Sarnecki, J and Estrada, F. (2006): “Keeping the Balance between Humanism and Penal Punitivism - Recent Trends in Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice in Sweden.”
**In: Josine Junger-Tas and Scott H. Decker, *Handbook of International Juvenile Justice*,
Dordrecht, Springer**

Please send proofs etc to:
Felipe Estrada
Institute for Future Studies
Box 591
101 31 Stockholm
Sweden
Felipe.estrada@framtidssstudier.se
Phone +4684021232
Fax: + 468245014

May 2005

INTRODUCTION	3
BACKGROUND – THE SWEDISH JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM FROM A CRIMINAL POLICY PERSPECTIVE	4
JUVENILE CRIME IN THE POST- WAR PERIOD	8
The overall crime trend	9
<i>Self-report studies</i>	12
Juvenile Violence	13
Alternative measures of trends in violence	15
<i>Victim and self-report surveys</i>	15
<i>Hospital and cause of death statistics</i>	17
RESPONSES TO CRIMES COMMITTED BY YOUNG PEOPLE –	20
A DETAILED DESCRIPTION	20
The Judicial System: the Police	20
The Judicial System: the Prosecutor	22
The Judicial System: the Courts	26
The Social Services	29
Other institutions	33
CONCLUSIONS	36
REFERENCES	40

INTRODUCTION

Geographically Sweden is one of the margin members of the European Union. Sweden is also rather sparsely populated with a total population of 9 millions. During the last decades every cohort of children/juveniles consist of approximately 100 000. Since the age of legal responsibility in Sweden is 15 years and special legislation still applies for juveniles until they reach 21 years, the juvenile population could be said to consist of around 600 000. It is a well-established fact that the number of young people who have been reported for committing a crime has increased dramatically since World War II even when controlling for population growth. This is not unique to Sweden and is often the same elsewhere in Europe (Estrada 1999a). It is not unusual to see this change as continuous, that young people are becoming "worse and worse". An attitude like this obviously affects the measures that are involved in the development of juvenile crime.

This report will present the measures against juvenile crime from a criminal justice policy perspective and highlight how this policy has changed over the past three decades. The report begins with a general background describing the history of the Swedish juvenile justice system. Thereafter the trends in juvenile delinquency¹ are analysed and the responses to crimes that are taken by the Swedish juvenile system are described in more detail. Finally we discuss how the current trends can be understood.

¹ The English concept "juvenile delinquency" has no direct equivalent in the Swedish language or in the Swedish legal system. Instead, in Sweden we usually speak of juvenile criminality, a concept which differs from juvenile delinquency in that it does not include so-called status offences, i.e. acts committed by juveniles which constitute a crime but are legal if they are committed by adults. The authorities' reactions in such cases have the character of social measures and are regulated by social legislation, not penal legislation. In this paper the term juvenile delinquency is used synonymously with the Swedish concept of juvenile criminality and thus covers all acts which are subject to penal sanctions according to Swedish law.

BACKGROUND – THE SWEDISH JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM FROM A CRIMINAL POLICY PERSPECTIVE

Swedish criminal justice policy is characterised by its emphasis on a comprehensive perspective. In the national programme for crime prevention, it is thus stressed that criminal justice policy covers more than the measures against crime that the legal system carries out (see also Takala 2004). Our report concentrates on the social and punitive side of criminal justice policy. Society's overall goal for criminal justice policy against juvenile crime in the post-war period can be said to be one of *diversion*. Criminal youths should be kept away from correctional treatment in general and prison in particular. In the post-war period, however, social reactions have changed. There is an emerging shift from treatment to punishment in programmes involving juvenile delinquents (for an overview of the situation in the rest of Scandinavia see Storgaard 2004).

Over the entire 20th century, it was clear in Sweden that measures against juvenile delinquents should be separated from measures against adult offenders.² As early as 1902, several laws were passed which followed this line of thinking. Instead of prison, "forced care" was introduced for criminal youths between the age of 15 and 17. In 1935, the Child Care Act was expanded to include young people between the age of 18 and 21. At the same time, youth prisons were established for young people (from 15 years) who could not be treated within the social youth welfare system. Treatment in youth prisons was for an unspecified period of time, so that the time in prison was not set beforehand and was based on the needs of the young person and not on the act he or she committed.

After World War II, forced care was abolished and replaced by protective foster care in community homes. Prison sentences were limited even further for young people under

² This section is taken from Estrada (1999b) where additional Swedish sources also are listed.

18. They were instead to be taken care of in the child care system, not in the prison system. This change was connected to a growing realisation of the negative repercussions on young people living in institutions. Youth welfare was increasingly aimed at preventive and supportive measures. Placing young people in institutions was reserved as a final measure. In the 1950s, a rather optimistic view prevailed of the chances of treating juvenile delinquents. There was a shift to thinking in terms of treatment rather than punishment.

In 1965, a new penal code was introduced which gave great support to the way of thinking that favoured treatment. Intervention against young people would be based on their personal circumstances. This meant that a more highly differentiated system of responses was developed. Youth prisons remained for young people who committed a crime for which the penalty prescribed was prison. Perpetrators also had to be between the ages of 18 and 20; only in exceptional cases were they under 18 or between 21 and 23. The time spent in youth prison continued to be unspecified. For young people between the age of 15 and 17, the goal was to keep them away from the criminal care system and instead take care of them through the child care system. Responses that tended to involve treatment were now grouped under a penalty named "commitment to special care".

The treatment ideology underlying the penal code was criticised strongly from the very beginning. The debate focused on the lack of proportionality between the crime and its consequences. Given that the consequences were focused on the individual and not the crime, this opened the door for inhumane and unjust decisions according to some critics. It was further pointed out with growing frequency that treatment was ineffective. For an individual, it is humiliating to be locked in an institution no matter what name is given to this involuntary deprivation of freedom.

Thus by the end of the 1960s, the need for force and locking people up came under question. Positive effects could only be expected if the person receiving care was motivated by the treatment. Motivation was considered to improve if young people could be treated outside an institution. In the 1970s, there was thus a desire to avoid placing people in institutions and in forced care as much as possible. After a long debate, youth prisons were abolished in 1980. According to the new *Social Services Act* that entered into force in 1982, youth welfare would be based on voluntary commitment and mutual understanding. Forced care measures were allowed by the *Act with Special Provisions on the Care of Young People* (LVU). These forced care measures, however, should follow the intent of the *Social Services Act* and also be based on what is best for the young person. *Intervention should not be based on any interest to protect society or any similar aim.*

Responsibility for community homes was now transferred from the state to the county council, and their name was changed from community homes to Special Approved Youth Homes. The reasoning behind the rearrangement was that care should be provided nearer to home so that contact with family and friends could be maintained and so that continuity in treatment would be easier.

In the second half of the 1980s several revisions were made in the LVU with the aim of making the response from society faster and clearer. Demands for greater consequences, that is, increased consideration for the *seriousness of the act*, began to be made. A clear sign of the change in attitudes towards the role of the system of responses was given by the *Commission on Prison Sentencing* in 1989. The intervention of society is no longer justified based on the youth's need for care; rather, it is the seriousness of the criminal act that is the starting point in determining the consequences. *Equality before the law and proportionality replaced voluntary commitment and mutual understanding as guiding principles* (Tham 1995; 2001).

