

# **Universalism and the Danish welfare state: ‘Immigrant<sup>1</sup> juvenile delinquency’ and the effects of the making of appropriate behavior through care and control**

*Trine Øland, Section of Educational Research, Department of Media, Cognition & Communication, University of Copenhagen, [troeland@hum.ku.dk](mailto:troeland@hum.ku.dk)*

Paper for the panel “Transforming Locally in a Multi-Polar World: Community, Scholarship, Power, and Resistance”, at the Geopolitical Economy Research Group Inaugural Conference ‘From the Thirty Years’ Crisis to Multi-polarity: The Evolution of the Geopolitical Economy of the 21th Century World, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, 25-27 September, 2015

WORK-IN-PROGRESS

<b><i>Universalism and the Danish welfare state: ‘Immigrant juvenile delinquency’ and the effects of the making of appropriate behavior through care and control</i></b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>The collaborative care and control of crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers – ‘crime’ prevention extended</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Notes on the political construction of ‘the immigrant’</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Main concepts and analytical approach</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Empirical material – interview and documents</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Symbolic forms and processes involved in the making of appropriate behavior</b>	<b>9</b>
Danish democratic and right-based culture	10
Cultural modernization	11
Behaving decently	12
Showing moral character	14
<b>Conclusion – racialization and criminalization</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>17</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Immigrants’ cover immigrants and refugees and their descendants and families, i.e. those who are identified and problematized by the welfare system and its welfare workers as ‘immigrants’, i.e. ‘strangers within’, even though they are not formally immigrants. In Denmark, people arrived as labour immigrants (primary male Turkish, Kurdish, Yugoslav, Pakistani and Moroccan) from the late 1960s. A general immigration stop was enforced in 1973, and after that people have arrived either as refugees (primarily from Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, Kurdistan, Bosnia, Palestine, Somalia and lately also from Afghanistan, Syria, Ethiopia and Congo) or as family members to immigrants and refugees, i.e. via family unification, or as temporary migrant workers from other European countries, e.g., Poland and Romania. In 2014, the share of immigrants and refugees and their descendants constitute about 11 pct. of the population of which about 60 pct. are from so-called non-Western countries (Danish Statistic 2014).

## ***Introduction***

The image of Scandinavian Welfare States as social-democratic welfare states, identified by principles of universalism (Esping-Andersen 1991), is still referred to as rather different from liberal welfare states and corporatist welfare states (Wacquant 2008: 155, 252; Olsen 2011: 121). In this paper, I want to indicate how the Danish welfare state operates on the basis of ambiguities between what Danish ethnologist Thomas Højrup terms a positive universalism of social policy and a negative universalism of cultural policy (Højrup 2007), how it furthermore has traits of a liberal/neoliberal welfare state, and not least I want to indicate how this effects welfare work with immigrant youth and the way it makes symbolic boundaries of Danish society.

According to Esping-Andersen's regime-type model of welfare states, the social-democratic regime-type and its principles of universalism and de-commodification of social rights is extended to the middle classes, i.e. not only to the working class. Equal rights goes for 'all/'the people' which means equality for all as regards high standards of welfare service and benefits. Such a universalistic system promotes equality of status but it also cultivates and crafts solidarity of the nation (Esping-Andersen 1991: 23-29). This means that all in principle are dependent. To minimize costs and secure that everyone as a taxpayer accepts the system, the idea is to proactively socialize everyone and build capacities for individual independence in each and every individual. Such a system is strongly committed to full employment and the prevention of social problems of any kind. In effect the social-democratic welfare regime is also based on liberal ideas stressing work, productivity and liberal work-ethic norms. Accordingly, the positive universalism gives everyone social rights, the right to public goods and a good life through provision of universal education, health and child care, but the negative universalism excludes some versions of the good life in favor of what has historically been determined and highlighted as a universal standard of individual existence – thus excluding some other standards. In other words, the ameliorating and improving traits of welfare states has symbolic violence attached to it (cf. also Woolford 2013, 2014).

In this paper I will look into how the Danish welfare state, through its welfare work with 'immigrant juvenile delinquency', produces and institutionalizes appropriate behavior as an internal front strategy to craft the nation when providing welfare in terms of 'civilization' and 'social security' on the one hand, and 'physical security' and 'safety' on the other; care and control. The focus will be on *the prevent strategies* embedded in crime prevention police work and street-based social work with 'immigrant juvenile delinquency' in Copenhagen after 9-11. In this situation, it is possible to investigate how the Danish welfare state crafts solidarity of the nation and thus defines membership of the welfare state when it is affronted by globalization.

Looking at how welfare professionals and their practices have been involved in welfare work with immigrants and refugees since 1970, it seems as if the trends revolves around a concept of prevention and prevent strategies: social medics and anthropologists, social workers and health visitors, etc., are from the 1970s producing knowledge about different aspects of immigrants' and refugees' lives, contributing to understand 'the stranger' and adjust both the

system and ‘the stranger’ to prevent ‘disturbances’ and improve society through the provision of knowledge for society and ‘the stranger’. This mirrors a general trend in the (liberal) Danish welfare state, where knowledge production is a constitutive force and a precondition for the planning of society. This planning goes on through proactive socializing, and preventing or solving problems within the existing social and economic system through a web of welfare professional interventions which basically function to shape and reshape practical and sensible individuals able to use knowledge to orchestrate their own welfare (Buus 2008).

### ***The collaborative care and control of crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers – ‘crime’ prevention extended***

The social policies of the social-democratic universal welfare state were developed in Denmark after WWII and culminated in 1976 with a Social Security Act aimed at both protecting and rehabilitating ‘the functionally deficient’ in order for them to have a better (normal) life (Nissen et al. 2015). ‘Outreach work’ and thus street-based social work was mentioned in the 1976 act (Hansen 2014: 53).

Crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers’ outreach work with immigrant juvenile delinquency is a fruitful spot to read and study *current movements in welfare work in Denmark*. Welfare work is affected by a general trend of penal policy, but in a particular ‘European’ way stressing a *social panoptism* where social service bureaucracies and welfare workers take an active part in exercising both care and control regarding ‘problem populations’ such as immigrants (Wacquant 2001: 84). These welfare workers possess the social and human means to exercise both care and control, and at the same time they play a part in defining misbehavior and normal behaviour when observing ‘signals of danger’ or ‘asocial’ elements that may develop into a criminal activity, i.e. before they have been registered as a criminal activity. These welfare workers merge what Bourdieu, and Wacquant, describe as the left caring hand and the right punitive hand of the (welfare) state (Bourdieu et al. 1999, Wacquant 2012: 73), Wacquant adding punishment and criminal justice to Bourdieu’s focus on marketization and economy of the right hand of the state.

As an expression of this trend, the front page of the professional journal *Socialpædagogen*, which is the magazine of one of the unions organising ‘social pedagogues’, stated October 10, 2014: THE SOCIAL POLICE to proudly announce that a new area of social work for social pedagogues is emerging *inside* the police force. Together with police officers, a social pedagogue is hired to do street level outreach work to keep the young from gang-related crime.

Simultaneously, *crime prevention* is defined in broad and expanding terms as it is in other countries (cf. for example Woolford & Thomas 2011). The Danish Crime Prevention Council (DKR) was inaugurated in 1971 by the Ministry of Justice, and prevention in general has been prominent in Danish welfare state thinking in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as already mentioned (Borch 2005), health visitors being the state’s professional spearhead in this regard (Buus 2008).

Crime prevention in Denmark relates to educating and socializing in general. Crime prevention has from the outset been integrated in educational programs and related to health issues. It should not only address crime but ‘asocial’ or deviant behavior in general. One of the Council’s most prominent interventions is the so-called SSP cooperation which was established in 1977 (DKR 2012:5); a cross-sectional and locally anchored cooperation of the school (S), social service and health care (S) and the police (P). SSP aims at creating a coordinated system of prevention which is meant to *also* prevent crime – the reference is prevention in a broad sense. SSP is based on a so-called model of prevention consisting of three concepts: *forming* (‘opbygning’) which is about creating good, safe and developing conditions for all in society; *prevention* (‘forebyggelse’) which is aimed at hindering unwanted conditions, occurrences or a specific problem; and finally *crime prevention* (‘kriminalitetsforebyggelse’) which focuses on criminal incidences and omissions and how they can be reduced (Ibid.:8-11). The SSP cooperation is often highlighted by agents of the welfare system as a well-functioning and now consolidated cooperation across welfare areas, giving inspiration to other cooperation’s to solve or intervene in specific other issues. The SSP, and especially the crime prevention and police section of the cooperation, is expanded today and networks of welfare workers to combat specific problems before they turn into ‘huge’ problems is a dominating way of thinking in welfare work today in general. Criminologists and others have discussed whether the police should be involved in preventive social work and social politics at all, criticizing the fact that the police expands into and replaces social work locally because they have larger amounts of economic means, which common social work have not had since the 1980s (Johansen 1989). It has also been pointed out that the SSP is based on assumptions about young people as a threat to society, criminalizing youngsters ‘*before they get their hands out of their pockets*’ (Koch 1989: 11).

Besides the focus on educating and socializing, crime prevention strategies in Denmark has focused on community technologies which seek to strengthen and revitalize local communities (DKR 1984), and strategies has also focussed on prevention through urban design and architectural tricks (DKR 1996, 2001).

### ***Notes on the political construction of ‘the immigrant’***

The general political history has since 2001 constructed immigrants as individualized and racialized deviants and obvious targets for prevent strategies combining care and control. From 2001 to 2011, a conservative and liberal government supported by the right wing party, ‘Danish Folk Party’ (‘Dansk Folkeparti’ in Danish), ruled in Denmark, and from 2015 some of the same politicians are in power. The immigrant was called both an ‘immigrant’ and a ‘foreigner’ (‘udlænding’ in Danish):

*‘Foreigners’ participation in the labor market is an important contribution to a better integration of foreigners into the Danish society .. [...] .. The effort to increase foreigners’ Danish language skills is strengthened, and the mandatory mother-tongue teaching is abolished. If a foreigner without good reasons is absent from language teaching, cash benefits or introductory benefits should be reduced.’* (Government 2001: 12).

Thus, an alienating and antagonistic attitude towards ‘foreigners’ was in this period at the center of the general policies as it is today when addressing refugees. The general cultural policies, however, are said to build on ‘*freedom of mind, diversity and community*’ (Government 2001: 20). Nevertheless, in 2002, the focus was on ‘passive immigrant parents’ and economic sanctions if the parents did not for example force their children to attend compulsory schooling regularly (Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration 2002), and day care was stressed as necessary for ‘bilingual’ children and their immigrant parents’ ability to learn the society’s ways of life (Ministry of Social Affairs & Ministry of Education 2003).

The cultural norms and traditions of the immigrants were accounted for as opposed to Danish norms, with authoritarian rearing of children leading to passivity and forced and arranged marriages, etc. (Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration 2003:15). Reference to ‘our values’, such as basic freedom of mind, democracy, human rights etc., were stressed, and they were stressed as threatened by the transformed composition of the population with immigrants and refugees (Ibid.:11).

Strategies should therefore aim at securing social cohesion and an open democracy: equality between men and women, responsible citizenship for all and ‘no acceptance’ of signs of segregated communities based on cultural differences. Following this, the government’s strategy against ‘ghettoization’ was published (Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration 2004). In this document, it is stated that ‘ghetto’ areas should be places where ‘foreigners’ individually meet with Danes and are able to establish networks across personal and cultural differences (Ibid.: 11). It was accentuated that society is tied together by a common acceptance of fundamental ‘core values’. Role models were put forth as important methods for implementing the understanding of: ‘*.. what it means to be a the good citizen*’(Ibid.:42) . Again, parents were targeted: they should make an effort to become the right role models for their children while living in Denmark. In other words, even though ‘they’ may be Danish citizens formally (as second or third generation immigrants), ‘they’ are not thought of as equal citizens, able to rear their children properly. ‘They’ are made deviant and advised to change (become the right role model) in the image of the state’s national and cultural understanding of citizenship created from above. ‘They’ are provided a vocabulary of will and motivation so ‘they’ can reconstruct themselves – if ‘they’ want to belong.

