupparken are in contact with the police over crime related activities. Why they do it, is not necessarily a matter of their ethnicity, as this example illustrate. This evolves on two levels; of incarnating the stigma ascribed to them of the Second-G and their ‘coping’ with this stigma, by realizing the stigma as ‘freedom fighters’. This illustrates that, their behavior may be a result of a stigmatization process, more than a question of ethnicity. As the parents describe, and they themselves expresses, that their ‘brotherhood’ is a shared resistance towards the police, in solidarity, more than a result of their ethnic background, even though the stigma is related to their ethnic background.

“Our group is more like a brotherhood, and to become a member you must have troubles with the police and perceive the authorities as something bad. You should perceive the police as somebody who are trying to destroy your life. I do not have the least respect for them [the police]. [Skræppebladet July 7, 2009]” (Johansen, 2013:106).

Johansen perceives this situation as a matter of politics, more than religion or ethnicity. A very important point. This example illustrates the paradox of the criminal youngsters in the ghettos, and their criminal acts. Not refusing, their acts are wrong and criminal. But the reason for their actions, are just reduced in the 2030 strategy to a matter of ethnicity. *“This fight had nothing to do with religious radicalization as they knew very little about Islam and explained that their interest in the intifada had nothing to do with religion but everything to do with politics” (Johansen, 2013:107.)*

Criminal activity

Another example of how the strategy reduces several of the daily social problems and challenges to a matter of ethnicity, can be debated with this example from Mehmet Necefs research of the ‘criminal youth’ in Vollsmose. His research presents various examples of situations with the young boys from

Vollsmose, who commit crimes are violent and vandalize public areas. His argument is that the acts of these young boys, is not necessarily reduced to a matter of where they live or ethnic background.

Necef argues that their action's may be a result of 'group-actions' and not because of their ethnic background. It is more about feelings of belonging to something or someone.

"For me it was just boredom, and a little trouble. I don't know what it was, when we went crazy!"?
(Necef in Nielsen. H.L, 2019:285)

"Sure, because of the police, but the police never came" (Necef in Nielsen. H.L, 2019:266)

Necef argues that we should look at the question of enjoyment and desire by a collective action, that gives an individual rush and a collective rush. They cannot explain their actions, just that it felt good. It does not make the action right, but it can illustrate how criminal actions are complex, and are not only a question of ethnic background or residency in a ghetto. Moreover, he does not reject the challenges with social problems in these areas and problems with these criminal actions, and he argues for a necessity of addressing these criminal actions with perspective. It's not just a matter of boredom or enjoyment or ethnicity. This bottom up perspective strongly invalidates the current political framing of a paradoxical situation regarding the Danish ghettos. The assumptions and conceptual logics that underpinned the strategy have now been debated and critically discussed in relation to the existing ethnographic material.

Discursive dominance

As closing the discussion of the articulations of the 2030 strategy concerning the Danish ghettos I want to make a last point. A central part of my analysis is the representation of 'problems'. I have examined how the Government's strategy represent certain problems as particular problems illustrated with the articulated problematizations. The point by a policy analysis with Bacchi's WPR-approach is the identification of representations of problems and not the problem itself. Therefore, I have analyzed the underlying assumptions and the embedded political rationale. I have articulated how this process of shaping certain issues as particular kinds of problems, entail some possible lived effects. An area of my analysis so far has silenced, is the concept of ghetto. I have used the political official accepted term ghetto when I refer to the social housing areas, by government designated ghettos. In my introduction, I presented a limited snapshot of this conceptual 'problem' or the possible

consequences of the stigmatization of the areas through this labeling. Up till now I have elucidated how the political discursively construction of the concept parallel society and ghetto have a negative effect on the ghetto area. Explicitly concerning the identification with this subjectification and the territorial stigmatization of the ghetto as place. As last argument, I want to present here, regard the concept of parallel society in relation to the ghetto. By discursively creating the concept parallel society without any concrete definition in the 2030 policy, other than a counterculture and an opposition to the Danish society, I perceive this problematization as having an amplifying effect on the negative articulation of the already existing and officially accepted concept of the ghetto. By presenting this (extra) concept of parallel societies it seems that it only serves as a rhetoric way of emphasizing the Governments negative perception of the ghetto. Moreover, to address the ‘problems’ with individuals with a non-western background. It articulates a strong emphasis on explaining the challenges with an ethnic-based rationale. My analysis reveals, that the concept parallel society is discursively articulated with power and dominance through the problematization of the non-western category. The parallel society concept thus illustrates the discursive dominance of the political ethnic-based discourse of the ghetto as an unwanted place.

