Chapter 11

Are we constructing Lutherans, people with values or US citizens?

Jonas Qvarsebo and Thom Axelsson

In recent years a new subject, "Life Competence" (*Livskunskap*), has emerged within the Swedish school system. The subject is, as the name indicates, multi-valent and fluid. It is about nothing less than "life," covering everything from health and sex education to emotional management and general social skills. It developed at the end of the 1990s, but has not yet achieved the status of a proper subject with a national syllabus and steering ordinances (Löf 2011). The ideas and practices of the subject have strong affinities to dominant discourses of values, ethics and democratic citizenship in Swedish society. Foundational for all of this is "The Common Value Foundation" (*Värdegrunden*),[1] which is a conglomerate of ethical guidelines for desirable attitudes and behavior that first appeared in the school political discussion in the mid-1990s, and from this time on has spread into many other arenas of society. In principle all authorities, organizations and companies worth the name are now doing some kind of "work" in relation to the Value Foundation. From central authorities such as the police, the fire service, the Swedish Migration Board, the Social Insurance Agency and the National Taxation Board, to associations and sports clubs of different kinds, policy statements are drawn up and codes of behavior are specified under the heading "foundation of values work." To work with these values is regarded as a solution, if not *the* solution, to various ethical problems that surface among figures of authority, bosses, employees and members.

Historically speaking, the ambition to shape and form children and adolescents according to an overarching societal morality is nothing new. But in the Swedish context this has not before 1994 led to an introductory chapter on moral values and guidelines in the national school curriculum. This chapter is about the "fundamental values" that supposedly hold Swedish society together and are to be transmitted to coming generations through the school system. Furthermore, the values at issue are said to be based on "ethics passed on by Christian tradition and Western humanism" (Lpo-94: 3), a wording that has provoked quite strong reactions in certain corners of society. The relationship between the Value Foundation and Christian ethics is, we believe, important and provides us with a key to understand how the Value Foundation is put to play in the Swedish society as a quasi-religious moral standard with historical affinities. The

implementation of Life Competence education in the Swedish context uncovers intricate and interesting genealogical relationships between American programs of behavioral adjustments and the Swedish Value Foundation, relationships that have connections to older technologies of power aimed at creating good citizens in the peasant Lutheran society. These links and relationships will be analyzed in some detail in this chapter.

Confessional technologies of government

In this study we employ Michel Foucault's genealogical approach. From this perspective we are not interested in the Value Foundation and Life Competence as political and educational concerns, but as technologies and techniques of government set up in school and society for "the conduct of conduct" (Foucault 1991). We are especially interested in how "confession" as a technology of power with a long historical pedigree can shed light on how the Value Foundation is put to play in Swedish society.

Foucault argued that modern man has become "a confessing animal" and that modern society can be characterized as a "singularly confessing society" (Foucault 1990: 59). Foucault was primarily interested in confession as a governing technique for the shaping of new forms of subjectivities and "procedures of individualization of power" (Foucault 1990: 59). In this study we want to analyze confession in a related way, as an overarching technology tied to the governing of social behavior. We want to do this by paying attention to the genealogical threads that connect the Value Foundation with older technologies of power, especially the old Swedish society's base in the "pure Lutheran doctrine" with the strategic use of Luther's catechesis. Thus, we view the Western church's (Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed) production and use of creeds, confessions and catechisms as important technologies of power aiming at the establishment of certain regimes of truth on a societal level as well as on an individual level. These are technologies that have been instrumental in shaping and molding collective bodies, regions and nations in the Western world in specific ways. Swedish society, especially from reformation times and onward is an excellent example of this.

Foucault used the example of psychoanalysis to show how Christian practices of confession were appropriated by a secular *scientia sexualis*, which spread to many areas of private life (Foucault 1990). But, as Foucault has suggested in other places, pastoral power – to which confessional techniques are related – does not only target private life but also the territory, the region and later the nation state, producing mentalities, attitudes and discursive grids that set limits for certain thoughts and actions while opening up the possibilities for others. The practice of confession is thus seen as emanating from the world of the monastery and as belonging to a whole system of regulating the soul and body (Foucault 2007). The different levels on which confession operates are intertwined in intricate ways. For example, when people feel the need to confess something about their private selves, whether in a religious setting like a church service or in a secular TV show, or on Facebook,

their confession is grounded in something more than just private experience; it is also rooted in dominant discourses of morality. Confession can be based on certain religious patterns of thought, like the Lutheran conception of sin and guilt before God where sin must be confessed before it can be forgiven, but it might also be based on certain secular ethical standards of equality, tolerance and personal autonomy.