At this point in time, the government centered its attention on democratic integration (e.g., the inculcation of Danish values), human rights, citizenship education and democracy training:

*‘Denmark has a long tradition of freedom of speech and freedom of press. We distinguish between religion and politics, and according to our freedom of speech and press we are constantly able to challenge established dogmas and ways of thinking. Our common values must be the point of departure to strengthen the democratic integration in Denmark. The government wants to strengthen the consciousness about Denmark as a democratic society based on freedom, liberal-mindedness and democracy. In this way we are best able to*

*counteract radicalization and increase equality and equal opportunity among Danes with an immigrant background'* (Government 2007: 7)

Summing up, the style of speech towards 'immigrants' was sharpened after 2001 and this affected the way in which school, education, integration, cultural and value politics were depicted. Not until 2007 was it directly articulated that integration must emphasize values, i.e., democratic integration. In continuation of this, the interventions were directed mostly at immigrants living in urban poor areas ('ghettos'), and at the ones assumed not able to handle themselves the right way economically, e.g., as entrepreneurs. The immigrant was increasingly constructed as an anti-social individual lacking a sense of - and threatening - Danish-Western culture and democracy, and therefore, 'they' should be reared and civilized using moral behaviorism and individualism, stressing the individual's responsibility and underplaying the collective responsibility of the society. Crime prevention became part of the general policy concerning immigrants, and the young immigrant (Muslim) male, living in a ghetto, became the implicit target group of the prevent strategies (cf. Kundnani 2009 as well), which increasing saw potential terrorists in the young immigrant male. This mirrors notions on racialization, criminalization and normalization as internal dynamics of liberal government (Foucault 2004, Badroodien 1999, Øland 2012a)

In the following I will study this forming, preventing and crime (and terror) preventing scheme of Danish welfare workers (crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers) and the way it seeks to make appropriate behavior emerge to change the ghettos and prevent crime and terrorism.

### ***Main concepts and analytical approach***

The paper uses theoretical-analytical tools of classical and modern sociology.

First of all, the concepts of *welfare work* and *professional interventions* are drawn from and constructed in continuation of, respectively, Emile Durkheim's and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology. Following Durkheim, modern differentiated societies bring about societal needs that shape moral and educational institutions and quests for systematic socialization. The moral and social powers of the individual are thus cultivated by professional groups that act as "state brokers" who negotiate issues between the family and the state; the private and the public (Durkheim 1992; Buus 2001, 2008).

Second, the project's concept of *state* is a strict sociological concept. Thus, the state is the organ of social thought working out representations which hold good for the collectivity (Durkheim 1992: 79). This Durkheimian notion about the state provides the historical roots of the Bourdieuan and Wacquantian sociological notion of the state as a bureaucratic field, which refers to the state as a structure, i.e., a space of institutions and agents struggling to define and distribute "the public good" or "the collective" using codified symbolic power that is grounded in socio-material relations of force (Bourdieu 1996b; Wacquant 2008, 2009). This conceptualization of state is moreover operationalized as levels of the bureaucratic field, such

as a level of policy, and a level of practical interventions and institutionalizations (Wacquant 2008: 84). Practical interventions and institutionalizations which are the focus in this paper, are thus understood as intertwined with overall movements in the bureaucratic field.

Furthermore, symbolic power is conceived of as social forms that transform with place and history – as opposed to purely cognitive, discursive or interactional schemes (Wacquant 1997: 230). Symbolic power makes itself noticed as legitimate categorizations and moralizations. Following Durkheim’s sociology of morals, the categories of thought are not universal or transcendental even though they appear so, but they are “socio-moralities” employed in social ordering processes and they exercise constraint over behavior through, e.g., professional work (Durkheim 1992).

In order to further operationalize these overall notions into a clear analytical focus, I draw on conceptualizations of *symbolic and social boundaries*. Michèle Lamont has developed an understanding of boundaries, refining the Durkheimian and Bourdieuan heritage, capturing fundamental social processes of relationality (Lamont 1992; Lamont & Molnár 2002). This calls attention to the inductive search for symbolic classifications and their relationship with group structures, e.g., investigating professionals’ moral evaluation criteria (Lamont 1992), and the way in which they function as distinctions based on race, citizenship status and class in defining national communities (Lamont 2000; Lamont & Duvoux 2014).

In my inductive search, I want to elaborate and adjust the themes of Loïc Wacquants *Punishing the poor* to the Danish context, i.e., the reshaping of social welfare conjoined with penal policy as crucial elements of today’s state craft in the domain of welfare work and professional interventions addressing “the immigrant”, because this reshaping is also crucial in the Danish field. As pointed out by Wacquant, not only “the market” and “workfare” but “security”, a drift to punitive regulation and a disciplinary logic as the answer to the threat of crime and disorder, seems to be constitutive of today’s state craft (Wacquant, 2009). In other words, I want to investigate understandings of professional interventions as differentiating *activities* which targets “problem populations” such as “immigrants” with special cultural, social and pedagogical action design to discipline, supervise and sanction proper behavior.

Summing up, the focus is on symbolic forms, mechanisms and processes of the specific welfare work of prevention – care and control – carried out by crime preventive police officers and street-based social workers. The analyses will detect how they ascribe worth and recognition to juvenile immigrants’ and refugees’ potential and capacity to change and behave properly.

### ***Empirical material – interview and documents***

The empirical material consists of six interviews with crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers working with (supposed) immigrant juvenile delinquents and their families in Copenhagen, and supplementary documents describing administrative and

organizational arrangements, for example the strategy of the local street level institutions and of the local SSP, documents of the DKR and more.<sup>2</sup>

The interviewees are *Erika*, a social worker educated in 1983 and now employed by a housing company as the residents' counselor in a so-called disadvantaged immigrant neighborhood in Copenhagen; *Atif* was originally educated as a technical engineer in 2001 and is since 2004 a self-taught street-based social worker in a poor immigrant neighborhood in Copenhagen, employed by a foundation who gets assignments from the municipality of Copenhagen, Section of prevention and counselling, to organize different activities; *Said* is also a self-taught street based social worker in a poor immigrant neighborhood in Copenhagen and he is educated as a youth pedagogue in 2014 and is employed by an institution run by the municipality of Copenhagen, Section of prevention and counselling; *Tim* is a policeman educated in 1980 with a diploma degree in criminology from 2007 and he works with general crime prevention in Copenhagen police district; *Bo* is a policeman educated in 1989 and he is doing outreach work such as organizing activities in the police force's youth club and conducting home visits in relation to the SSP-cooperation in a specific area of Copenhagen with many immigrants; and finally *Sally* is also a police(wo)man educated in 1986 and educated as a teacher in 2005, and she works with crime prevention in terms of educational programs in all sorts of schools due to the SSP-cooperation.