In 1993, *the Commission on Juvenile Crime* (SOU 1993) presented its proposals for society's response to juvenile crime, which were essentially that there should be fixed, clear responses and that they should guarantee the citizen's protection under the law. The rules concerning the commitment of juvenile delinquents to social care were given a new form "so that punitively- motivated requirements for predictability, consequence and proportionality are given more space". Criticism aimed at youth homes administered by the county councils resulted in the establishment of National Board for Institutional Care (SiS) in 1993. The following year, the state assumed responsibility for youth welfare in the special approved youth homes.

Today, SiS has the responsibility for young people under 18 who have been sentenced to the new institutional care. The length of time for institutional care of young people is determined by the seriousness of the crime and is for no less than fourteen days and no more than four years. Punishment is intended to be for a limited time. The proposal means that institutional youth care will in principle replace prison sentences for juvenile delinquents under 18. To give young people between the age of 18 and 20 a prison sentence as the consequence of their action still requires special circumstances (i.e. that the crime is very serious).

The diagram below gives a summary of the development in the number of young people in institutions in the post-war period. We can see that the number of people in institutions increased up until the end of the 1960s. In the 1970s, the number fell dramatically. The decrease ended in the 1980s and thereafter there is a slight increase in the 1990s described in more detail below.

Figure 1. Young people aged 15-20 who have been admitted to community homes (or the equivalent) or prison on any given day, 1951-1982 and 1983-1997, per 1,000 inhabitants.

JUVENILE CRIME IN THE POST- WAR PERIOD

Measuring the extent and development of juvenile crime is far from simple. Official crime statistics are the most accessible source, but they have their well-known shortcomings. Our knowledge, for instance, of an individual's propensity to report a crime, the work routines of the police or court routines and how they have all developed and changed over time is, unfortunately, far too unsystematic and insufficient. It is thus justifiable to remain somewhat sceptical about statistical pictures of crime as descriptions of the "real" development. In short, any attempt to produce an ideal description of crime trends should be based not only on official crime statistics, but should also utilise other statistics, such as victims studies and cause of death statistics, that are less affected by changes in the criminal justice system or in the methods used to produce the official statistics.

It is also well-known that the number of criminal offences registered in official crime statistics was much larger in the year 2000 than it was in 1950 and that this increase

was to a large extent the result of an increase in theft offences (Smith 1995; Pfeiffer 1998; Estrada 1999a; Westfelt 2001; Falck et al 2003). This is probably an expression of an actual increase in juvenile crime. But it is more uncertain what this increase looks like. Is it, as has often been claimed in both academic literature and public debate, a question of a continual, linear increase? Post-war criminological research into crime trends has been dominated by descriptions of an ever-increasing population of offenders (e.g. Wilson and Herrnstein 1985; Smith 1995; Pfeiffer 1998). In more recent times, however, an alternative description has gained currency, highlighting a levelling off in this trend during the 1980s (Kyvsgaard 1991; Estrada 1999a, 2001; von Hofer 2000, 2003; Westfelt 2001). Figures 2 and 3 present these two alternatives. At the beginning of the 1990s, this question was debated in Swedish criminology. Which of the two descriptions holds true is of significance when the policy on juvenile crime is to be evaluated.

Fig.2 Alternative 1. Linear increase in juvenile offending 1950-2000.

Fig. 3 Alternative 2. Juvenile offending levelling off 1950-2000.

The overall crime trend

Theft is the dominant- type of crime among young people. This has meant that the discussion about the development of juvenile crime has been about how theft has developed. In recent years, however, violent crimes among young people have become a more prominent issue (von Hofer 2000; Estrada 2001). Because violent crimes are far more unusual than theft,

variations in violent crimes will disappear in general reports. In view of this, an analysis of general developments will first be given below and then followed by analysis of violent crimes.

Juvenile crime increased slowly in the first part of the 20th century (Figure 4). It increased with greater speed starting in the 1950s, with the 1950s showing a doubling in the number of young people reported for committing a crime. This strong rate of increase continued throughout the 1960s. At the beginning of the 1970s, the trend was broken, and since then there has been a *clear stabilisation in the statistics or even a decrease in the number of juvenile offenders*. The total level of police reported crime in Sweden increased up until the beginning of the 1990s, at which point it stabilised at a level slightly lower than that recorded in 1990.

Figure 4. Youths aged 15-17 convicted of theft respectively assault 1913-2002 (per 1000). Sweden.

The marked drop in theft convictions at the very end of the period should partly be seen in the light of major re-organisations of the police and the prosecutorial systems in Sweden, which led to a loss of efficiency and to reduced output (von Hofer 2003). This

observation gives rise to the following classic question in relation to the use of crime statistics in general: to what extent are the described trends real, and to what extent are they simply the result of amongst other things procedural changes within the criminal justice system or variations in reporting behaviour? The most obvious answer is of course that both alternatives are true to a varying extent. In most of the countries in Western Europe for example statistics concerning *convicted* juveniles indicate a clear *reduction* over the last twenty years or so (as shown in figure 4, Estrada 1999a). Those indicators which lie 'closer' to the crime event however, and which are thus less sensitive to changes within the criminal justice system (such as statistics relating to suspects), suggest that the reductions are not real but are rather the result of "system effects" (a more detailed discussion is found in Estrada 1999a). Thus the development in the number of young people suspected of committing crimes as outlined in the penal code has been stable for the last three decades in Sweden. Well worth noting is that the number of adults suspected has increased more or less in line with the development in reported crimes.

One problem with the crime statistics is connected to the decrease in the percentage of crimes that have been solved in the last few decades. A reduction in the number of crimes solved has been seen as suggesting a situation in which fewer and fewer criminal individuals are identified and reported for their crimes. It is therefore considered productive to check for such a relation by calculating the number of registered juvenile delinquents.³ In that way, a "worst case scenario" on development is produced. These calculations, however, do not confirm that juvenile crime continued to increase at an unchanged rate over the entire post-war period. A reasonable conclusion is that, instead the number of juvenile criminals has been more or less stable in the last few decades. A reasonable hypothesis is thus that the increase in crime can be attributed above all to the increased number and activity of adult

³ The connection between the rate of crimes solved (the percentage of reported crimes that the police have solved) and the risk of discovery (the risk of a criminal being discovered and reported for a crime that was committed by him or her) is problematic. In essence, it can be said that the risk of discovery for the individual criminal has probably not decreased to the same degree as the percentage of crimes solved. This means that the calculations that have been made most likely overestimate the development.

perpetrators. This interpretation is supported by the development in the types of crimes that are committed principally by young people. The number of crimes that are most closely identified as juvenile crimes has been unchanged while reports for other types of thefts, where young people constitute a smaller share of perpetrators, have increased.

Self-report studies

Alternative sources of information on trends in juvenile crime also indicate that the offending of young people has been relatively stable and may possibly even have decreased over recent years. The first large self-report study of juvenile crime in Sweden was conducted in the town of Örebro in 1971. Twenty-five years later, in 1996, this study was repeated using the same survey instrument (Ward 1998). This study also indicated that variations in levels of self-reported crime were relatively small. Ward shows however a certain polarisation among the groups studied, with the group presenting the highest levels of criminal participation becoming both larger and more heavily involved in crime between the two surveys, whilst at the same time the size of the group reporting no involvement in crime whatsoever also became larger. National self-report studies were first started in Sweden in the mid 1990s (Ring 1999, 2005). Since this point, five self-report surveys have been conducted on representative samples of pupils in school - year nine (aged approximately fifteen years). The findings from these surveys show that levels of self-reported drug offences and violent crime have been relatively stable between 1995 and 2003 whilst levels of theft offences and vandalism appear to have fallen off somewhat. The proportion of young people who report not having committed offences of any kind over the course of the previous year has increased from 19 per cent in 1995 to 23 per cent in 2003 respectively from 39 per cent to 50 per cent regarding the more serious offences. At the same time, it is worth noting that a large majority of the fifteen-year-olds surveyed (approximately 75 %)⁴ still report that they have committed one or a few offences during the past year. Relatively few youths report having committed

⁴ If certain minor offences such as thefts from school or the respondent's home, and fare dodging on public transport, are ignored, the proportion of youths reporting having committed one or more (non-minor) offences during last year stood at 61 per cent in 1995 and 52 per cent in 2001 (Ring 2003).

large numbers of offences and the results suggest that in total the size of the group with high levels of involvement in crime has diminished somewhat (Ring 2005).

