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Abstract
This paper begins to unpack the framing of terrorism in the Swedish Parliament through distant reading and by chronologically extracting neologisms in a comprehensive corpus of transcripts of parliamentary debates. Combining language technology and historical contextualization, we find support for the argument that the term ‘terrorism’ gained much of its modern meaning around 1970. Specifically, our study points to a legislative framing of the issue of terrorism in Swedish parliamentary debate from the early 1970s and onwards. We also find a proliferation in the production of neologisms and compounds after 9/11 2001, reflecting, among other things, the rise of a more distinct counter-terrorism discourse and more ‘specialized’ roles and functions related to terrorism and counter-terrorism activities. The paper concludes by emphasizing the analytical benefits of tracing parliamentary discourse through neologisms as an explorative approach to identify significant patterns for further investigation.
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1. Introduction
This study begins unpacking the framing of terrorism in the Swedish Parliament (the Riksdag) through distant reading the use of new vocabulary, i.e. neologisms, in parliamentary debates, drawing upon a combination of language technology (LT) and historical analysis. Our investigation is part of the ongoing Terrorism in Swedish Politics (SweTerror) project [1], a major mixed methods investigation of the national parliamentary discourse on terrorism. Building on a prior paper [2] on the neologisms of the related words ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ in the Swedish bicameral Parliament 1867–1970, we here turn to the unicameral Parliament from 1971–2018 asking: What compounds with terror or terrorism as an element have been added to the discourse from 1971 and onwards? Through this research question, we trace such neologisms in a comprehensive corpus of the minutes from the Parliament (Kammarens protokoll) with an interest in exploring significant patterns in the framing of terrorism.

1.1. The contested concept of terrorism
There is no generally accepted definition of terrorism, which can be described as an ‘essentially contested concept’ [3]. The term has frequently been used by various actors in conflicting ways, often
to label the actions of their opponents as illegal or illegitimate and it can partly be understood as a social and cultural construct [4]. ‘One man's terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter’ is a familiar cliché, an illustrative example being how the ANC (African National Congress) for a long time was regarded as a liberation movement by many Swedes and politicians alike [5]; at the same time it was branded as a terrorist organization by the South African and the U.S. governments.

Scholars of terrorism, to a large extent, agree that terrorism gained much of its contemporary meaning in the late 1960s and early 1970s. While the term can be dated back to the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror, the modern conception of terrorism was linked to the emergence of a particular transnational threat in the form of Palestinian commandos and other militants, including the members of the West German urban guerrilla Red Army Faction (RAF). The term brought together a multitude of violent tactics that had priorly been used in armed insurgencies – hijackings, bombings, hostage-takings, assassinations, etc. – into one single category. A major reason for terrorism being conceived then as a critical problem in dire need of a label, was that it affected the foundations of the modern (Western) social order in the form of global communications and diplomatic relations [6]. Another element in the background was policy-making initiatives primarily from the U.S. to criminalize political violence, initially aimed at curbing guerrilla warfare in Latin America [7].

To navigate this conceptual complexity, we draw upon historical contextualization and a notion of terrorism as an effect of discursive practices. Here, we understand discourse as a virtual collection of intertextually entwined utterances relating to a macro-topic and as a social practice feeding into societal structures of power and agency [8]. Specifically, we approach the discursive formation of terrorism in the Swedish Parliament in terms of ‘framing’, that is conceptual, habitually formed frames of meaning-making that are constructed through and by concrete linguistic acts [9].

1.2. Disposition

As a starting point, the paper discusses results from our prior study and comments on our LT-driven approach to the extraction of neologisms in Swedish parliamentary debates and the corpus used. We then turn to our findings and discuss results that support the argument that the concept of terrorism gained its modern meanings around the year 1970. This is followed by a contextualizing discussion of the extent to which compounds in our material point to a ‘legalistic’ framing of terrorism from the 1970s and onwards. We continue by noting a proliferation in the production of neologisms and compounds after the attacks in the U.S. on 11 September 2001, reflecting an increased focus on counter-terrorism, militant Islamism and ‘specialized’ roles and functions associated with terrorism and counter-terrorism. We conclude by stressing the analytical benefits of tracing parliamentary and historical discourse through neologism as an explorative approach to identify significant patterns for further investigation.