The interviewees are all organized in different locally anchored collaborative networks – SSP and others. The welfare workers work in areas of Copenhagen where outreach work, and for example home visits to all who have been charged in a case, is especially prioritized in the latest strategies of the SSP (SSP København 2012). Moreover, the SSP in Copenhagen is trying to include other agents as well, such as agents from the housing area, private schools and organizations of volunteers.

The symbolic boundary approach is meant as a point of departure to develop mini-concepts and conceptualizations; to find trans-situational symbolic and social forms between and across professions (which could be processes, types, and patterns), i.e. symbolic and social forms as empirically grounded grammars of state crafting. This way, the symbolic and social forms will be depicted as the collective forms of these welfare workers, which need to be carved out through sociological analysis.

The professionals were interviewed from a broad socio-historical and sociological perspective (Muel-Dreyfus 2001; Bourdieu et al. 1999; Lamont 1992). Therefore, the questions asked in the interviews concerned how the welfare workers were doing boundary work, probing

---

<sup>2</sup> The six interviews were carried out as part of a larger project called "The Field of Welfare Work Addressing "the Immigrant" Since 1970 – Symbolic Boundary Work and the Making of Society" which is part of a collective research project called "Professional interventions as a state-crafting grammar addressing "the immigrant"" and granted means from *the Independent Research Council in Denmark: Section of Humanities* 2013-2016. In this project 48 welfare workers were interviewed: school teachers, adult educators, pedagogues, social workers, police officers, doctors, psychologists, psychiatrics, nurses, health visitors, midwives, job consultants, and different so-called 'street-based' workers or consultants, as regards 'youth', 'housing', and 'integration'.

systematically about this boundary work and trying to get the interviewees to position, contextualize and historicize their views and boundaries. Boundary work is in this regard something that people do not necessarily know they produce even though they sociologically speaking do it all the time when they describe who they are similar to or different from, in this case in relation to other professionals. In the analytical work subsequently, the boundaries and the categories they are related to, were furthermore carved out. As specified by Michèle Lamont and Ann Swidler, it is important to note that such interviews do not focus on *'people's own views as much as on their sense of where they stood, morally and socially, with respect to other relevant groups'* (Lamont and Swidler 2014: 161). In other words, the interviews were carried out as sociological interviews which in general are good for studying classification systems, boundary work, identity constructions, imagined realities and cultural ideals.

Having interviewed six welfare workers in different contexts, the research design allows for systematic attention to comparison across contexts to carve out trans-situational symbolic boundaries of professionals' work, thus understanding the professionals' constructions as elements in a structure crossing the individuals and the individual professions (McCarthy 2011, 2014; Maynard-Moody & Musheno 2003). Embedded in this understanding is the assumption that the professionals may be constructing appropriate behavior based on individual and local circumstance, but the symbolic forms they use in these constructions and the boundary making they launch are not of their own making – they are socially made and have a socio-historical genesis, because they are the product of a long and slow-paced process of incorporation (Bourdieu 1996a: 29).

### ***Symbolic forms and processes involved in the making of appropriate behavior***

How do these welfare workers make boundaries of appropriate behavior through symbolic forms, mechanisms and processes? And what effects does this work have? What is communicated to the young while trying to get them to behave properly?

The preliminary and sketchy analyses can be summarized around four symbolic forms (to be elaborated and theorized further). First, the symbolic form of a Danish democratic and right-based culture is carved out pointing to democracy training and the promotion of Danish culture as sort of a superior democratic culture. Second, the symbolic form and process of cultural modernization is cut out. Third, a symbolic form of behaving decently is exposed and finally, a symbolic form of showing moral character where community building and learning to become a volunteer are significant. The symbolic forms are stabilized through categorizing practices and processes and contain battles and ambiguities (to be elaborated).

## Danish democratic and right-based culture

The first symbolic form concerns the idea of Danish culture as a democratic and right-based culture of a certain caliber.

Generally the welfare workers believe in the Danish welfare system's ability to help and care for those in need, and they mark out the welfare system as an unequivocal good thing which applies for all, the immigrants and refugees as well. Danish national culture is furthermore referred to as democratic and a place where the Danish welfare model exists and makes sure that everybody gets a dignified life. To Erika for example, the most important thing is to enlighten the residents, i.e. the immigrants and refugees, about their rights, because: *'real many of them do not know about their rights and do not get what they are entitled to'* and Erika thinks that the municipality deceive all those who do not know about their rights, for example regarding how to deal with not being able to pay the rent at a certain point in time. This points to the fact that the immigrants and refugees, in line with other citizens of the welfare state, are considered dependent, and the welfare workers help the immigrants and refugees to see that, and this is connected to the welfare workers' mission to act civilizing as well, building up the individual inside the nation as a cultural entity.

This is very much voiced when all of these welfare workers – some more than others – stress that the immigrants and refugees must learn to live in a democracy with a system of justice, and furthermore to be reflexive, to make an argument, be able to discuss and accept other people's stances and make up their own mind. This is opposed to fighting in a physical sense which the young boys are more inclined to according to Atif who states that the young have to *'be able to debate, have to be able to pose questions without jumping at each other, without starting a fight'*. Sally stresses that her job is about creating dialogue in the classrooms she enters. To her this adheres to Denmark as a democracy and in general she posits Danish-ness as *the norm*. In Sally's mind *'it can be really frustrating to grow up in an environment where you can see that your parents are not Danish'*, especially the girls feels like this, she says, and mentions that the immigrant girls wants to participate in *'something Danish'* such as school crossing patrol classes, which the parents often hinders because *'it is not their culture'*. Sally's conclusion is that the parents obstruct the immigrant girls from having a normal children's life, i.e. a modern life. A normal life of a child or a young person also has to do with leisure-time activities and having an after-school job and Tim and Bo often help the young to get a job for example, drawing on their network of job consultancies and employees in the neighborhood, thus providing aspects of a 'normal' children's life in the Danish welfare state.