Since property crimes dominate among the reported offences, the total level of self-reported crime has decreased. This decrease is greatest among the most socially well-adjusted respondents and those reporting the lowest levels of participation in crime, but it are also discernable among youths presenting much higher levels of delinquent participation and among those from socially disadvantaged backgrounds. It should also be pointed out, however, that the study includes a number of questions relating to the young people's experience of criminal victimisation. In contrast to the levels of self-reported crime, levels of reported victimisation as regards certain types of theft, threatening behaviour and violence remain fairly constant over the period examined. Taken together the existing data seems to suggest that *the post-war period does not appear to have been characterised by an ever expanding population of young offenders in Sweden.*

Juvenile Violence

Swedish criminologists are generally in agreement about the development of violent criminal activity among young people up to the 1980s (von Hofer 2000; Estrada 2001). Criminal statistics show that the number of young people prosecuted for assault remained at a low level until the end of the 1930s (Figure 4 above). At the end of the 1950s, there was a clear increase. At the end of the 1960s, the increase stopped and up to the middle of the 1980s, the number of young people who were prosecuted for assault remained at a more or less stable level. Since the middle of the 1980s, assault statistics show a very large increase and in the 1990s we saw an increase in juveniles convicted for robbery (Figure 5).

Figure 5. 15-17 year olds convicted of assault and robbery respectively, per 100,000 of population. 1973-2003.

Some people, both academics and politicians, have interpreted these dramatic increases as reflecting a corresponding increase of juvenile violence. One problem with this interpretation is, however, that the increase is preceded by a clear change in public awareness of juvenile crime. “Youth violence” became the focus of the media in the summer of 1986, and politicians started campaigns, appointed commissions and amended legislation (Estrada 2001, 2004). All of this may be considered to have affected citizens and institutions like the school's view on youth violence, and has therefore had an effect on people's propensity to report crimes. Our research shows for example that the number of cases of school violence reported to the police has increased substantially since the 1980s. An analysis of the police reports indicates that the explanation for the increase lies primarily in an increased reporting propensity. Significant changes have taken place in reporting routines (table 1).

Table 1. Violence in schools. Assaults on 7-14 year olds reported to the police. A sample of variables. Stockholm, 1981-1997. Per cent.

	1981-1992	1993-1997	Proportion of increase
--	-----------	-----------	---------------------------

Notifier

Reported by victim or family	67	39	17
Reported by school	29	60	83

Method of notification

Reported via visit to police station	67	39	21
Police called at school	19	9	2
Reported by phone, fax, other	14	51	77

Seriousness of assault

Non-serious violence; violence leading to bruising, not requiring medical attention	33	49	61
Assault; violence leading to bleeding or requiring medical attention	46	41	37
Serious violence; violence leading to serious injury or emergency medical attention	21	10	2
Number of incidents	80-98	194-230	

$p < .01$ (for each variable). Variations in the number of incidents are due to missing data for the respective variables.

It is thus reasonable to question whether the official statistics on juvenile violence are the best source for describing the development of violent crime among young people in the period. In view of this, other indicators are of greater value.

Alternative measures of trends in violence

Unlike the general levelling off described above the upward trend in violent crime is not corroborated by the available alternative indicators.

Victim and self-report surveys

Since 1978, Statistics Sweden (www.scb.se) has carried out a nationwide survey asking a representative sample of 16-24 year olds about their exposure to violence (see Nilsson &

Estrada 2003 for a presentation of this dataset). These victim surveys show an increase in the subjective experience of threats and violence. The level of more concrete episodes of victimisation on the other hand, and in particular of more serious violence, has remained more or less stable. A more detailed examination of these victim surveys suggests that juvenile violence increased somewhat from the mid 1980s to then level off again during the 1990s at the level of the late '70s and early '80s (Figure 6). The statistics from victim surveys thus do not suggest a linear trend.

Figure 6. Proportion of youths aged 16-24 who report having been subjected to violence resulting in visible injury, or requiring medical attention, during the past year, 1978-2002.

Since 1972, self-report surveys on drug use have been carried out in Stockholm among all students in year nine (i.e. 15 year olds). Between 1987 and 1998, these surveys also included questions on the students' experiences of violence. These surveys indicate that school children in Stockholm report neither that more of them have been assaulted, nor that more are carrying out assaults, nor even that they have witnessed more acts of violence during the years 1987-1998 (Estrada 2001). Data for the years 1995-2003 from the nationally representative self-report study of crime among schoolchildren show stable response rates in relation to levels of self-reported violent crime (Ring 2005). A reasonable summary of the

results of victim and self-report surveys is thus that they do not show a continual increase but rather that violent acts by youths have remained at a more or less stable level since the 1970s.

Hospital and cause of death statistics

Since the end of the 1960s, Sweden has maintained a register of patients admitted to public hospitals. This patient register contains amongst other things details of the number of persons admitted as a result of assaults (for a more complete presentation of this data see Estrada 2005).⁵ There has been no general increase in the numbers admitted for hospital care as a result of violence (Fig 7). The clear rise in numbers seen during the period 1968-1973 is probably most correctly interpreted as indicating the length of the start-up phase for the reporting system. It is interesting to note that the trend is reminiscent of the trend curve indicated by the nationwide victim surveys presented above (Estrada 2005). The higher levels in the 1990s correspond well with those presented during the second half of the 1970s. Here too, the mid 1980s stand out as a low-point. If the trends are studied in more detail, we find that the number of admissions among the youngest juveniles has fallen by 25 per cent during the period 1990-1996 as compared with 1975-1979. For 15-19 year olds, admissions during the 1990s lie at exactly the same level as they did during the second half of the 1970s, and for the older youths there has been a 5 per cent reduction (Estrada 2005). A reasonable summary is thus that the number of hospital admissions resulting from violence has remained at a more or less stable level since 1973 for youths aged 10-25 years. Whilst this does not constitute a direct indication that juveniles are not in fact committing crimes of this type, it does indirectly belie the perception that serious violence is on the increase among this group, since the perpetrators and victims of violence are most often drawn from approximately the same age group (Sarnecki 2001).

⁵ Hospital admission statistics are presented in such a way that the same person being admitted several times during the same year will be counted once for each admission. The figures for 1997 should be regarded with caution since there has been both a change in the classification system and a drop in the quality of reporting.

Figure 7. Absolute number of hospital admissions as a result of violence by age. Sweden, 1968-1997.

The material from the patient register also allows us to follow the trend in the number of cases where the injury resulted from the use of a weapon. These cases obviously constitute a small proportion of the admittances but can be seen as an indicator of trends in more serious violence. Taken together the number of violent injuries resulting from stabbings or shootings has not increased during the period studied (Estrada 2005).