The discourses that make use of confession might thus vary, they can be religious or non-religious, but the mechanisms, the techniques, the drives and the desires embedded in the confessional practices are nevertheless similar. Within a religious discourse, there is obviously a "faith" operating, which is rooted in Holy Scriptures, creeds and confessions. The transgressions of rules and boundaries are within that framework of ideas thought to create a need for atonement, repentance and confession in order for harmony to be restored. A very similar logic, a faith-logic if you will, is operating in modern secular society but within different discursive framework. For instance, the public "scandals" often reported in media – mainly involving politicians and celebrities – always have to do with the transgression of moral boundaries of some sort: sexual, financial or some other ethical standards commonly agreed upon in society. The individuals caught in the wrongdoing are expected to "come clean" publically; to confess and admit that they are personally and genuinely sorry in order for the moral order to be restored. Inscribed in these confessions is a fear of not belonging to the company of the good, the risk of being viewed as deviant and in danger of exclusion from desirable sectors of social life.

The church and Western secular societies thus share certain mechanisms of faith and confession, which makes a genealogical analysis interesting. Undoubtedly, these mechanisms take on forms and move around in different ways, yet they hold their shape in some vital sense. One way of conceptualizing this is to use Bruno Latour's phrase "immutable mobiles." Mobile because they move around in space and time and immutable because even though they move, they retain their characteristic functions (Latour 1987). Looking at practices of confession this way can also help us to go beyond confession as expressions of modern "therapeutic society" only. The motives for confession are not just to feel good about ourselves, to develop self-esteem, self-confidence and so on; the older confessional strategies are still in operation in some sense. In other words there is a historic and social dimension of confession that can be analyzed from a genealogical perspective.

We want to especially highlight two aspects of Foucault's genealogical analysis: historical kinship and mechanisms of power. Given that the Value Foundation aspire to shape citizens in various ways, certain governing practices seem more related than others in that they share similar techniques for governing human behavior. It is possible to identify genealogical links to the governing ambitions that operated when Sweden was a uniformly Lutheran society with a state church that monitored the faith and conduct of all citizens. This dimension of genealogy can also be described as a re-contextualization of historical practices in that they are compared to modern practices and thereby are made re-thinkable. An analogy to Derrida's strategy of

deconstructive reading where transformation is always present in reading and re-reading can be made here (Wood and Bernasconi 1988).

The other aspect concerns power mechanisms. Foucault's concept of govern-mentality is here of central importance. The basic premise of governmentality is that all types of governing rest on certain assumptions about those who are gov-erned. In modern times it is almost always some form of scientific knowledge that is being invoked. However, it is not possible to analyze how government works without also studying the practices through which it is exercised as well as the desired personal qualities and behaviors that are expected (Foucault 1988; Dean 1999; Rose 1999; Qvarsebo 2006; Axelsson 2007). The assumptions of govern-ment, the knowledge it invokes, the techniques it mobilizes, and the kind of sub-ject it seeks to fabricate are thus the central features of this analysis.

To make use of genealogy is, finally, to engage in discourse analysis. Here this means that the focus is on the more or less systematic ways of talking and thinking about various phenomena and practices, which in different ways serve to structure and organize our lives as individuals and societies (Foucault 1981). From this per-spective there is no pure and unmediated knowledge about the world; it is always mediated through linguistic categories, concepts and thoughts. The world comes into existence – in the sense of becoming comprehensible, manageable and pos-sible to act in and on – when it is named and categorized in certain specific ways (Börjesson 2003; Qvarsebo 2006).

Confessional technologies of government in the old Lutheran Swedish society

During the sixteenth century Swedish society moved from Catholicism, with all of its institutions and symbols, to "the pure Lutheran doctrine" and thereby also to new ways of governing society and individuals. This was a gradual development, and at the center of this process was the formation of a set of discourses and prac-tices that made the homogeneity, agreement and harmony of society the desired objective for the governing practices. In church politics this manifested in Lauren-tius Petri's new church order from 1572. Based on this the confessional booth, the practice of penance and the indulgences, as well as many other Catholic practices, were done away with. However, the practice of confession as such remained but within a different framework, and connected to new practices where power oper-ated in new ways.