2. Parliamentary data and new vocabulary

In recent years, considerable research interest has been invested in LT-driven studies of semantic change, both concerning historical and present-day data. Internationally, much of the research has concerned word embeddings, normalization and BERT models [10] [11] [12]. At the same time, there is a growing focus on parliamentary data and the development of concepts, not least among Nordic historically-oriented scholars [13] [14] [15] [16].

2.1. Previous period

In our previous study [2], we chronologically extracted neologisms and compounds derived from the lemmas ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ in the transcripts of the debates in the Swedish bicameral Parliament 1867–1970 (Figure 1). This provided us with a birds-eye overview of the usage and frequency of terror and terrorism related words as well as the time of their introduction, enabling us to examine these neologisms and compounds in relation to their historical context.

Our analysis supported the argument that the terrorism gained its contemporary meanings around the year 1970 [6] [7], but also highlighted a certain complexity in its conceptual use. Among other things,
we showed that terrorism (same spelling in Swedish and English) was used in the Swedish Parliament already in 1867, but then merely in a metaphorical way, as in the compound (valterrorism) in reference to perceived oppressive voting procedures in the Parliament. It was not until the early 1900s that terrorism came to denote various forms of lethal political violence, but still it was rarely used by Swedish parliamentarians (29 hits 1900–1970). Instead, other terms, including compounds consisting of attentat (‘attack’), and dåd (‘deed’), were sometimes used to label the forms of violence that we have later come to associate with terrorism. Furthermore, our study showed that the use of the word terrorism preceded that of terror (same spelling in Swedish and English). The word terror was first introduced as a concern for the Swedish Parliament in relation to the Finnish Civil War in 1918 and its usage primarily concerned state activities, as exemplified by compounds such as terrorregim (‘terror regime’) and terrorkrig (‘war of terror’) [17]. We could also distinguish periods of compound productivity related to domestic and geopolitical contexts. For instance, the compound arbetmarknadterror (‘labor market terror’) was used 1925–1935, denoting disruptive and at times violent actions between labor unions and employers, and atomterror (‘atomic terror’) 1948–1963, denoting the nuclear threat and the ‘balance of terror’ (terrorbalansen) during the Cold War.

Figure 1: The production of compounds with ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ as an element in Swedish parliamentary debate 1867–1970. First occurrences of new derivations of terror in the bicameral corpus and staples showing the use of all derivations. The top left table shows the terror lexemes with more than 10 occurrences. Note that the frequencies are based on total occurrences, including ‘secondary’ debate text, and not ‘pure’ debate speech.

2.2. Preparatory approach – enhanced perspective

Our prior study was based on digitized Swedish parliamentary records retrieved from the National Library of Sweden. Although this data is available in fairly good OCR quality, the Westac (Welfare State Analytics) project (http://www.westac.se/en) is currently cleaning up, partly re-digitising and curating the material. The present paper is based on the latest available version (v0.4.6) of the Westac corpus of the minutes (at the time of the submission of the conference abstract) (https://github.com/welfare-state-analytics/riksdagen-corpus). There is also an ongoing exchange between Westac and SweTerror insofar as SweTerror’s LT analyst (Olsson) is further enriching and
curating the data for specific research (and FAIR) purposes. Notably, we have identified minor gaps in the version of the corpus used. For instance, some 50 debate protocols have not been included for the year 1976, which only affects analyses of the corpus to a limited extent (likely there are also gaps in the digitized material from the bicameral Parliament). In total, the Westac dataset used contains 6,584 documents from the observational time (the parliamentary years 1971–2018) of which 2,062 contain the lemma terror (see below for comments about frequencies). A document contains protocols from the debates, but the number of protocols per document differs somewhat over time (while, for instance, the documents from 1979 contain between 1 and 8 protocols each, the documents from 1990 and onwards contain only 1 each). However, regardless, our analysis focuses on debates and parliamentary years rather than on documents or formalia.

In this paper, we have maintained the rudimentary yet fruitful perspective from our prior study and used a preparatory base-lining of the Westac corpus. The data was processed for analysis with tokenization, lemmatization and dependency parsing by means of the Sparv Pipeline tool designed for automatic neural and statistical annotation of documents with textual structure and linguistic properties for Swedish applications [18].