Statistics relating to fatal violence are often seen as the most reliable indicator of the trends in violent offending since few cases will be unreported. Trends in fatal violence can therefore be used as verification for trends in types of violent offences characterised by a somewhat larger dark figure. Since the 1970s, violence resulting in death has not increased in terms of either the number of youths who are perpetrators or the number who are victims. The number of youths who die as a result of acts of violence has remained constant at approximately 16 individuals per year (Estrada 2001, 2005). This suggests at the very least that any increases in juvenile violence that may have occurred have not affected the levels of the most serious forms of violence.

A reasonable summary of the results of victim and self-report surveys, hospital data and fatal violence is thus that they do not show a continual increase but rather that the number of violent acts committed by and against young people has remained at a more or less stable level since the 1980s. An integration of the interpretations of data drawn from alternative sources and crime statistics respectively leads therefore to the following hypothesis regarding violent crime in Sweden (and probably accurate for other parts of Europe too):

A change in criminal behaviour is not the principal reason for the rapid rise in the number of particularly young people being registered by the criminal justice system since the 1980s. This increase is rather the result of a marked shift in the way society responds to young people's actions. This change has occurred in parallel with an ideological shift, from the treatment ideology to a neo-classicist focus on just deserts, which has affected the politics of social control. Together, these tendencies have lead to an increasing propensity to report acts of violence, which has in turn led to a situation exhibiting all the classic characteristics of a deviancy amplification spiral (Hall et al. 1978; von Hofer 2000; Estrada 2001, 2004).

RESPONSES TO CRIMES COMMITTED BY YOUNG PEOPLE –

A DETAILED DESCRIPTION

In Sweden the responsibility for responding to crimes committed by young people is shared by the social services and the judicial system (Sarnecki 1991; SOU 1993). The extent to which the judicial authorities and the social services share responsibility for the response to crimes committed by young people is mainly dependent on the age of the offender.

- For those below the age of fifteen (below the age of legal responsibility⁶), the main responsibility for the response to crime lies with the social services.
- For those aged between fifteen and seventeen, (and in certain cases up to the age of twenty), the responsibility is divided between the social services and the judicial authorities.
- From the age of eighteen to twenty, the responsibility lies mainly with the judicial authorities.

The Judicial System: the Police

The Swedish justice system functions on the basis of the legality principle, which means that the police and other agencies within the justice system are obliged to intervene where the legal criteria that serve to define a criminal act are fulfilled. At the same time, however, the system allows for a large number of exceptions to this rule. In practice, therefore, as is the case in many other countries, the Swedish police have a large amount of discretionary power. When the police discover that a minor offence is being committed, their efforts are often limited to an order to cease and desist. If this is sufficient to stop the improper behaviour, the police do not report the matter. According to the legislation, the police have the right in certain cases to direct young offenders to repair the damage caused by their criminal acts. If the offender complies, the offence is not reported. In 1990, however, certain restrictions were introduced in relation to the police's right to exercise discretion in relation to the reporting of offences (RPS FS 1990:3).

⁶ Age of legal responsibility in Sweden is as mentioned before 15 years.

According to Swedish law the police shall prevent, discover and investigate crimes. If a crime has been reported, the official task of the police is to investigate who committed the crime. As in most western countries, the police in Sweden have a low success rate (approximately 20 percent) when it comes to clearing up traditional crimes. This is true both for crimes committed by juveniles and those committed by adults. Nevertheless the police, and in particular those police who work with juvenile crimes, are familiar with most of the highly criminally active juveniles within a police district. The criminal activities of these young people are so extensive that even given the low risk of discovery, they will become the subject of a police investigation at some time or other. Furthermore, the police obtain substantial knowledge about the more active juvenile offenders through contacts with and interrogations of other juveniles, neighbourhood police work and other police activities.

In normal cases, the police are expected to investigate crimes committed by young people over the age of twelve, but such investigations are supposed to be carried out in collaboration with the social services. The principal objective with an investigation of this kind is to investigate the need for social measures. By law the police have the right to investigate crimes committed by younger children only in special cases. In addition, the last decade has witnessed a certain shift in praxis, such that schools, for example, have become more inclined to report offences committed by relatively young pupils to the police (see Table 1 above). The social services, however, still have the right to request that specific criminal investigations be suspended when they relate to persons under the age of fifteen.

Most investigations of juvenile crimes are relatively simple since the crimes committed by young people are usually not of a particularly serious nature. By law, the police are required to show great regard and care in their interrogations of juveniles. Parents and/or

representatives of the social authorities should be in most cases present during an interrogation.

In different parts of Sweden the juvenile crime investigation issue has been resolved organisationally in variety of ways. In some areas, special units have been established which specialise in crimes committed by juveniles, or in some instances even certain types of juvenile crime, such as mugging, for example. In other areas, the less serious offences committed by juveniles are investigated by local community police officers whilst investigations into more serious offences are transferred to the central criminal investigation departments at the police district level. Irrespective of the way in which the police organise investigations of juvenile crime internally, this work always takes place in collaboration with the local social services.

If a suspect is under the age of 15, the police turn over the results of their investigation to the local social services. If the suspect is older than 15 the results of the investigation are turned over to the prosecutor. However, if the suspect is under 18, the social services are usually informed.

The Judicial System: the Prosecutor

According to current legislation, the police are to have a prosecutor assigned to an investigation if the offence is not of a “straightforward nature” and where there is a suspected offender aged fifteen or older involved. In certain cases the prosecutor is the head of the formal investigation. The prosecutor is also responsible for deciding whether the suspect should be arrested and whether an application should be made to a court for a detention order. However neither arrests nor detention orders are utilised very often in relation to offences committed by juveniles. For an individual aged fifteen to seventeen to be detained during an ongoing investigation, the law requires “exceptional cause”. One of the prosecutor’s

important tasks is that of deciding which measures should be taken regarding the suspect once the police investigation is finished:

- Should the preliminary investigation be discontinued?
- Should the prosecutor issue a prosecution waiver⁷?
- Should s/he issue a summary sanction order?
- Should s/he prosecute the suspect in court?

A preliminary investigation may be discontinued, for example, if it turns out that the act committed by the individual did not constitute a crime. The prosecutor may also find that the evidence is insufficient to warrant prosecution.⁸

A waiver of prosecution still constitutes a relatively common form of decision taken by prosecutors in Sweden (see table 2) although its use has decreased substantially since the mid-1980s (Figure 8)..

⁷ A waiver of prosecution may be perceived as warning or conditional discharge and means that the guilty party will not be subjected to any further measures by the legal apparatus (on the condition that they do not commit any further offences) as a result of the act. However, the act will be considered a crime and will be recorded as such in the register of convicted persons. The prosecutor may issue a prosecution waiver in regard to less serious crimes but only if the suspect has admitted to the offence. In the absence of an admission of guilt, the matter must be tried by a court

⁸ The prosecutor may also discontinue a criminal investigation if the crime in question may be deemed to be insignificant in relation to another offence and if the costs of the investigation would assume unreasonable proportions, providing the sanction would not exceed a fine or a waiver of prosecution. In such cases however, the interests of other parties (e.g. those of the victim) may not be disregarded.

Figure 8 Youths aged 15 – 17 years who have been convicted by means of a court sentence, a prosecution waiver or a prosecutor's fine in 1980 and 2000, for assault and theft offences respectively.