What is 'othered' and subordinated here is clear: to be non-Danish is of no value and furthermore linked to being physically aggressive, uncivilized and unable to enter a democratic discussion and act as Danish children.

## Cultural modernization

Another symbolic form that is carved out concerns cultural modernisation and this form is marked out by the welfare workers as an opposition to what the immigrants come from and as sort of a developmentalism connected to the idea of modernity. The two street-based social workers Atif and Said – who are also both sons of immigrants themselves and therefore has been treated as immigrant youngsters by welfare workers previously – accentuates that they themselves are Danes, and definitely not to be thought of as immigrants. They stress that it is important that the youngsters, who are most often Danish citizens, also identify themselves as Danes. Atif tells about the young boys he works with and how they think that he want to integrate them and want them to be Danish, and they despise that, because they think it is about values and having to eat pork which excludes them. Therefore they oppose everything Danish and build their understanding of culture and religion on the opposites of Danish-ness and they acquire a desire to be as un-Danish as possible. Atif understands their stance but he also confronts this stance of theirs and wants them to understand that they are Danish:

*‘because Danish-ness is what gives you rights, Danish-ness is fundamental in terms of your freedom of speech’*, he says. He wants them to use the rights they have and the democracy they are part of. When the boys go abroad and get into trouble in Egypt for example, the boys do want to identify themselves as Danish to avoid prison and punishment. Atif uses such episodes to explain to the boys what Danish-ness is and the importance of them identifying as Danish. But he also implicitly tells the boys that they have no rights if they do not identify as Danish but as belonging to another national or ethnic group in the territory of Denmark.

Danish national identity is underlined as the important identity and seems to be the one and only precondition to safety and security for these boys. This is what he tells them implicitly.

Furthermore, Atif tell stories about the Danish society as opposed to the poor societies where most of the boys’ families come from; societies where there is no *‘real trust’* and *‘you have to lie to get something’* versus societies like the Danish society which are *‘built on values such as trust from the start’*, meaning: *‘when you say you are in need, the system believes in you’*. A systematic contrast between the more developed and civilized Danish society versus the societies from which the boys’ parents come from is stabilized. Atif is presenting thoughts relating to modernization and this entails that someone, i.e. the immigrant youngsters, needs to be and is doomed to be modernized, because they are lacking behind culturally:

*‘Very prejudicial I will say that Morocco is 100 years behind in relation to Denmark; the development in regards to freedom of speech and human beings in general; it is still a dictatorship. So, when you take a farmer from there up here and he becomes an engineer, then you think he has everything going for him, but he will have all sorts of issues with his identity. So, it may be that he is an engineer, but he may also have it in him to kill in the name of God. I think we need to understand that it is not only about passing high school’*

What might be called developmentalism comes into play here (Madsen 2011). The societies the young originate from are referred to as dictatorships and at a stage where Denmark was 100 years ago. Denmark is pointed out as placed higher on the scale of development, and

modernization is not only a movement in time, but on the scale of development – and Denmark thus becomes the place the boy's home countries necessarily are heading. Implicitly Atif says that Denmark has been a democracy for generations and that the population in this territory is habitually used to democracy and trust, which the boys are not. In line with this, Tim thinks that the immigrant boys and their families normally are denying everything and have *'an almost inherent inborn mistrust'*, and Atif thinks it is not enough when other welfare workers such as school teachers focus on formal education and is satisfied when the young succeed in high school. Atif points out that terrorists are often well educated but backwards as regards to democracy. Atif wants to challenge the young in regards to their Danish-ness: *'we have to be able to put forth our points of views without being punished. That is part of Danish-ness; the overall understanding of democracy'*. At the same time it is delimited what both democracy and Danish-ness is when connecting the two, while members of other cultures are constructed as lacking behind, subordinated and in need of cultural modernization. As goes for Danish welfare state progressivism in general (Øland 2012a), this move crystallize two distinct races and their hierarchical relation which appear due to markers such as 'lacking behind' which is connected to non-Danish people, and therefore you can say that racialization is linked to cultural modernization.

As part of this modernization, it is clear that the welfare workers think that the young need to be influenced in another – more disciplinary – way than is the case in ordinary pedagogical arrangements. This can be illustrated when revealing how the welfare workers focus on constructing the immigrants as unstructured and lacking a sense of time. About the police force's youth club, Bo says: *'we apply a tougher pedagogical strategy than you do in a normal youth club or spare time club ... and don't take this the wrong way, but we don't put up with anything; we are tough but just. If they are late, they have to do push-ups. Actions lead to consequences. I think the boys like that'*. The same focus is visible when Erika stresses that she teaches 'them' to arrive 'on time', *'because I wait for 15 minutes, then I leave and then I have been watching them and seen them stand there and the door was closed'*. This has been a huge issue for Erika and she teaches everyone to arrive on time. It seems to be her trade of with 'them' that they have to be able to control themselves in this sense (cf. Elias 1992). Said adheres to a similar approach when he confronts what he calls 'disservices' of the whole welfare system when it doesn't express explicit demands and expectations to the immigrant youngsters but only express what Said calls 'the feel sorry for – mentality' of the ordinary social workers which he thinks creates citizens of second and third and fourth rank, i.e. a class society. For example, Said thinks that immigrant women should not stay-at-home but be employed and meet Danish women outside the home.