The Lutheran church interfered in the lives of families and individuals in several ways, not least in the yearly parish household examinations held by the priest as well as through various moral regulations of, for instance, sexual practices and alcohol. The anti-Catholic policy increased with time and in 1595 King Karl IX explicitly banned the Catholic mass and at the same time the last existing mon-astery in Sweden was closed down. In this process the Swedish church gradually became a loyal Lutheran state church where religious and worldly power and ambition was mixed in intricate ways (Behre, Larsson and Österberg 1985).

One powerful technique of government during this era was the household code, *hustavlan*. This was a section in Luther's Small Catechism rooted in the three estates of medieval society: the clergy, the nobility and the commoners. The catechism portrayed these estates as part of the divine order of society, you belonged to one or the other and this decided who and what you could be and do in life. Building on certain New Testament passages the catechism outlined the estates' internal hierarchical relationships as well as their mutual interdependence. A specific geography of power was thereby established where everyone had a divinely ordained place and calling in which they should remain. This power-geography was not hierarchical in a simple way, as some have thought, but was relational and dynamic. A person could have authority by the rules of one estate and at the same time be in submission in another. For example, the household master, who was the unquestionable authority in the household, was in submission to the priest, who in turn was in submission to the king (Lindkvist and Sjöberg 2003).

It was the expressed duty of the household master to provide for all members of his household, both financially and morally, and the household members in turn were expected to execute their duties without grumbling. Failure in this regard resulted in punishment of some sort, a verbal rebuke most often or, in some cases, corporal punishment. The catechism was thus an important instrument for instilling the truth about God, society and oneself in every soul, to form the right kind of self-awareness and confession, thereby establishing a specific regime of truth throughout every sector and member of society, from the household master to the domestic servant.

To instruct all members of society in the pure Lutheran doctrine was of great importance during this period. The ecclesiastical laws of 1686 made clear that household masters and parents were responsible for the instruction of the children and that this was to be controlled by the priests. An important objective of this instruction was that the children—and other members of the household, that is domestic servants—devoted themselves to Luther's Small Catechism. Everyone should preferably not only read a portion of it every day but also know it by heart. It was the household masters' duty to implement this objective and it was the priests' duty to control and assess the level of knowledge and insight in each individual. This was done through the yearly household examination that was held every fall. Officially these examinations went on until 1895 but unofficially the practice went on even longer. Through this confessional practice the commoners learned to understand their role and place in the societal hierarchy, to honor the authorities and to fear God (Behre, Larsson and Österberg 1985; Hedenborg and Kvarnström 2006). The fusion of state and church together with the practices of catechism, the household code and the yearly examinations, in a sense made all of society into a parish and every member of society into church members in submission to a whole regime of government that touched on every part of life.

The upholding of the pure Lutheran doctrine also meant that specific rules of excluding undesirable practices and ideas in the population needed to be

implemented. One important example of this is the so-called Conventicle Ordinance, *Konventikelplakatet,* that was adopted at the 1727 *Riksdag* and that remained in force until 1858. This ordinance prohibited all gatherings with the purpose of spreading religious teaching and edification that could not be classified as household devotions in accordance with the Lutheran church, which was a rather effective way of excluding from society religious ideas and expressions not in line with Lutheranism. It was also prohibited to adhere to any other religion than the Lutheran faith, and the punishment for transgressing this rule was nothing less than expulsion from the country of Sweden. During the nineteenth century the religious law was gradually loosened, but not until 1951 did it become possible to leave the Lutheran church without conditions (Hedenborg and Kvarnström 2006).

The Value Foundation

What happens if one re-contextualizes the Value Foundation, and the practices to which it has been associated, by viewing it in light of the old Lutheran society as described above? In other words, what happens if we take a genealogical approach to the Value Foundation? This is the question that bridges the above presentation and the following discussion of the Value Foundation and Life Competence. The ambition to govern people through value statements is not a Swedish invention. It is a form of government that we find in influential international documents like the conventions and charters associated with the UN—ethical guidelines rooted in ideas of universal and transcendent values. These types of documents all embody the idea that human behavior can be modified and changed for the better through authoritative statements about what is good and right. The similarity with the creeds and confessions of church traditions are striking, in fact they can be seen as a secularized version of creedal statements. The same is true for the Value Foundation, which is part of the same discourse of governing through value statements. This is seen for instance in the highlighting of lofty values such as the equality of all people, individual freedom and the integrity of the individual. These are abstract and transcendent values that are viewed as foundational for creating a better society.