The Swedish Young Offenders Act (LUL 1964:167) gives prosecutors broad powers regarding the issuance of prosecution waivers when a suspect is below the age of 18, and in certain cases up to the age of 20. The rules are much more generous in relation to young people than older people. But the prosecutor may revoke a prosecution waiver if the young person returns to crime. In the legislation from 1988 on young offenders, the prosecutor's power to revoke such decisions was extended. The provisions regarding prosecution waivers were also made more formal and were to some extent given the form of a formal caution issued by the prosecutor to the juvenile and his parents. A further legislative change in 1994 (SFS 1994:1760) produced a situation whereby waivers of prosecution may in principal no longer be used for youths who have previously been registered in connection with offences.

Before a prosecutor issues a waiver of prosecution to a person under the age of eighteen, s/he often obtains an opinion from the social services if the offence is of a serious nature. When such a decision is issued it is often combined with the condition that suitable

measures are to be undertaken by the social services. Prosecution waivers are issued only in extremely rare cases in relation to violent crimes or vandalism.

Another option available to a prosecutor is to determine the sanction for a crime him/herself. The conditions for the prosecutor to be able to issue a summary sanction order are similar to those for a prosecution waiver: the crime must be relatively minor and the suspect must have confessed. In addition, the suspect must have accepted the severity of the sanction. Summary sanction orders may be issued only in the form of day-fines, where the number of days is determined by the seriousness of the crime while the amount of each day-fine is determined by the guilty party's economic circumstances. Approximately 33% of all the entries into the police register involve summary sanction orders. Among the youngest youths (i.e. those aged fifteen to seventeen), the proportion is somewhat higher at 37 per cent.

Finally, as was mentioned above, the prosecutor may decide to prosecute. Of the fifteen to seventeen year olds who were convicted of offences in 2001, 61 per cent received these convictions in the form of a prosecutor's decision whilst 39 per cent were convicted by a public court, having been indicted by the prosecutor. The corresponding proportions for eighteen to twenty year olds were 51 per cent and 49 per cent respectively. Thus the majority of the younger youths and approximately half of the older ones are convicted by means of a prosecutor's decision. By contrast, fifteen years ago a significantly larger proportion (83 per cent) of fifteen to seventeen year olds were convicted by means of a prosecutor's decision as were 61 per cent of the older group. Thus a considerably larger proportion and number of youths are today indicted for their crimes in a public court, whilst at the same time, the proportion and number of young people being convicted by means of a prosecutor's decision has fallen substantially.

The Judicial System: the Courts

When a prosecutor decides to prosecute an individual, his guilt and any possible sanction will be determined by the court. Of the approximately 4,600 juveniles aged fifteen to seventeen convicted annually by the courts in Sweden, 47 percent is sentenced to day-fines (the same type as can be decided upon by a prosecutor). A similarly common court-imposed sanction regarding juveniles involves being delivered into care in accordance with the Social Services Act. The proportion of sentences of this kind has doubled since the mid 1980s (Figure 9). (see also Granath 2002); the number of juveniles given a sentence of this kind has increased almost fourfold. This sentence means that the court transfers the responsibility of finding a suitable measure for the guilty party to the local social services board.

Figure 9 Comparison of distribution of court sentences for youths aged fifteen to seventeen, 1980 and 2000.

Approximately eleven per cent of all registered offenders in Sweden are sentenced to prison. Prison sentences are employed very rarely in Sweden for persons who have not yet reached the age of 18⁹. Up until 1999, approximately 60 individuals per year aged under eighteen at the time of their offences were sentenced to a prison term, whilst a

⁹ According to Swedish law, exceptional cause is required before an individual aged between fifteen and seventeen may be sentenced to prison. The opportunities to sentence eighteen to twenty year olds to prison are also limited, although the legislation is somewhat less restrictive in this case and only reasonable cause is required.

further 25 or so were sentenced to a special form of probation that begins with a short stay in prison. Since the introduction of the new youth sanction *Secure youth care* in 1999, only very few persons under the age of eighteen (to date no more than four per year) have been sentenced to prison (Figure 10). Individuals in this age group are today in principal only sentenced to a prison term if they are of an age such that the length of a sentence to secure youth care would extend beyond the date on which they turned 21 years of age.

The fact that so few young persons are sentenced to prison shows that the intention of the new Act, i.e. to minimise the number of youths sitting in prison, has been achieved. The new sanction does in fact involve young people being sentenced to a fixed term sanction (which according to the intentions of the Act should be of approximately the same length as the prison term for which one would be sentenced as a young offender, usually approximately half the length of the sanction that an adult would have received for the same offence) but is served in an institution established for the care of young people (here referred to as a youth care facility). These are the same institutions where youths are placed in compulsory care by the social services (see below). These institutions are focused on the treatment of young people and have a staff to 'inmate' ratio (of) approximately three times that of prisons (approximately three staff members per youth in care). Over the course of 2000 and 2001, approximately 100 annually youths have been sentenced to the new sanction (of which approximately 85 per cent were aged between fifteen and seventeen at the time of the offence, whilst the remainder were over the age of eighteen). This constitutes a slightly higher number than those who were sentenced to prison (including probation with a prison term) prior to the new Act coming into force. In addition, the introduction of the secure youth care sanction has led to longer custodial sentences. Youths sentenced to prison prior to 1999 served an average sentence of approximately 5.4 months. Youths sentenced to the new sanction, on the other hand, spend an average of 9.5 months in custodial care (Brå et al 2002; Kuhlhorn 2002).

Figure 10 Number of youths sentenced to custodial sanctions 1995 and 2000

The other sanctions which a court can use in sentencing minors are:

- Suspended sentences (approx. 1% of convicted persons aged 15 to 17 and 13 % of those aged 18 to 20, were given this sanction in 2001) and,
- Probation (without prison) (approx. 1 % of convicted persons aged 15 to 17 and 11 % of those aged 18 to 20, were sanctioned in this way in 2001).

Some of the sanctions presented above may be combined with each other or with other forms of sanction. Thus probation may for example be combined with contractual care or community service. Combinations of this type are rare, however, for young persons under the age of eighteen. On the other hand, surrender into the care of the social services may be combined with the youth service sanction, which comprises community service specifically adapted to younger people. For approximately twenty per cent of the fifteen to seventeen year olds sentenced to care within the social services, the sanction is combined with youth service in this way. In rare instances, youth service is also applied in combination with probation for young people over the age of eighteen. Fines too may also be imposed in combination with other sanctions. Finally, young people are in rare cases sentenced to

psychiatric care. This sanction is however extremely rarely used in relation to the youngest age group.

The distribution of sanctions in 2001 for all those convicted, and for young people aged fifteen to seventeen and eighteen to twenty respectively, is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Convictions for 15 to 17 year olds, 18 to 20 year olds and all persons sentenced by the courts, or awarded prosecution waivers or summary sanctions by the prosecutor, 2001.

Convictions	15 – 17 years		18 – 20 years		All ages	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Imprisonment	3	0	733	7	11 113	10
Closed youth care	85	1	17	0	102	0
Psychiatric care	3	0	15	0	362	0
Probation	132	1	1 087	11	6 419	6
Suspended sentence	117	1	1 310	13	9 425	9
Care under Social. Service Act	2 178	18	239	2	3 379	3
Fine by sentence	2 171	18	1 833	18	21 632	20
Fine by prosecutors decision	4 426	37	3 733	36	35 911	32
Waived prosecution	2 871	24	1 086	10	12 027	11
Other	43	0	280	3	10 341	9
Total	12 029	100	10 333	100	110 711	100

The Social Services

The social services do not have the task of punishing young people for their crimes.

Therefore, when the social services make a decision regarding a measure suitable as a response to a criminal act, the decision should be based solely on the young person's social situation. (If an individual has a serious history of criminality, that is naturally included in the overall picture of his/her social situation.) Swedish law places the entire responsibility for

responding to crimes committed by individuals under the age of 15 on the social services.