For the analysis, the debates were grouped by parliamentary year (autumn to summer, for instance 1971/1972) and queried for the lemmas ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’. This produced data on the ‘diachrony’ of compounds with terrorism as an element, indicating the yearly production of neologisms, which was taken as the basis for our analysis. Notably, compounds that were overtly related to warfare (e.g. ‘terror bombing’), and thus outside the scope of our study, were rather unusual in the data, which also meant that they fell out of the analysis due to our criteria (see below). The distant reading was also, to a limited extent, combined with close reading to examine the specific contexts of the neologisms and compounds deemed significant, primarily focusing on the first occurrences of the words.

2.3. Pragmatic understanding of neologisms

There are different linguistic approaches to the linguistic notion of neologism. Inspired by a typology by Alexandre Rodríguez Guerra [19], we utilize a pragmatic definition that departs from the existence of a, formally, new linguistic unit or a lemma that could hitherto not be detected in a specific context, in our case the Westac corpus of the minutes. In many deliberations on the phenomenon of neologism, additional semantic properties pertaining to one and the same linguistic form, i.e. new meanings relating to one specific lexical unit, also are considered neologisms. Neologisms of this kind, however, are not possible to detect by means of the methodical approach in this study. This means, when speaking of neologisms in what follows, we thereby refer to lexical units that (1) contain either terror or terrorism as a constituent and (2) appear in the data for the first time. In this sense, we are, thus, dealing with neologisms in an ‘isolated’ discourse related sense, that is with relation to the specific data analyzed, albeit not with a general regard to language use in other parliamentary genres (bills, governmental reports, etc.) or, for that matter, the Swedish language community at large.

The parliamentary debates offer a rich material for understanding the use of words with terror and terrorism as an element in political discourse, since Swedish parliamentarians are free to take the floor (most ask for permission beforehand) and use them to present their own and the parties’ position on current issues [20]. While the debates are centered around the opposition’s reactions towards the government’s agenda and bills [21], they are regarded as vital for the parliamentary democratic system among all parties [22]. Notably, however, the debates are not necessarily transcribed exactly as spoken but edited by the stenographers for clarity and formality with the aim to represent the speaker’s intended meaning rather than their exact wording [23].

Since this paper concerns discourse and framing, in the discussion we will focus on words that have been used repeatedly (more than 10 times and in separate debate protocols), with a few exceptions concerning analytically interesting examples in the 2000s, keeping in mind that the time of the introduction of neologisms affects their frequencies. One should also remember that parliamentary debate speech is a particular genre and some compounds only found once in our material were likely made up on the spur of the moment [24]. Moreover, it should also be noted that the corpus not only contains debate speech but also ‘secondary’ debate text in the form of headings, results from voting, comments, etc. For instance, the compound terroristorganisation (‘terrorist organization) can be found
523 times in the corpus, but only 424 in actual speeches. While the use of neologisms in headings, for instance, is analytically interesting, in the following we will specifically focus neologisms found in speeches.

3. Analysis – legislation and proliferation

Terrorism became a critical political issue in Sweden in the early 1970s when militant Croatian exiles with ties to the Croatian National Resistance (HNO, Hrvatski narodni otpor) and the historical Ustaše movement carried out a series of attacks in the country, including the killing of the Yugoslavian ambassador in 1971 and the hijacking at Bulltofta airport in 1972. One of our more striking findings is that many of the words that are today commonly used in relation to terrorism were first introduced in the parliamentary debate in Sweden at this point (Table 1). For instance, the word *terroristverksamhet* (‘terrorist activity’) was first used in 1972 (76 occurrences during the parliamentary years 1971/72–2018/19), *terroristorganisation* (‘terrorist organization’) (424) in 1973 and *terroristattack* (‘terrorist attack’) (189) in 1974. This feeds into the argument that terrorism to a significant extent gained its modern meanings and usages at this point. It is worth noting that the similar compounds *terrorverksamhet* (‘terror activity’) and *terrororganisation* (‘terror organization’) had been used earlier in the bicameral debate (1940, 1954 and 1966–1968, 1970), but then almost exclusively in war-like contexts or in reference to state agents.