### **Behaving decently**

Yet another symbolic form in data can be carved out. This symbolic form covers quests to behave decently. Sally describes that, even though the young are condemning and makes a distance when she enters their classroom, if they behave decently: smile and greet her when she leaves the room and she has a feeling that they have accepted the police as more than a force arresting and harassing them, then she is content. Both Atif and Said express an

interventionistic style interacting with the young. Atif stresses to have 'strong relations' with the young which according to Atif means that *'we see who has the ability to do what'*, and he notices when a boy starts to behave in a decent manner and appreciate it and sees to that he *'have a good relation'* with lots of talks, persuasion and insistence versus 'negative' relations when something is broken or there is trouble of any kind. This kind of forming the young draws on behaviorism (behavioral psychology) as a disciplining tool where rewarding good behavior is preferred. It moreover draws on the belief that behavior can be adjusted and developed through the making of strong relations to the young. The focus is on governing their behavior. Exactly the same is evident when Said accentuates use of role models and a special kind of group work with the young where they have to assess issues on a scale and anonymously assess themselves and each other. These 'methods' are not methods from a textbook, but something Said and his organization have thought out locally. In a way they seek to establish the young as someone who has a relation to themselves and are able to reflect and manage themselves and not only be governed from the outside.

Likewise, Atif tries to make the young think: *'young people growing up in Denmark need to learn to think for themselves and it is important that we give this to them'*. Sally tries to make the young think as well. She thinks that the youngsters shape a reality out of norms of their own which are not based on facts and arguments and she tries to work with their misconceptions and show them that they are wrong if they for example think that everybody smokes or everybody is in a gang and walks around shooting people. The underlying premise is that the young want to behave and be normal and as most people, and that it is possible to be normal if you decide to be so; if you are informed about what is best and normal, then you can decide to join. Here it is clear that the young are expected to establish a relation to themselves and reflect and make explicit choices, and it is also clear that they are simultaneously constructed as non-reflexive and not able to choose, authoritarian in style, etc.

Both Said and Atif have themselves experienced being misunderstood and discriminated by welfare workers, and Tim says he knows that policemen are called *'racists and everything else'*. So it seems to be common knowledge to them all that welfare workers discriminate. Tim states that the young are right when they say they are checked by the police all the time when driving a car in specific neighborhoods: *'if you look special, then you get more attention from the police on the street which you have to recognize as a policeman and this is perhaps not fair, but we cannot change it right now'*. Moreover, he states that no matter what everybody should just behave themselves and talk nicely to each other *'so that it only takes 5 minutes instead of escalating into a situation where we have to fight people'*, because then it all goes on nice and smoothly and the situation does not get out of hand. Here, he stresses order and functionality over the fact that the young are institutionally discriminated and offended by that (which might be why they are not always able to behave themselves).

Furthermore, Tim simply states that alarming and disturbing, i.e. indecent, behavior is *'young people who live in what we call particularly marginalized and vulnerable residential areas'* which translates into the fact that living in a certain place in itself counts as disturbing behavior. In the mind of Tim a method to reduce crime is to *'try to move people away from*

*the groups they are in* – away from the marginalized residential areas and ultimately he talks about exit programs in collaboration with the social services. To Bo this also entails forcible removals of children to save them and give them the opportunity to have a better and crime free life, and he talks about removing the young from the streets of the area to the benefit of the general population of the area – to better the life in the area for the people who lives there; to make their life more safe and secure. As Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie, and English criminologist Daniel McCarthy has described, prevention is about building up something in front of what you want to protect, also in a physical sense to prevent dangers of entering the entity you want to protect (Christie 2001), or it is about moving e.g. specific clients ‘out of our patch’ (McCarthy 2013:124). Prevention seems to be about ‘*expulsion, segregation, removal, apartheid*’ (Christie 2001:8), and therefore states often tries to keep immigrants and refugees outside of the nation-state or placed in specific areas, which is always another area than the one they are situated in.

The organization of Said does a lot of monitoring and they use yellow vests when monitoring to distinguish themselves from their target group and avoid being shot at for instance. They use screening as a method to investigate and seek control regarding the youngsters’ alarming behavior in a particular area; they use logbooks to be able to see patterns in the movements of the youngsters and understand their dealings, activities and tendencies. They inform the local community about what is going on and they seek dialogue with the young and thus consider themselves as mediators or bridge-builders when the established system fails to solve conflicts. This whole idea of moving people away from the place where all sorts of illness and disorders are attached is also voiced in the tales of Erika when she tells about the importance of making holidays for the residents away from the area so they can experience other things and be influenced in another way and have new and different relations. Moving the youngsters and other people away from the place for a short or a longer time – to reduce and prevent crime and make the place a better place – is a very common assumption. It has been part of the SSP for a long time and it is criticized by social workers and criminologists for its focus on individuals and short-term superficiality with no lasting effect for the ones ‘in need’.

Crime prevention is moreover generally connected to urban design and planning, architecture in terms of spatial purification thinking, where deviation and risk of deviation is doomed as problematic and dangerous and in danger of being displaced (Borch 2005, cf. Bookman & Woolford 2013 as well). Such a strategy is aimed at hindering certain (‘indecent’) interactions and behavior between certain people to take place at a particular spot.

### **Showing moral character**

The last symbolic form in data concerns moral. There is an appeal for morality and taking responsibility for one’s own actions and life and for the rebuilding of the neighborhood, i.e. for strong responsible individuals inside the group that lives in the marginalized neighborhoods.

The street level workers, who operate in a market of projects and sparse funding opportunities, use volunteering and community-rebuilding as a way to appeal to immigrants'/refugees' own morality. For example, youngsters from a so-called troubled neighborhood are urged by Atif to think of themselves as volunteers – or humans who can *become* volunteers in their own community and then be their own most valuable resource. In other words, they can develop from service users to volunteers. To Atif it is generally important to think of the marginalized neighborhoods as places where you can find resources that you as a social worker can work with: *'there has to be resources that can be ambassadors, because I was one myself, and these are the ones you should listen to because they can uplift the marginalized areas'*. Underneath is an understanding that the citizens of the marginalized neighborhood are able to undertake the task that no one else and no system has been able to undertake: to uplift the whole area by being appointed and by appointing themselves as resources. Atif explicitly connects this resource thinking to *'the concept of volunteering'*. The idea is to *'make them volunteers in their own local area, so that they become leaders and pioneers'*. This is what it takes to have a positive and long-lasting development. The young do not always know what it means to be a volunteer, but then they are introduced to it by Atif and his colleagues, Atif states. Usually volunteering to the young boys is *'something that happens in the mosque and there they are rewarded for it'* and Atif tries to change the habit of expecting rewards – by appreciating them as humans if they behave decently and only appreciating them if they do so (!). The young are in a sense admonished to become the sort of human beings they at the same time are claimed to be. This is a well-known feature of appreciative educational thinking which is often mixed with so-called pedagogy of consequence as it is in Atif's version (Øland 2012b: 231).