Thus the criminality of this group is regarded as a social welfare problem.

Accordingly the measures of the social services are to have the aim of helping the young offender out of the social situation that is causing him/her to commit crimes. The measures vary substantially, depending on which factors are deemed to be causing the individual's delinquency. Several years ago there was a heated debate in Sweden about whether or not the social services should have the right to undertake coercive measures with regard to their clients. The opponents of coercion thought that if the purpose of the social services was to help an individual, then it could hardly be done against the individual's will. It was also feared that the social services' right to use coercion would make the development of confidential contacts between social workers and clients impossible. The supporters of coercive measures felt that in certain cases, e.g. extensive drug abuse or substantial antisocial behaviour by young people, coercive measures were necessary, at least at the beginning of the treatment process.

The compromise finally reached was that the use of coercive measures would be limited greatly in the social legislation. In the *Social Services Act* (SoL) there are no coercive measures at all. This Act, which in most cases is also applicable to young offenders, states that those measures which have the aim of removing the causes of an individual's criminality are to be undertaken in terms of cooperation between the individual his/her parents and the social services. Regarding individuals with minor criminal histories, these measures are usually limited to one or a series of talks with the young offender and his/her parents. If it becomes apparent through these talks that there are serious problems in the home (economic problems, internal conflicts, etc.), an attempt will be made to resolve these problems. The family is then given some opportunities to receive economic support, therapy, a contact person and other forms of support. In certain cases the family may get a social worker who

can meet with them at home over a longer period in order to help the family members resolve various problems (e.g. the family's economic planning, their leisure time problems, and conflicts in relationships).

In cases of extensive antisocial behaviour that constitutes a threat to a young person's ongoing development, a law containing coercive measures known as the *Act with Special Provisions on the Care of Young People* (LVU) may be utilised. Another law containing coercive measures which can be used by the social services is the *Act on the Care of Drug Abusers in Certain Cases* (LVM). The rules governing when an individual may be forcibly taken into custody for the purposes of social services care are very restrictive. According to the Social Services Act (1982) the local social welfare boards have the right to decide about taking a child or young person into custody for social care. These boards, which are made up of local politicians and reflect the political party breakdown at the local government level, have been established by law in every Swedish municipality. In the larger municipalities, additional local boards have been set up. All decisions on custody for social services care made by these boards must be approved by a county administrative court. These courts have an organisation which is completely separate from that of the criminal courts. Decisions arrived at in the county administrative courts may be appealed to higher courts.

Table 3: Youths aged 15 to 17 placed outside of their own home by the social services in accordance with SoL and LVU in 2001. (Source: Brå et al 2002).

Decision	N	%
Family home (SoL)	908	47
HVB-home (SoL)	643	32
Institutional care (SoL)	47	2
Other (SoL)	46	2
Family home (LVU)	26	1
HVB-home (LVU)	117	6

Institutional care (LVU)	201	10
Other (LVU)	7	0
Total	1995	100

In approximately 2000 cases per year, the social services arrive at a decision to place a young person outside of the family home. In the majority of these cases (approximately 80 %, see Table 3), the decision relates to voluntary care in accordance with SoL. The young person is usually placed in a family home or a so-called home for residence and care (HVB). HVB placements are also used relatively often in relation to compulsory (LVU) placements. (In 33 % of compulsory care orders, the young person is placed in a HVB home).

The most common form of placement used in connection with compulsory care orders is placement in a youth care facility. Unlike the other institutions, these facilities have the right to use compulsion to keep the youth in place, and they often have secure units. In addition to placements in accordance with LVU, and in rare cases SoL, youths sentenced to secure youth care are also placed in these institutions (see above). Thus both youths placed in care in accordance with LVU and those sentenced to secure youth care are given compulsory care at these institutions. The difference is that youths in the LVU group are placed in these institutions by the social services (once the care order has been confirmed by the county administrative court) and are discharged in accordance with a decision reached by the social services which must however be re-examined every six months, and which may in this context be appealed in the county administrative court, whilst those sentenced to secure youth care are placed in these institutions by means of a court sentence and stay throughout the term of this sentence.

It is common that young people who have been placed in youth care facilities by the social services or by the courts are there for the same reason – i.e. involvement in crime. The social services may however also take a decision to issue care orders and place youths in institutions (although not usually youth care facilities of this kind) as a result of other problems experienced by the young person, such as the parents inability to look after the young person, for example, and different forms of behaviour which are self-destructive but not criminalised.

Other institutions

In Sweden, just as in other countries, there is a strong correlation between behaviour in school and criminality as well as other forms of deviant behaviour, both in the teenage years and in adulthood (Sarnecki, 1986, 1987; Ring 1999). Swedish teachers recognise very well the symptoms related to a heightened risk for persistent criminality, alcohol and drug abuse, etc., even if not all teachers are conscious of how important these observations may be.

Schools usually have their own organisation for dealing with student problems. Many schools have a school psychologist, a social worker (school curator) and medical personnel (doctor, nurse) attached to them. These personnel, along with those heading the administration of the school and certain teachers, constitute a student care team which, among other things, has the task of deciding how to react when students show symptoms of deviant behaviour. Most schools also have teachers who are specially trained to take care of students with school problems, behavioural difficulties, etc. Initially schools try to resolve problems that arise by means of talking with the student and his parents. Another possibility open to schools is that of taking students out of normal classes and placing them in special education groups, where they may receive more support and be subject to more control. In certain difficult cases the students can be placed in special separate schools run by local school boards. The goal, however, is to separate students with adjustment problems as little as

possible from other students and to make sure that they are kept in their ordinary classes to as great an extent as possible. In addition, according to current law, schools within the compulsory school system cannot completely exclude students from the educational system. Instead, students with serious problems among the older age groups are given the option of taking a part-time class schedule and working the rest of the time (without pay) at some workplace nearby. In such cases, the school is responsible for providing the student with suitable guidance.

In general, the school staff will initially try to resolve a student's behavioural problems themselves. The social services are usually not contacted until the measures put in place by school staff have been seen not to produce the desired results. Even though school personnel see their students' behavioural problems at an early stage, schools make relatively few reports to the social services. In Sweden, the level of cooperation between the social services and schools varies from municipality to municipality.

The social services and the schools are also supposed to cooperate with the mental health care authorities responsible for children and juveniles, which have an independent status in Sweden. Parents, especially parents of younger students with behaviour problems, are often given a recommendation to make contact with this institution which offers various forms of individual, family and group therapy. However, contacts with the mental health care authorities are in principle voluntary and in most places they do not accept clients who are not clearly motivated regarding treatment. Sometimes the social services also utilise psychiatric experts to analyze young people with more serious behavioural disturbances. Certain young people with substantial criminality in their backgrounds can also be taken in for observation and in rare cases even for treatment in the county's psychiatric clinics for children and juveniles.

In the context of the debate on juvenile delinquency, the issue of leisure time is usually ascribed major importance. Sometimes juvenile criminality is simply defined as a leisure time phenomenon. A significant portion of the leisure time activities available to young people in Sweden are either financed or directly organised by public sector agencies. The financing of leisure activities for young people is provided through payments to an extensive number of organisations. It is estimated that at least half of the young people in Sweden are members of one or more organisations, most often sporting associations. In many places, especially in some of the country's smaller cities, the degree of association membership is significantly higher. However, associational activity seems to a large extent to be characteristic for young people from socially well-functioning families and, accordingly, for young people among whom the risk of developing serious antisocial behaviour is relatively low. The number of organisations that successfully recruit young people in the risk zone for criminality, and that may serve as an effective alternative to their antisocial network is relatively small (Sarnecki, 1983, 1986).