There are thus no particular Swedish values to be found in the Value Foundation, it is basically a national adaptation of standard Western universal values. However, by including this statement in the national school curriculum it has become linked with the fabrication of the nation. It is similar to the older religious instruction of society that was intimately tied to the governing of a geographical territory. This is seen for example in the fact that the talk of the Swedish Value Foundation became prevalent at a time when big waves of migration from nations without a strong Christian culture escalated from the mid 1980s. To insist on the importance of Swedish values in this context was a way to protect national and cultural homogeneity in a time of cultural turbulence.

The central passage of the Value Foundation contains the following words:

> The inviolability of human life, individual freedom and integrity, the equal value of all people, equality between women and men, and solidarity with the weak and vulnerable are the values that the school should represent and impart. In accordance with the ethics borne by Christian tradition and Western humanism, this is achieved by fostering in the individual a sense of justice, generosity of spirit, tolerance and responsibility. Teaching in the school should be non-denominational.
>
> (Lgr11: 9)

These lofty values are seldom picked out individually for interpretation and implementation. In fact, there has been little argument over any of these values. It is rather the abstract phrase "the Value Foundation" that is being referred to almost like a mantra. The way the Value Foundation is put to play in society is thus not through discussion and interpretation but by identifying those who are speaking and acting in accordance with the right values and those who aren't. In this sense the use of the Value Foundation is similar to how people referred to doctrine and catechism in the old Lutheran society, a referring to the authoritative dogmas and truths that are thought to hold society and social life together. The Value Foundation is invoked as a truth of the highest order, that which is foundational for society and to which everyone must submit in order to speak and act with credibility.

The emergence of the Value Foundation, and its inscriptions in various programs, documents and practices, has meant that the discussion of moral issues in Sweden nowadays is carried on not so much in terms of influence, discipline and socialization, but rather in terms of "value foundation work." Traditional talk about discipline and order is still there but it has been marginalized and rearticulated in the vocabulary of value work. And this kind of work has seen a very wide spread. Today not only the schools are to work with the Value Foundation. Policy statements are drawn up and codes of behavior are specified under the heading "foundation of values work" in many sectors of Swedish society. Every organization of some importance needs to have these statements to be credible in this new context.

The school system (which in Sweden nowadays includes also preschool and after-school leisure activities) can still be regarded as one of the most important arenas for the Value Foundation. And the intensity in the talk about these values shows no signs of decreasing within the school. As recently as 2009 the government asked the National Agency for Education to "introduce measures to promote, strengthen, and disseminate knowledge about the school's value foundation as it is described in the curriculum" (Nykänen 2009). When Life Competence emerged toward the end of the 1990s, it was precisely the connection to the Value Foundation and value foundation work that made it so attractive. Here were concrete programs and guidelines for doing value foundation work, a way of making all of these abstract values visible and concrete and thereby useful for the molding and shaping of the pupils' attitudes and behavior in accordance with the dominant societal moral.

Life Competence

There are many programs and methods that assemble themselves under the name of Life Competence. Several of these have been put to use in the Swedish school system. Examples of programs are: *SET*, *Project Charlie*, *Dialogue between Friends*, *Vital*, *Lion Quest–Together*, *Forum Game*, *You & I Right & Wrong*, *The Group as a Seedbed* and *Life Knowledge*. We have chosen to focus on two of these programs: *Project Charlie* and *Lion Quest–Together*.