Both Atif and Said presents strong narratives of themselves as persons who at a certain critical point in their life realized that they had to work with marginalized immigrant youth – *'to make a difference to some people instead of thinking about material stuff'*, Atif states. He realized that he had a mission in life and took responsibility. The same goes for Said who describes himself as an entrepreneur that wants to do something so that other young people do not have to go through the same kind of stuff he went through. Therefore he made a drop-in-center for the 'thugs' of the neighborhood and managed to get himself activated in a sensible way as an alternative to being active on the streets, doing crime, etc. They both tell stories about their own strong character and qualities as humans and they stress the importance of viewing the young as humans with resources, full of surprises, and not as cases in a file. If you are considered a volunteer and not a service user, this is more evident.

This symbolic form stresses that the young can (be enabled to) uplift themselves and their own group morally. So, community and place is not only a geographical or social space; it is also considered a moral space where individual immigrants/refugees are to be re-constructed through strong relations to street level workers – and with the help of leaders and pioneers as sort of spearheads of the problematized neighborhood. Tim stresses that the young needs to have a certain type of will power, *'not to look at Danish society as an enemy'* and *'then it could be great if some of them could act as pioneers – some of them are stronger than others'*. He marks out 'strong individuals' as the ones who have responsibility to act on behalf of the

collective, insinuating that the young should think of themselves as a group that can be uplifted if the stronger ones within this group is able to uplift the whole group. Even though for example Tim believes that *'no boy is born a criminal'*, he places the bad influence as primarily stemming from 'the family' and the family thus becomes the most responsible unit if crime occurs. Said thinks that instead of doing disservice to the young, demands should be put forth so they can show that they are equal human beings, not of lower rank, and of as high a moral standard as everyone else, able to be responsible. An important difference from Atif and Tim is that Said in this regard is *resisting* the modernization of the young, implicitly saying that the young immigrants per definition *are* of as high a moral standard, not that they are able to get there in due time and with a little help from welfare workers. In comparison Bo thinks that the families and the young preferably should take responsibility themselves but he adds that if they cannot, then he will help them and think that it is his job to do so.

Thus, crime prevention in practice seems to be linked to community (re)building and the strengthening of local communities and promotion of neighborhood (cf. Borch 2005: 98 for the strategy of DKR), but the interesting thing is that it seems as if such a strategy depends on the morally apt behavior of strong individuals within the neighborhood and only in exceptional cases build on the assumption that the young and the communities are of as high a moral standard as they are supposed to become.

### ***Conclusion – racialization and criminalization***

Throughout Denmark's history, there are examples of similar *'internal front'* strategies to develop a civil and national identity as a defense and survival strategy in the regional and global community (Kaspersen 2006). Facing fascism and Nazism in Europe in the 1930s, it was stated politically that Denmark as a small state could never defend itself by military means, but it could stand strong symbolically, drawing on, e.g., progressive pedagogy voicing 'schooling for democracy'. Thus, a Danish *welfare nation-state* formed after WWII as a political disciplinary project of state-crafting, and it was reproduced anew after 9-11.

Generally, the social democratic universal welfare state gives everyone rights to social welfare benefits and centers on creating (and fulfilling) needs, motives and intentions; carrying out dialogues with the human/citizen; evaluating and cultivating according to psychological understandings development. The liberal/neoliberal welfare traits focuses on shaping the humans' ability and will to learn, work and govern him- or herself, using interventions like self-evaluation and appeal for morality. It explicitly targets groups that deviate from the construction of the "normal" human being, such as "the immigrant juvenile" without an obvious long-term national-territorial Danishness, thus including disciplinary projects to form the suitable citizen and prevent him from being a criminal and a terrorist. This movement stresses the destruction of ethnic group life and history and promotes the reconstruction of it from above in another shape, thus accentuating the fact that groups are made, remade and/or destructed through specific symbolic and organizational work of grouping (class-making, race-making) (cf. Wacquant 1989:15). The cultural political pressure

of negative universalism thus seems to be strengthened. Welfare work of crime prevention police officers and street-based social workers stresses that Danishness is linked exclusively to democracy and social rights, and thus the clever thing to do for the immigrant juvenile delinquent – to most of these welfare workers – would be to move towards Danishness and stop lacking behind in this regard and stop identifying with ‘their own group’. Danishness is highlighted as the universal standard of individual existence, excluding other standards which are potentially racialized and criminalized. Thus, the preventive strategies might also produce what it seeks to prevent; the helping hand also stigmatizes and expels and crime prevention strengthens society as segregated (to be elaborated).