Table 1: The ‘top 20’ neologisms with ‘terror’ or ‘terrorism’ as an element in Swedish Parliamentary debate 1971–2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Parliamentary year</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>terroristorganisation</td>
<td>1972/1973</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>terroristbrott</td>
<td>1989/1990</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>terroristlag</td>
<td>1972/1972</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>terroristattack</td>
<td>1977/1978</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>terrorhjort</td>
<td>1974/1975</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>terroristattentat</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>terroriststuttack</td>
<td>1975/1976</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>terroriststiftning</td>
<td>1973/1972</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>terroristbekämpning</td>
<td>1974/1975</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>terroristbrott</td>
<td>1977/1978</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, the generic compound *terrorattentat* (‘terror attack’) (193) was only introduced into the parliamentary debate as late as 2001, which seems rather conspicuous in our context. However, one should note that this word was also more or less absent from the newspaper discourse up until 2001; a query in The National Library of Sweden’s newspaper database (https://tidningar.kb.se) shows that the word was introduced in the Swedish press around 1990 but first came into wider use after 9/11. Other surprisingly ‘late’ neologisms are *statsterror* (‘state terror’) (11) and *statterrorism* (state terrorism) (81) which appear in our material first in 1984 and 1986, respectively (the similar *statterroristisk* was used only once, in 1940). [17] [25] This may seem exceptional, considering that the word terrorism has ever since its conception been associated with state repression and violence. As mentioned above, the word first appeared during the French Revolution in reference to ‘the Reign of Terror’. However, the very concept of ‘state terrorism’ may be a more recent historical novelty. Although notions about states being perpetrators of terrorism were quite common in the ‘political’ 1960s and 1970s, this specific term likely found its way into the critical discourse a bit later [26].

3.1. Legalistic framing

Another major aspect of the Swedish parliamentary debate about terrorism is the extent to which neologisms and compounds have been connected to legislative concerns (Figure 2). Among the words with terror and terrorism as an element used for the first time by MPs in the early 1970s were *terroristlag* (‘terrorist law’) (390) in 1973; *terroristlagsstiftning* (‘terrorist legislation’) (186) in 1974, and *terroristbestämmelser* (‘terrorist regulations’) (143) in 1975. It is hardly surprising that the Parliament
discussed terrorism from a legislative perspective, since one of its core tasks is passing legislation. However, what is striking is that ‘legislative’ terror compounds were very rare before the 1970s and when they did appear they were used in reference to foreign events (one example being terrorlag (‘terror law’)) apropos the situation in Europe and South Africa in 1951 and 1961, respectively). Essentially, what the sudden productivity in legalistic neologisms in the first part of the 1970s shows is that terrorism had become understood as a national problem to be dealt with by means of legislation. The killing of the Yugoslavian ambassador and the Bulltofta hijacking contributed to the Swedish Parliament adopting the Terrorist Act in 1973, aimed at preventing political acts of violence of an international nature and exclusively directed against foreign citizens suspected of ties to militant groups [27] [28].

Figure 2: The frequency of compounds with ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ as an element in Swedish parliamentary debate 1971–2018, focusing on the relation between the total number of compounds (blue line) and ‘legalistic’ compounds (green).

This development followed an international trend insofar as terrorism was to a considerable extent understood and handled as a legal problem by Western states in the 1970s, a key issue being how international and national law might regulate acts of political violence [6] [7]. In Sweden, the parliamentary discourse about terrorism became, to a large extent, centered around the Terrorist Act for decades. This controversial legislation remained an emergency powers act during its existence that had to be renewed every year, and thus became the subject of an annually recurring parliamentary debate [27] [28]. For instance, there was a increase in the use of ‘terrorist law’ in the later part of the 1980s, reflecting the controversy surrounding the protracted municipal arrest of a number of Kurds suspected for the murders of two defectors from the PKK (Kurdistan’s Workers Party) in 1984 and 1985 as well as the assassination of prime minister Olof Palme in 1986. Overall, there was a rather consistent production of legalistic neologisms, including terroristlista (‘terrorist list’) (29), introduced in 1975, that referred to a official list of militant foreign organizations deemed a particular threat to Sweden. Other similar ones were terrorbrott (‘terror crime’) (150) in 1977, terrorismsstänkt (‘terrorist suspect’) (16) and terroristbrott (‘terrorist crime’) (421) in 1989. In fact, there was a significant increase in the use of such compounds following 9/11, partially related to the Parliament’s adoption of a number of EU counter-terrorism legislation initiatives.
3.2. After 9/11