Lion Quest–Together (henceforth referred to simply as *Together*) is a translation of an American program from the international organization Lions. The original program is entitled *Skills for Growing* and is available for several different age ranges.[2] The Swedish material is aimed at children's groups from the preschool class (age 6) to 3rd grade. It is also available in English for grades 6–8 (*Skills for Adolescence*) and for High School (*Skills for Actions*). The overall themes for these programs are: Bullying Prevention; Character Education; Drug Prevention Standards; Service Learning; Social Emotional Learning; and Suicide Prevention. *Together* is said to train children in things like working together in groups and helping others, and provide them with knowledge about "how to live a healthy life". *Project Charlie* emerged in a specific local context, in Edina, a suburb of Minneapolis, Minnesota in the US.[3] In the 1970s the suburb was afflicted by drug abuse among young people. The problems became so serious that they were said to have taken on epidemic proportions, and so a solution was sought. This is the background to the rather strange name *Charlie*, which is an acronym for **Ch**emical **A**buse **R**esolution **L**ies **In** **E**ducation. The program, which has been translated into Swedish, is divided into four sections: "Self-esteem," "Relationships," "Decision making," and "Chemical use." The program is geared to children in the lower levels of compulsory school and deals with how they should learn to manage their emotions in a healthy way. Special importance is attached to dealing with negative feelings and disappointments in a constructive manner.

Solving a problem

All forms of governing are intended to deal with problems of some sort. It may be a defect that needs rectifying, an attitude or an action that needs correcting, an experience that is to be avoided or something similar. The Life Competence programs explicitly deal with different types of perceived social and emotional problems. Drugs, bullying, asocial behavior, negative emotions and lack of involvement are the focal points for the type of governing inscribed in the programs. Forming ideal citizens through shaping the emotions, attitudes and behavior of the young is, however important this is, not the main objective for the programs, but is rather a means for an even higher purpose: to create the ideal society. It is thus a version of the good society, and the corresponding good citizen, which is at the heart of the governing processes at work in these programs.

The problematizations of governing that the programs are based on are aimed at several levels of social life. The *Together* program, for which the overall aim is

"social and emotional learning," links up with the national and state level with aims for promoting empathy training, conflict resolution, and prevention of drugs and violence. In the original version of *Together* the governing ambitions are related to specific political projects, such as the Canadian projects *National Strategy on Community Safety* and *Crime Prevention Safety*. As the names suggest, these are whole packages of state measures aimed at the protection of society from drugs, antisocial tendencies, violence and crime. Hand in hand with this preventive orientation there is also heavy emphasis on citizen education with the purpose of shaping socially and emotionally competent citizens. This kind of governing seeks to tackle what is perceived as evil in society while simultaneously fabricating citizens who possess drives and attitudes that are viewed as constructive and beneficial to society.

   At the individual level, the problematizations have to do with emotional and social skills, to strengthen children's self-awareness and self-esteem and to provide tools for personal development. There is also a strong emphasis on social competence. This type of governing is aimed at fostering appropriate behavior toward friends and family, as well as cultivating the right attitudes to school and to society in general. In addition, there is a rather strong interest in getting children to take part in different types of help projects and to develop an inner sense of social commitment. As Barbara Cruikshank (1999) has showed in an American study about the governing of democratic citizenship, there is in programs like this a concern that the citizens of the future become "involved" and truly "active" people. The idea of "empowerment" is a clearly discernible technique in this type of governing; an aspiration to create active citizens who will make certain societal projects into their own life projects. This is a central feature of the Life Competence programs. Inscribed in empowerment strategies are notions of the individual's autonomy and of having the power to create one's self in various ways. At the same time, individuals are not be allowed to shape their lives in just any way; this must be carried out within the framework of socially beneficial projects such as drug prevention, combating poverty and raising the nation's educational level. It is thus a qualified empowerment permeated by specific societally oriented governing ambitions.

Techniques and procedures

An important question in these programs is how the perceived problems and defects are to be combated more concretely, by what methods. These, of which we will give a few examples, are techniques for the governing of attitudes and behavior. One such technique concerns the family as a whole. The programs are designed to give both child and parent strategies for resisting negative influences of various sorts. Television in particular is said to have assumed the role as the "educator" of children, which is seen as a threat to the family. From a socio-economic perspective it is quite obvious that the primary target for this kind of governing is the lower social classes, children who are assumed to be left alone in front of the television without responsible adult supervision.

The talk about the family and its importance for children's wellbeing is a central feature, and here the North American influence with its emphasis on "family life" surfaces. But the family is not to be trusted; the programs are based on a notion of the family's supposed lack of morals and social competence. Because of this lack it is necessary to intervene in family life from the outside. This involves educating parents through recommendations, claims, instructions, hints and advice of different sorts. A concrete expression of this is the "Parents' Booklet" that accompanies *Together*, where parents are instructed in how to understand and handle their children in accordance with the program. It is thought possible to create desirable family relations through authoritative instruction based on transcendent and codified values. The genealogical link to catechism work in the old Lutheran society is discernible here. The picture of the family that emerges in relation to this technique of government is one that has historically been associated with governing the poor through interventions headed first by church and philanthropists and later the welfare state.