Summary of chapter

In this chapter I aimed at supplementing my policy findings with ethnographic research. I intended to examine how the identified problematizations and embedded rationales and principles of neoliberalism and ethnic-based logics resonated with ethnographic studies of everyday practices and experiences from the ghetto areas. My purpose here was not to examine how the Government strategy had direct effects on the ghettos areas, instead I intended to involve a new perspective to the policy analysis. There are problems with crime and gangs, social control and some parents have challenges with their families and children. Also they struggle with language, employment and education and levels of ‘inactivity regarding the labor market. They may experience forms of ‘isolation, senses of a parallel life and stigmatization, but in this chapter I gave few ethnographic examples to illustrate another picture of more complex stories.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis arose with an interest in political power and governance and explicitly how this were expressed within the Government's strategy '*A Denmark without parallel societies - no Ghettos by 2030*'. I have conducted an extensive policy analysis of the strategy with the purpose of exploring how certain issues are discursively constructed as particular kinds of 'problems'.

I approached this study within the *What's the problem represented to be?* -approach by Carol Bacchi. This specific methodology utilized a certain kind of policy analysis combining the theoretical perspectives of Michel Foucault on discourse and Governmentality. Moreover, I approached this policy analysis within a theoretical framework of territorial stigmatization presented by Loïc Wacquant. My choice of the theoretical framework allowed me to examine how government policies may influence the areas it target. In my case, I was interested in exploring how the political discourse of the 2030 strategy might involve processes of territorial stigmatization of the Danish ghetto areas.

Within the framework of the WPR approach as both method and theory I extracted the core problematizations of the policy material. The analytic task of the WPR approach is to work backwards from the identified problematizations to examine what underlying rationales and principles it emanates from. My analysis revealed a political discourse which articulates from the four core problematizations; parallel societies, non-western background, bad parenting and unsafe areas. The problematizations revealed a dominant political discourse of the ghettos as an unwanted place characterized by ethnic-based problems. The analysis further revealed how the policy articulated a dominant problematization of the parallel societies in connection to the ghettos. This revealed an underlying assumption of a government rationale assuming the ghettos as places where parallel societies emerge as countercultures to the Danish society.

I have examined the problematizations and my analysis revealed two strains of a political rationale that underpins the political discourse. First a neoliberal mentality with sentiments of universalism and an ethnic-based conceptual logics. These principles and logics together established a general picture of a dominant government rationale behind the 2030 strategy. The dominant government rationale of the strategy was expressed with emphasis on the individualization of responsibility and even an explicitly logic of a criminalization of the 'non-western parent' utilized with more implementation of control and regulation of behavior and economic sanctions. My analysis of the government rationale

revealed some sentiments of a universalist understandings of rights, Danish culture, norms and standards. Expressed regarding the Danish society and culture as ‘fixed’ and perceptions of a correct Danish behavior, illustrated with the problematization of the bad parent.

Furthermore, the neoliberal rationale underpinned the various initiatives of sanctions and control of individual behavior and economic sanctions towards parents. The two first parts of my analysis were based on the policy material and established the discourse and examined the underlying rationales. The second part I proceeded with a critical conversation between my findings of the policy analysis with existing ethnographic research from the ghetto areas. My analysis of the policy in relation to the ethnographic studies illustrated how the assumptions and political discourse in various ways left the problematizations to be ‘unproblematic’ and simplistic by reducing several of the challenges and social problems to questions of ethnicity or as a matter of the ghetto as place. The policy analysis established a picture of the Danish ghettos because of a failed integration of immigrants and their descendants and refugees, in general the groups of people with non-western background. Moreover, is the policy articulating a picture of a general problem with parallel societies and countercultures that threatens the Danish cohesion. I used the ethnographic research to present a critical conversation with my findings of the policy analysis of the 2030 strategy with data from the ethnographic studies. I presented some examples from the empirical material to broaden the analysis of the effects of the policy and to examine how the political discourse might influence the ghettos regarding processes of territorial stigmatization. Two different examples illustrated how processes of territorial stigmatization influenced the residents, but they coped with in various ways. Both Johansen and Jensen described how the residents experienced the governance at a local level, influencing their encounters and social relations. Jensen describes how ethnicity were present in their social relations and encounters, but not as an absolute negative situation. Johansen shared an interesting observation of the political discourse direct influence in her everyday life and encounters with the day-care. The rationale and assumption if this government’s strategy concerning the expectations of a Danish behavior’. A general conclusion is that these everyday challenges and social problems are more complex than the strategy articulates. My ethnographic research exemplified how the question of ethnicity is misinterpreted as the only explanation for the problems within the ghettos. Generally, my analysis revealed some dominating ‘taken-for-granted’ assumptions, that not only articulated in the 2030 strategy, but articulate in general in the Danish media, in the public and in politics. Furthermore, they had a lived effect for the individual living in the ghettos. However, these assumption and logics, cannot stand alone and need to be analyzed and understood in a broader context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacchi, C. & Goodwin, S. (2016), *Poststructuralist Policy Analysis – A Guide to Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan. This Palgrave Pivot imprint is Published by Springer Nature, USA. ISBN 978-1-137-52544-4, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52546-8.