It comes as no surprise that our results show the impact of the 9/11 attacks in the U.S. (2001) upon the parliamentary discourse on terrorism. The attacks on 9/11 ushered in a new era of concerns and in the 2000s Sweden witnessed a number of incidents related to Islamist violence, including the attempt on the life of artist Lars Vilks in the lethal Copenhagen shootings in 2015 and the lethal truck attack on Drottninggatan in Stockholm in 2017. An overview of the most frequently used words with terror and terrorism as an element overall, including ‘old’ neologisms introduced prior to 1971, not least ‘terrorism’ ‘terrorist’ and ‘terror’, clearly shows the traction that the issue of terrorism gained in the parliamentary debate after 2001 (Figure 3). Whereas 97 neologisms were produced during the parliamentary years 1971/1972–2000/2001, just as many appeared during the much shorter period of 2001/2002–2007/2008. In this context, it should be noted that the lemma terror is in general more frequently occurring in the documents from the 2000s than before.

Some of the neologisms in the 2000s were variations of familiar compounds, such as terrorlagstiftning (‘terror legislation’) (33) introduced in 2001 and ‘terrorism legislation’ (terrorismlagstiftning) (32) in 2008, but others had a more distinctly novel character. Among other things, the impact of 9/11 and the new structures of terrorism in a globalized network society [29] can be sensed in terroristnätverk (‘terrorist network’) (42) and terrornätverk (‘terror network’) (29) that both came into use in 2001. These two terms also were to a significant extent used in reference to the al-Qaida network, responsible for the attacks in the United States.

From 2014 and onwards, terrorism became associated with a particular group in a way that it had not been before. Prior, various organizations had, of course, been mentioned in parliamentary debates about terrorism, but not in the form of compounds, the few exceptions being ustasjaterrorister (‘Ustaše terrorists’) and arabterrorist (‘arab terrorist’) used once in 1971 and 1973, respectively. However, beginning in 2014, IS-terrorist (‘IS terrorist’) was used as many as 60 times in the Swedish parliamentary debate in reference to the Islamic State (IS), that is the militant salafist organization that proclaimed itself to be a worldwide caliphate, conquering areas in Iraq and Syria. The same year, terrorsekt (‘terror sect’) (34) was introduced in reference to IS. Moreover, the phenomenon of foreign fighters was also strongly associated with the organization’s activities. A number of neologisms in the mid-2010s concerned persons who travel abroad to take part in armed conflicts. Already in 2013

Figure 3: The frequency of compounds with ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ as an element in Swedish parliamentary debate 1971–2018 (lemmas with more than 100 occurrences in the corpus), including neologisms introduced prior to the period, such as the major trend lines of the 2000s ‘terrorism’, ‘terrorist’ and ‘terror’.
terrorresa (‘terror travel’) (121) appeared and was followed by the similar compounds terroristresa (‘terrorist travel’) (26) in 2014 and terrorismresa (‘terrorism travel’ (45) and terroriststridande (‘terrorist combatant’) (19) in 2015.

Moreover, the compound terrorist combatant seems indicative of a tendency towards an explicit association of terrorism with warfare. Such a connection between terrorism and warfare could, of course, be found pre-1970, but also in the Western discourse from the late 1970s and early 1980s and onwards, for instance, in the rhetoric by the Reagan administration about terrorism as declarations of war as well as the metaphor ‘war on terror’ or the ‘global war on terrorism’ (GWOT) coined by the Bush administration for its global counterterrorism military campaign. However, compared with the US and many other European countries, in Sweden, the military discourse in policy-making on terrorism was for a long time weak. Nevertheless, at least to some extent, a conceptualisation of terrorism as a military threat started to manifest itself in the parliamentary debate in the mid 2000s through compounds such as terroristkrieg (‘terrorist war’) (7) in 2005 and terrorkrigsbrott (‘terror war crime’) (6) in 2015.