The rationality of governing in relation to the family also has certain genealogical similarities to that of Swedish social engineering, the ambition to govern society in a certain direction through welfare institutions such as preschool and school. The will to instill the right kind of behavior and attitudes through national school programs has been a great theme of Swedish school politics for centuries (Sandin 1986; Qvarsebo 2006; Axelsson 2007). This is not unique for Sweden, but to view the family as a domain consisting of individuals—rather than as a whole—and with relatively weak parental rights has strong genealogical links to the Swedish model of social engineering where the welfare state has come close to individual citizens in a way that is unique in both an international and a historical perspective (Arvidsson, Berntson and Dencik 1994; Axelsson 2007).

Another technique has to do with guidelines and instructions to the instructors. The programs are concerned with minute detail of how instructors should go about implementing the programs in the most effective way. Nothing is left to chance; everything is meticulously described, from how to present the program to a new group of children to dividing them into sections to perform the actual supervision of every individual child. This is a rationality of governing that is directed at the child's intellect and will, training them through providing them with various facts and arguments with the hope that they themselves will come to the right conclusions and decisions, a type of governing that makes use of what Foucault called "technologies of the self" (1988). By thinking about, discussing and processing the information provided the child operates on their understanding of themselves and moral action, thereby shaping the self in various ways.

The basis for governing and the fabrication of the subject

The techniques and procedures of governing people are rooted in specific forms of knowledge about how people are thought to function. Medical knowledge is

invoked in the programs as being of great importance, primarily as a base for educating the children about the effects of drugs on body and mind. Under the heading "Chemical substances" in *Project Charlie* the crucial point is to provide information about drug abuse and how to work with "preventive education with healthy messages" which are said to contribute to the development of "healthy and critical attitudes" and which are hoped to counteract the use of drugs. The children are here taught about drugs and their effects. One assignment is to categorize which drugs require a prescription and which don't. Examples of the latter are painkillers without codeine, aspirin and vitamins, while painkillers with codeine, penicillin and insulin are examples of the former. Another assignment is to categorize legal and illegal drugs.

The instructions concerning medicine, tobacco, alcohol and drugs have a ring of universality to them. But at the same time this kind of governing has always been geared towards groups in society where there are suspicions about inadequate supervision and general carelessness. The governing strategies of the Life Competence programs are thus genealogically linked to older forms of governing the poor, as we have mentioned above. A US technology for dealing with drug abuse among young people in the seventies has with the help of Life Competence traveled in space and time and been reinstalled in a new national context where it resonates with earlier discourses of governing the poor.

The aims for shaping the subject come to the fore in the very introduction to the programs. For example, under the heading "Understanding yourself and others" children learn how they are supposed to behave during work with the program. Listening, putting your hand up, only giving encouragement, not "putting people down," staying within one's field, having the right not to take part in something, and respecting others are behaviours that are stressed as essential. In addition, it is considered important to resolve differences of opinion through several methods of conflict management. There are also guidelines for how the children should handle their emotions, specifically anger, in ways that are deemed as constructive. Thus, the programs require constant work with the self. Personal development in this way becomes a social obligation.

Context upon context

The fact that the Life Competence programs have their origin in socially exposed areas in the US shines through at several points. When implemented in the Swedish preschool and school some thirty years later, as is the case with *Project Charlie*, this background comes to the fore as has been showed above. The strong focus on medicines and drugs that evolved in a specific national context—the drug problems in the Minneapolis suburb of Edina in the 1970s—remains a major feature in material which is now aimed at preschool and lower-level school children in Sweden, without any consideration of the new context. Although *Project Charlie* is said to primarily deal with relationships, conflicts and counteracting bullying—which can be viewed as general problems in most societies—it has a heavy emphasis on

dealing with chemical drugs in various ways. The same goes for *Together*, which reflects governing ambitions to combat drugs at the national level. Sweden, as any other Western country, has its share of drug problems, but this is generally not portrayed as a problem of such magnitude that it should dominate the pedagogy of preschool and school in the way it does in these programs. But since the historical background of the programs has been discursively erased they can be reinstalled in a new setting without any discussion about different contexts and implementation processes, which is exactly what has happened. Thus, through these programs knowledge, norms and governing strategies from another time and context have put to play in Sweden.