Bacchi, C. (2009), *Analysing Policy: What's the problem represented to be?*. Pearson Australia. Unit 4, level 3. 14 Aquatic Drive, French Forest NSW 2086. ISBN: 9780733985751 (pbk)

Cruikshank, B. (1999) *The Will To Empower*. Cornell Paperbacks, first printing. United States of America. ISBN: 978-0-8014-8599-2

Danish Government (2018) Et Danmark uden Parallel samfund – Ingen ghettoer I 2030.
<https://www.regeringen.dk/publikationer-og-aftaletekster/%C3%A9t-danmark-uden-parallelsamfund/>

Foucault, M. 1991 [1968]: Politics and the Study of Discourse. In: *The Foucault Effect - Studies in Governmentality*. Eds: Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Jensen, T. G. (2016) *Sameksistens – Hverdagsliv og naboskab i et multietnisk boligområde*. Roskilde Universitets Forlag. 1. udgave. ISBN: 978-87-7867-472-2

Johansen, M.L. (2013) *In The borderland – Palestinian Parents navigating Danish Welfare State Interventions*. PhD. Thesis. Department of Culture and Society Program of Anthropology Aarhus University. The Danish Institute Against Torture Copenhagen

Johncke, S. 2011. 'Integrating Denmark: The Welfare State as a National(ist) Accomplishment'. In K.F. Olwig and K. Paerregaard (eds.), *The Question of Integration: Immigrants, Exclusion and the Danish Welfare State*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, p. 30-53.

Lemke, T. (2001) 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society Volume 30 Number 2 May 2001: 190–207*

Mik-Meyer, N. & Villadsen, K. () kapitel 2. i *Magtens former, sociologiske perspektiver på statens møde med borgeren*.

Michael, A.P. (2018) Foucault, bio-politics and the birth of neoliberalism.

Nielsen, H. L. (2019) Kampen om Vollsmose. U Press. ISBN 978-87-930060-83-8

Nikolas, R., Pat O'Malley & Valverde, M. (2009) Governmentality. Sydney Law School Legal Studies Research Paper No. 09/94 September.

Olwig, F. K. & Paerregaard, K (2011): The Question of Integration. Immigration, Exclusion and the Danish Welfare State. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Olwig F., Karen (2012) 'Integration'; Migrants and Refugees between the Scandinavian Welfare Societies and Family Relations.

Larsen, T.S.(2011) Med Wacquant i det ghettopolitiske felt. Dansk Sociologi. Nr. 1/22. årg. 2011

Larsen. T.S (2018) Advanced Marginality as a comparative research strategy in praxis: the Danish "Grey Belt" in conversation with the French "Red Belt", Urban Geography, 39:8, 1131-1151, DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2018.1440124

Qvortrup, S.J. & Christensen, A.D (2012) Territorial stigmatization and local belonging, City, 16:1-2, 74-92, DOI: 10.1080/13604813.2012.663556

Wacquant, L. (2008), *Urban Outcast -A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Polity Press, 65 Bridge Street, Cambridge CB2 1 UR, UK. ISBN:13: 978-07456-3124-0

Wacquant, L. (2009), *Punishing The Poor -The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Duke University Press. (Original French-language edition (2004)) ISBN 978-0-8223-4404-9)

Wacquant, L., Slater, T. & Pereira, V.G. (2014) Territorial stigmatization in action. Environment and Planning A 2014, volume 46, pages 1270–1280 doi:10.1068/a4606ge

Webpages

Landsbyggefonden.dk (2019) <https://www.landsbyggefonden.dk/om-lbf/publikationer/boligomraader-i-bevaegelse/sanering-byggeboom-og-omraadeloef/indroduktion-til-kapitel/#sectionLink0>

Fyens Stiftidende .(2019) ”Her er den store plan: Sådan skal boliger i Vollsmose rives ned”. Jørgen Volmer. published 06.05.2019. kl.20.03.<https://www.fyens.dk/odense/Her-er-den-store-plan-Saadan-skal-boliger-i-Vollsmose-rives-ned/artikel/3347057>

Politiken (2019) Halvdelen af Mjølnerparken skal sælges, men oprøret slår ud i lys lue. Flemming Christiansen. Visited 27. may 2019. <https://politiken.dk/indland/kobenhavn/art7216340/Halvdelen-af-Mj%C3%B8lnerparken-skal-s%C3%A6lges-men-opr%C3%B8ret-sl%C3%A5r-ud-i-lys-lue>

Tv2 Østjylland (2019) Frustrerede beboere i Gellerup afviser enhver form for nedrivning. Visited on 10 april 2019. <https://www.tv2ostjylland.dk/artikel/frustrerede-beboere-i-gellerupparken-stemmer-mod-nedrivningsplan>