As was mentioned earlier, the economic problems affecting Sweden at the beginning of the 1990s resulted in certain cutbacks within the public sector. The local authorities, which are responsible for schools, the social services and the leisure sector, have been forced to make savings and have done so primarily in areas of activity that are less well regulated in law than the social services. Amongst other things, substantial savings have been made in the area of leisure provision for young people and student care within schools. During the second half of the 1990s, as the economy has improved, more resources have once again been devoted to these sectors, but one has to work on the assumption that preventive efforts, not least within schools, are less comprehensive than they were previously. At the same time as the resources available to schools for social measures have been reduced, schools have turned to an increasing extent to the police for support in connection with

criminality among pupils (Estrada 2001). Several local authorities have made policy decisions that all crime in schools is to be reported to the police.

CONCLUSIONS

Sweden is a pluralistic welfare society with a highly developed public sector. Until the middle of the 1970s Sweden experienced a substantial increase in levels of criminality and other social problems among juveniles. From that point onwards the trends seem to have stabilized, and there are even signs that levels of juvenile crime may have diminished.

The ideas of welfare and pluralism also contribute to the relatively large amount of tolerance and humanity shown in Sweden towards persons who deviate from the norm. These ideas are considered to be important in the formulation of the measures to be used in relation to young offenders. Relatively substantial and long-term criminality is required before the authorities are allowed to undertake more far-reaching measures. The emphasis on treatment instead of punishment is also considered to be more humane, even though the ideas behind it have been questioned (Brå 1977, SOU 1993:35). The criticisms directed at the strong treatment focus within the Swedish justice system, and primarily within that part of the justice system focused on young people, have comprised two elements. The one related to the lack of scientific evidence that treatment was an effective method, the other to the perception that the system was unfair. In the light of more recent research, the first of these arguments against employing treatment as a means of responding to crime has shown itself to overstate the case (e.g. Lipsey 1992, 1995; Loeber & Farrington 1998 and Brå 2001b). The treatment of young offenders has shown itself capable of producing positive effects, even if these effects are rarely all that strong (Brå et al 2002 and Andreasson 2003). The criticism of the system's unfairness, on the other hand, is still relevant. In this context, a hypothetical case is usually

referred to whereby two youths who have committed the same offence are responded to in quite different ways. One comes from a well-functioning social background and is merely given a caution, whilst the other comes from much more difficult conditions and is therefore taken into care and placed in an institution.

In general, one can argue that in Sweden, the 1980s and 1990s have been characterised by increasing levels of concern for juvenile violence which has been perceived both within the media and among the public as undergoing a substantial increase. Discussions of the trends in violent crime of the kind presented above seldom reach the public and tend to be contrasted in the press with descriptions of tragic and particularly bloody cases of violence. The general perception among the public at large may be assumed to be that the country has suffered a dramatic increase in the levels of violent crime committed by young people and other forms of serious youth crime. In the context of this climate of opinion, there is a general questioning of methods used to treat young offenders that are perceived to be too lenient. Certain treatment measures, such as taking youths with a long criminal record on sailing trips have been presented in the media as both ineffective and at odds with the public's general sense of justice. This atmosphere has led politicians to perceive a need to show that they take juvenile crime seriously, and in particular violent crime (Tham 1995, 2001; von Hofer 2000; Estrada 2001, 2004). Many of the reforms of legislation and praxis relating to young offenders appear to have the objective of accentuating the idea that this is a problem that cannot be taken lightly.

The substantial reduction in the number of young persons convicted of crime has therefore been followed by a substantial tightening of both the law and its application in relation to young offenders. This has led, for example, to a dramatic reduction in the number of young people being awarded waivers of prosecution and to a larger number of youths being sentenced by the courts. This and a long list of other measures suggest that there are efforts

afoot to limit the measures of the social services, which are perceived as rather diffuse by many, and instead to emphasise the more transparent means of dealing with young offenders that are manifested by the justice system. These efforts, however, have not been allowed to go so far as to sentence young people to prison. On the contrary, Swedish legislators have made it clear that they do not regard prison as a suitable sanction for youths. Placing juveniles in prison is regarded as inhumane and as running contrary to the UN's convention on the rights of the child. Parallel with the general increase in the severity of the response to juvenile crime, then, the prison sanction has in effect been abolished for the youngest individuals who have reached the age of criminal responsibility. Instead of a prison term, the sanction of secure youth care has been introduced, which takes the form of a treatment measure but which is imposed by a public court and in accordance with the proportionality principle. In this way, the "lenient" influence of the social services is removed from this sanction. Given the current social climate, however, the introduction of secure youth care has in fact had a "net-widening" effect, if not with regard to the number of youths being given custodial sentences then at least with regard to the length of the custodial sentences being imposed. Despite the fact that it was not the intention of the legislators, the courts appear to feel that they may sentence youths to a longer stay in a youth care institution than they could when the youths in question were instead being sent to prisons.

It is nonetheless highly doubtful that the influence of the social services over measures relating to young offenders has declined in any general way as a result of the neo-classicist trend witnessed within the Swedish justice system. It is true that the social services do not exert an influence over the length of stay in youth care institutions, but the treatment provided is nonetheless of a social nature and is provided in a collaboration between the National Board of Institutional Care, which falls under the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs and the local social welfare authorities. Further, the fact that a larger number of young people are being indicted and sentenced in public courts has resulted in more youths being

delivered into the care of the social services. In connection with this sanction, the measures are formulated by the local social services even if the court has a certain influence over the way they are formulated.

The general conclusion of the above presentation is thus somewhat surprisingly that the combination of a general critique of the treatment ideology, a neo-classicist focus within the judicial system and a stiffening of sanctions against young offenders, has led to a situation where the influence of the treatment ideology and the social services has in fact become more powerful in relation to the way society responds to the crimes of young offenders. The fundamentally humanist view of youth crime and of measures for young offenders that has been dominant in Sweden over recent decades appears at least for the moment to remain intact, although the authorities have become more inclined to intervene against young offenders. The pressure from various quarters to change this system and to make it “more effective”, or even simply “tougher”, remains however. The Swedish Government recently appointed a new inquiry with the task of reviewing the way Swedish society responds to crimes committed by young persons. The Government’s directive to the inquiry states amongst other things that “The measures taken are to be dedicated to preventing the youth from reoffending. The commission’s objective, whilst maintaining the penal law principles of proportionality, predictability and consistency, is to make progress with the work to develop a sanctioning system for young persons whose content is both clear and instructional, and to create improved conditions, on the basis of the young person’s needs, for a return to a life characterised by good social function, thus producing positive change.” (Ju 2002:14). By means of these formulations, the Government appears to be opening the way for both a more powerful element of neo-classicist thinking but also a continued treatment focus within the new legislation. The future will tell which of these directions the inquiry and the future legislation will take and what the consequences of coming reforms will be for the system’s humanist focus.