Trine Øland Copenhagen August 16, 2015

## **References**

- Badroodien, A. (1999): Race, crime, welfare and state institutions in South Africa from the 1940s, *Social Dynamics: A journal of African studies* 25(2):49-74.
- Bookman, S. & Woolford, A. (2013): Policing (by) the urban brand: defining order in Winnipeg’s Exchange District, *Social & Cultural Geography* 14 (3): 300-317.
- Borch, C. (2005): Crime Prevention as Totalitarian Biopolitics, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention* 6(2): 91-105.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996a): *State Nobility. Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996b): I Statens ånd. Det byråkratiske feltets opprinnelse. In P. Bourdieu, *Symbolisk makt*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S, pp. 48-77.
- Bourdieu, P. et al. (1999): *The Weight of the Word. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Buus, H. (2001): Velfærdsstatens kvindeliv – etablering, utvikling, avvikling? *Kvinder, køn & forskning* 2, pp. 69-78.
- Buus, H. (2008) *Indretning og etterretning. Rockefeller Foundations indflydelse på den danske velfærdsstat 1920-1970*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanums Forlag.
- Christie, N. (2001): Forebyggelse, *Social Kritik* Vol. 13, No. 72: 4-14.
- DKR (1984): Det Kriminalpræventive Råd (1984): Kriminalpræventive overvejelser om miljøplanlægning. Notat nr. 13. [Crime Preventive Suggestions on Environmental Planning. Memorandum no. 13]. Copenhagen: Det Kriminalpræventive Råd.
- DKR (1996): Det Kriminalpræventive Råd (1996): Kriminalpræventiv boligprojektering. Boligplanlægning med tryghed og trivsel. [Crime Preventive Housing Planning. Housing Planning with a Focus on Safety and Well-being]. Glostrup: Det Kriminalpræventive Råd.
- DKR (2001): Det Kriminalpræventive Råd (2001): Trygge Boligområder. Forslag til kriminalpræventiv renovering. [Safe Residences. Suggestions for Crime Preventive Renovation]. Glostrup: Det Kriminalpræventive Råd.
- DKR (2012): Det Kriminalpræventive Råd (2012): SSP – en guide til samarbejdet.
- Durkheim, E. (1992): *Professional ethics and civic morals*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Elias, N. (1992): *An Essay on Time*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1991): *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2004): “*Society must be defended*”. *Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76*, London: Penguin Books.
- Government (2001): *Vækst, velfærd - fornyelse* [Growth, welfare - change]. Regeringsgrundlag. The Danish government.
- Government (2007): *Mulighedernes samfund* [A society of opportunities]. Regeringsgrundlag. The Danish government.
- Hansen, C. S. (2014): Ungdomsklubbernes og gadeplansarbejdets historie og aktualitet, i: Johannsen, G. S. & Petersen, M. (red.): *Unge livsvilkår – muligheder, risici og professionelle udfordringer*. København: Akademisk forlag.
- Højrup, T. (2007): Kulturkamp, anerkendelseskamp og velfærdspolitik. I: Højrup, Thomas & Bolvig, Klaus (red.): *Velfærdssamfund – velfærdsstaters forsvarsform?* s. 23-130. København: Museum Tusulanums Forlag.
- Kaspersen, L.B. (2006) 'The Formation and Development of the Welfare State', in J.L. Campbell, J.A. Hall & O.K. Pedersen (eds), *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism. The Danish Experience*. Québec: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 99-132.
- Kundnani, A. (2009): *Spooked! How not to prevent violent extremism*. Institute of Race Relations, London.
- Lamont, M. (1992): *Money, Morals, & Manners*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, M. (2000): *The Dignity of Working Men. Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Lamont, M. & Molnar, V. (2002): The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167-195.
- Lamont, M. & Swidler, A. (2014): Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing, *Qualitative Sociology* 37(2):153-171.
- Lamont, M & Duvoux, N. (2014): How neo-liberalism has transformed France's symbolic boundaries? *French Politics, Culture and Society*, 32(2): 57-75.
- Madsen, U. (2011): Danishness and the Construction of the Other: A Postmodern School-Ethnography of Despair, Distrust and Desire, in Werler, T. (ed.): *Heterogeneity – General Didactics Meets the Stranger*. Berlin: Waxmann, pp. 35-53.
- Maynard-Moody, S. & Musheno, M. (2003): *Cops, Teachers and Councillors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McCarthy, D.J. (2011): Classing early intervention: Social class, occupational moralities and criminalization, *Critical Social Policy* 31(4): 495-516.
- McCarthy, D.J. (2014): *'Soft' Policing. The Collaborative Control of Anti-Social Behaviour*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration (2002): *På vej mod en ny integrationspolitik* [Towards new politics for integration]. Ministeriet for flygtninge, indvandrere og integration.

- Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration (2003): *Regeringens vision og strategier for bedre integration* [The governments' vision and strategies for improved integration]. Ministeriet for flygtninge, indvandrere og integration.
- Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration (2004): *Regeringens strategi mod ghettoisering* [The government's strategy against ghettoisation]. Ministeriet for flygtninge, indvandrere og integration.
- Ministry of Social Affairs & Ministry of Education (2003): *En god start til alle børn* [A good start for all children]. Socialministeriet og Undervisningsministeriet.
- Muel-Dreyfus, F. (2001): Uddannelse, jobforventninger og knuste drømme. I: Petersen, K.A. (red.): *Praktikker i erhverv og uddannelse – om pædagogiske og sundhedsfaglige praktikker*. København: Akademisk Forlag, 45-120.
- Nissen, M.A.; Fallov, M.A.; Ringø, P.; Kjaerulff, J. & Birk, R.H.: (2015): *Det produktive menneske. Om neoliberalisme, politiske ideer og socialt arbejde som forandringsagent*, Social Kritik 141: 14-27.
- Olsen, G. (2011): *Power & Inequality. A Comparative Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- SSP København (2012): *Strategi – opgaver og ansvar*. SSP København 2013-2014.
- Wacquant, L. (1989): The Puzzle of Race and Class in American Society and Social Science, *Benjamin E. Mays Monographs Series*, Vol. II, No. 1, pp.7-20.
- Wacquant, L. (1997): For an analytic of racial domination. In *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol. II, 221-234.
- Wacquant, L. (2001): The Advent of the Penal State Is Not a Destiny, *Social Justice* 28(3): 81-87.
- Wacquant, L. (2008): *Urban Outcasts – A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Wacquant, L. (2009): *Punishing the Poor. The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Wacquant, L. (2012): Three steps to a historical anthropology of actually existing neoliberalism, *Social Anthropology* 20(1): 66-79.
- Woolford, A. & Thomas, J. (2011): Exception and Deputization under Today's NDP: Neoliberalism, the Third Way, and Crime Control in Manitoba, *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 26(1):113-132.
- Woolford, A. (2013): Nodal repair and networks of destruction: residential schools, colonial genocide, and redress in Canada, *Settler Colonial Studies* 3(1):65-81.
- Woolford, A. (2014): Discipline, Territory, and the Colonial Mesh: Indigenous Boarding Schools in the United States and Canada, in Woolford, A.; Benvenuto, J. & Hinton, A.L. (eds.): *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, pp. 29-48.
- Øland, T. (2012a): 'Human potential' and progressive pedagogy: a long cultural history of the ambiguity of 'race' and 'intelligence'. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 15(4): 561-585.
- Øland, T. (2012b): Det registrerede og det væsentlige – om anerkendelse som praksisform, in Andersen, P. Ø. & Ellegaard, T. (eds.): *Klassisk og modern pædagogisk teori*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.