In the new context these programs have been linked to new discourses and strategies for the governing and shaping of citizens put to play in Swedish society. In this chapter we have analyzed this phenomenon as a re-contextualization of technologies of power operative in Swedish society in the name of the Value Foundation. To refer to these values has become an important way of talking about and regulating morality and behavior since the mid-nineties and onward. The re-contextualizing dimension has to do with a re-activation of older technologies of power that have had a strong influence in Sweden during the old Lutheran era, a time where the whole nation was regulated much like a big church. Older discourses of social regulation have thus been reactivated and put to play in new ways through the connection with the Value Foundation and the Life Competence programs. Stripped from their earlier national-religious motivations they are now at work in the form of social and emotional training in the service of modern citizenship. In this chapter we have pointed out several similarities between the techniques of governing in the Lutheran era—the catechesis and the household examinations—and the training of behavior and emotions through the Life Competence programs in connection with the Value Foundation. This intermingling of historical and national contexts and various technologies of power has led to a situation, at the level of discursive practices, where multiple ideals of citizenship have been intertwined in Sweden— social and emotional training ideals, the process of becoming citizens with certain societal values and older religious ideals of morality.

Notes

1 The term was coined in the mid-1990s and was specified in the Swedish comprenhensive school curriculum of 1994 (Lpo-94).
2 http://www.lionsquest.ca/snapupload/For%20Educators/SFG%20-%20Lions%20Quest %20Curriculum%20Map%20for%20Character%20Education%2020070924.pdf
3 http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/modules/wbs/dsp_print_project_description. cfm?project_id=5236

References

Arvidsson, H. Berntson, L. and Dencik, L. (1994) *Modernisering, välfärd: om stat, individ och civilt samhälle i Sverige*, Stockholm: City University Press.

Axelsson, T. (2007) *Rätt elev i rätt klass: Skola, begåvning och styrning 1920–1950* (diss.), Linköping: Liu-Tryck.

Behre, G. Larsson, L-O. and Österberg, E. (1985) *Sveriges historia 1921–1809: Stormaktsdröm och småstadrealiteter*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Börjesson, M. (2003) *Diskurser och konstruktioner: En sorts metodbok*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Cruikshank, B. (1999) *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1981) "The Order of Discourse," in R. Young (ed.) *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, Boston: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1988) "The Political Technology of Individuals," in L.H. Martin (ed.) *Technologies of the Self*, London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1991) "Governmentality," in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Foucault, M. (1990) *The History of Sexuality. An Introduction: Volume 1*, New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collége de France 1977–1978*, New York: Palgrave.

Hedenborg, S. and Kvarnström, L. (2006) *Det svenska samhället 1720–2000: Böndernas och arbetarnas tid*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lindkvist, T. and Sjöberg, M., (2003) *Det svenska samhället 800–1720: klerkernas och adelns tid*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lion Quest curriculum map for character education standards, http://www.lionsquest.ca/snapupload/For%20Educators/SFG%20-%20Lions%20Quest%20Curriculum%20Map%20for%20Character%20Education%20070924.pdf

Lpo-94. (1994) *Läroplan för det obligatoriska skolväsendet, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet.* Stockholm: Skolverket.

Löf, C. (2011) *Med livet på schemat: Om skolämnets livskunskap och den riskfyllda barndomen* (diss.), Malmö högskola.

Nykänen, Pia (2009) *Värdegrund, demokrati och tolerans: Om skolans fostran i ett mångkulturellt samhälle*, Stockholm: Bokförlaget Thales.

Project Charlie, http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/modules/wbs/dsp_print_project_description.cfm?project_id=5236

Qvarsebo, J. (2006) *Skolbarnets fostran: Enhetsskolan, agan och politiken om barnet 1946–1962*, Linköping: LiU-Tryck.

Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Re-framing Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sandin, B. (1986) "Hemmet, gatan, fabriken eller skolan: Folkundervisning och barnuppfostran i svenska städer 1600–1850," Arkiv avhandlingsserie, 22, Lund: Arkiv.

Wood, D. and Bernasconi, R. (eds) (1988) *Derrida and différance*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.