3.3. Specialized roles and functions

In the 2000s, we can also see a growth in neologisms for roles, functions and stakeholders related to terrorism. Above, we noted that ‘terrorist network’ and ‘terror network’ entered the debate in 2001, and we can see other more specialized functions, such as terrorfinansiering (‘terror funding’) (12) in 2004 and terrorismfinansiering (‘terrorism funding’) (9) in 2008. One can also compare with the phenomenon of so-called foreign fighters.

At the same time, an increase in neologisms related to counter-terrorism point to the formation of a stronger counter-terrorism discourse (Figure 4). While both terrorbekämpning (‘terror combatting’, approx. ‘anti-terror measures’) (172) and terroristbekämpning (‘terrorist combatting’, approx. anti-terrorist measures’) (69) was already used in 1975 in the parliamentary debate; there has been a rise in the productivity of compounds concerning counter-terrorism since the late 1980s. For a long time, Sweden, contrary to many other Western countries, was reluctant to form a national tactical anti-terrorist strike force. Such initiatives first gained traction after the Palme killing in 1986 and the neologism terroriststyrka (‘terrorist force’, approx. ‘anti-terrorist force’) (6) appeared in 1989, the year that the Parliament green-lighted the creation of a national police tactical and anti-terrorist unit. In the 2000s, we also see a more Anglo-American-influenced policy-making terminology, as exemplified by the introduction of the specific term kontraterrorism (‘counterterrorism’) (13) in 2006 (c.f., priorly used terms, such as ‘anti terrorism’) [30]. The rise of a more distinct counter-terrorism discourse can also be discerned in neologisms referring to professionalized forms of expertise, including terrorexpert (‘terror expert’) (9) in 2008.

![Figure 4: The frequency of the compounds related to counter-terrorism practices in Swedish parliamentary debate 1971–2018 (lemmas with more than 10 occurrences in the corpus).](image)
Neologisms in the 2010s also seem to reflect an institutionalization of a ‘terrorismmindedness’, that is an integrated perception and practice treating terrorism as an ever-present threat [31]. The fact that the compound ‘terror threat’ (terrorhot) (210) was introduced already in 1974 shows that an awareness of terrorism as a potential threat was hardly new. However, in the 2010s we find neologisms that indicate a more integrated terrorismmindedness, including ‘terror threat assessment’ (terrorhotbedömning) (4) in 2011 and ‘terror threat level’ (terrorhotnivå) (11) in 2016. The former compound appeared as a part of the title of the National Centre for Terrorist Threat Assessment (Nationellt centrum för terrorhotbedömning) established at the security service. The contrived ‘counter-terror response capability’ (terrorbekämpningsförmåga) (9) appearing in 2016 is another term that indicates an interest among Swedish MPs in institutionalized counterterrorism mechanisms.

4. Conclusions

This paper has studied the framing of terrorism in the parliamentary debate in Sweden by chronologically tracing neologisms and compounds in our material through distant reading. Our results, among other things, support the argument that terrorism gained its more modern meanings in the early 1970s. We also found a distinct legislative framing of the issue of terrorism that has continued over the years. The paper has also highlighted 2001 as a watershed year as there was a proliferation in the production of neologisms after 9/11, reflecting the rise of the ‘terror networks’ al-Qaida and, in particular, IS, as well as a distinct counterterrorism discourse. Furthermore, neologisms and compounds indicate a specialization of roles and functions associated with terrorism, both concerning terrorism and counterterrorism.

A main point of this paper is that even a rudimentary explorative LT approach to the extraction of neologisms in parliamentary data may yield significant results. Our findings both support previous research on the discourse on terrorism and provide historical perspectives that call for further investigation. Although this approach has already proven fruitful, a more sophisticated analysis will most likely generate more robust and detailed results. For instance, the application of word vectors will allow us to more deeply examine conceptual developments and other terms that carry similar meaning as the neologisms in our study. Also taking into account meta-data about party affiliation of speakers who use neologisms, will provide data about the extent to which different political parties have used different compounds, which allows for a more multi-dimensional analysis of the politics of terrorism. Moreover, by also focusing on close reading we can examine the context of the compounds in a more nuanced way and deepen the historical contextualization. In this sense, our approach in this paper can be understood as a vital, although rudimentary, first step towards a more complex exploration of the political and historical discourse on terrorism in Sweden.
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