REFERENCES

- Andreasson, T. (2003). *Institutionsbehandling av ungdomar. Vad säger forskningen?* [Institutional treatment of young people. What does the research have to say?]. Stockholm: Förlagshuset Gothia.
- Brå (1977). *Nytt straffsystem*. [The New Penal System] Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Brå (1982). *De unga lagöverträdarna. Åtgärder vid brott av ungdomar under 15 år*. [Young offenders. Measures in response to crimes committed by youths under fifteen years of age] Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Brå (2001a). *Kriminalstatistik 2000*. [Crime statistics] Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Brå (2001b). *Kriminell utveckling: tidiga riskfaktorer och förebyggande insatser*. [Criminal development: early risk factors and preventive measures] Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Brå et al (2002). *Sluten ungdomsvård – en uppföljning*. [Institutional care of youths – follow-up] Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention, National Board of Health and, National Board for Institutional Care.
- Estrada, F. (1999a). Juvenile Crime Trends in Post-War Europe, *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 7, 23-42.

- Estrada, F. (1999b): Crime. In *Review of national youth policy. Sweden National Report* (pp. 223-237). Stockholm: The National board for Youth Affairs.
- Estrada, F. (2001). Juvenile Violence as a Social Problem. Trends, media attention and societal response, *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 639-55.
- Estrada F. (2004). The Transformation of the Politics of Crime in High Crime Societies, *European Journal of Criminology*, 1, 419-444.
- Estrada, F. (2005). Trends in violence in Scandinavia. An exemplification of the value of alternative indicators of crime. Working paper 2005:4, Stockholm: Institute for Future Studies.
- Falck, S., von Hofer, H. & Storgaard, A. (2003). *Nordic Criminal Statistics 1950-2000*. Report 2003:3. Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.
- Granath, S. (2002). *Påföljdssystemet för unga lagöverträdare 1980 – 2000. Förändrade reaktioner, förändrat samhälle eller förändrade brottslingar*. (The Juvenile Justice system 1980-2000. Changed reaction, changed society or different criminals). Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.
- Hall S., Critcher C., Jefferson T., Clarke J. & Roberts B. (1978). *Policing the Crisis. Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: MacMillan.
- von Hofer, H. (2000). Criminal Violence and Youth in Sweden: a Long-term Perspective, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 1, 56-72.

von Hofer, H. (2003). Crime and Punishment in Sweden. Historical Criminal Justice Statistics 1750-2000, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 4, 162-179.

Ju 2002:14 *Utredningen om översyn av det allmännas ingripanden vid ungdomsbrott* [Commission of inquiry on revision of intervention in case of youth crime] <http://www.riksdagen.se/debatt/dir/index.asp>

Kühlhorn, E. (2002). *Sluten ungdomsvård. Rättsliga reaktioner på de ungas brott före och efter införandet 1999*. [Institutional Care of Youths. Juridical reaction on youth crime before and after introduction 1999] Stockholm: National Board for Institutional Care.

Kyvsgaard, B. (1991). The Decline in Child and Youth Criminality: Possible Explanations of an International Trend, in A. Snare (ed.), *Youth, Crime and Justice*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Lipsey, MW. (1992). Juvenile Delinquency Treatment: A Meta-analytic Inquiry into the Variability of Effects, In T D Cook, D S Cooper, D S Cordray, H Hartmann, L V Hedges, R J Light, T A Louis, and F Mosteller, (eds.), *Meta-analysis for Explanation: A Casebook*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lipsey, MW. (1995). What do we Learn from 400 Research Studies on the Effectiveness of Treatment with Juvenile Delinquents?, In J McGuire, (ed.), *What Works? Reducing Reoffending: Guidelines from Research and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.

Loeber, R. & Farrington, DP. (1998). *Serious & Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. London: Sage Publications.

- Nilsson, A. & Estrada, F. (2003). Victimisation, Inequality and Welfare during an Economic Recession. A Study of Self Reported Victimisation in Sweden 1988-1999, *British Journal of Criminology*. 43, 655-672.
- Pfeiffer, C. (1998). Juvenile Crime and Violence in Europe, *Crime and Justice, A Review of Research*, 23, 255-328.
- Ring, J. (1999). *Hem och skola, kamrater och brott*. [Home and school, peers and crime] Doctoral dissertation. Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.
- Ring, J. (2005): *Stöld, våld och droger bland ungdomar i årskurs nio*. [Theft, violence and drugs among Swedish pupils], Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- RPS FS 1990:3: *Polislagen med kommentarer* (The Police Act with comments) http://www.polisen.se/inter/mediacache/4347/4734/2671/polislagen_pdf.pdf (2004-09-12)
- Sarnecki, J. (1983). *Fritid och brottslighet* [Leisure and criminality], Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Sarnecki, J. (1986). *Delinquent Networks*. Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention
- Sarnecki J. (1987). *Skolan och brottsligheten*. [School and crime], Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Sarnecki, J. (1991). Reaction to Crimes Committed by Young People, in A. Snare (ed.), *Youth, Crime and Justice*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Sarnecki, J. (2001). *Delinquent Networks: Youth Co-offending in Stockholm*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SFS 1994: 1760: *Lag (1994:1760) om ändring i lagen (1964:167) med särskilda bestämmelser om unga lagöverträdare*.

Smith, D.J. (1995). Youth Crime and Conduct Disorders: Trends, Patterns, and Causal Explanations. In M. Rutter & D.J. Smith (Eds.), *Psychosocial disorders in young people. Time trends and their causes* (pp. 389-489). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

SOU 1993:35, *Reaktion mot ungdomsbrott* [Reaktion to juvenile delinquency], Stockholm: Fritzes.

Storgaard, A. (2004). Juvenile justice in Scandinavia, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 5, 188-204.

Takala, H. (2004). Nordic cooperation in criminal policy and crime prevention, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 5: 131-147.

Tham, H. (1995). From Treatment to Just Deserts in a Changing Welfare State, in A. Snare, (ed), *Beware of Punishment*. Oslo: Pax.

Tham, H. (2001). Law and Order as a leftist project? The case of Sweden, *Punishment and Society*, 3, 409-426.

Ward, M. (1998): *Barn & brott av vår tid?: självdeklarerad ungdomsbrottslighet 1971 och 1996: en jämförelse utifrån Örebroprojektets data*. [Children and crimes of our time?: self reported juvenile crime in 1971 and 1996: a comparison employing data from the Örebro project], Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.

Westfelt, L. (2001). *Brott och straff i Sverige och Europa. En studie i komparativ kriminologi*. (Crime and Punishment in Sweden and Europe - a Study in Comparative Criminology). Doctoral dissertation. Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.

Wilson, J.Q. & Herrnstein, R. (1985). *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank David Shannon, Department of Criminology, Stockholm university, for his translation of the text.

About the authors

Felipe Estrada is associate professor at the Department of Criminology, Stockholm University, Sweden. His dissertation "Juvenile Crime as a Social problem -trends, media attention and societal response" was published in 1999. During 2000-2001 he worked as secretary in the welfare commission that was set up in Sweden to draw up a balance sheet for welfare in the 1990s. This task included an examination of the connection between living conditions, social exclusion and victimization. Part of this work has been published in the *Journal of European Social Policy*, *The British Journal of Criminology* and *The European Journal of Criminology*. He is also editor of *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*. From 2005 he will be working with a project on "Pathways to

inclusion and exclusion – risk exposure and turning points in a life course perspective” at the Institute for Future Studies in Stockholm.

Jerzy Sarnecki is Professor at, and formerly Head of, the Department of Criminology, Stockholm University. He has also been Head of Division on Swedish Council for Crime Prevention. Professor Sarnecki is currently the President of the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology. He has published several books on *Juvenile Delinquency*. In 2001 his work *Delinquent Networks. Youth Co-offending in Stockholm* was published in Cambridge Studies in Criminology, Cambridge University Press. Currently he is working with a publication about *Knowledge based crime prevention. Theoretical base for crime prevention in Stockholm*.