

Ideology in Change?

Swedish partisan politics from the 1960s to 2014

Leonardo Tengdahl

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to study to what extent there has been ideological changes over time in Swedish partisan politics. In order to investigate this, the political theories Conservatism, Neoliberalism, the “Third Way”, Social democracy and Marxism/Communism was used. These theories laid the foundation for the analytical tool. An idea and ideology analysis was used to investigate the changes in the party programs over time. The method in use is a comparative case study. The material in this thesis consists of different party programs from the Social Democratic Party, the Left Party and the Moderate Party. The oldest party program is from 1967 and the latest from 2013. The results of the study conclude that ideologies tend to change and that it is primarily the parties’ view on the economy that has converged. In spite of this, the differences in ideologies are abundantly present in contemporary Swedish politics.

Key words: Ideology, Sweden, Politics, Liberal economy, Convergence
Words: 17390

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Aim of the Study and Research Question	2
1.2	Limitations of the Study	2
2	A Short History of Swedish Politics	4
3	Previous Research.....	6
4	Theory	8
4.1	Communism / Marxism.....	8
4.2	Conservatism	9
4.3	Neoliberalism	10
4.4	Social Democracy	12
4.5	The Third Way	12
5	Methodology	16
5.1	Research Design	16
5.2	Moderate Party, the Left Party and the Social Democrats in Sweden	17
5.3	Idea and Ideology Analysis	17
5.4	Operationalization and Analytical Tool	18
5.5	Validity and Reliability	20
5.6	Empirical Data.....	20
6	Results of the Study	22
6.1	Party programs 1967, 1969 & 1975	22
6.2	Party programs 1990, 1987 & 1984	24
6.3	Party Programs 2000, 2001 & 2002	27
6.4	Party Programs 2012 & 2013	30
7	Analysis of the Results.....	33
7.1	The Left Party.....	33
7.2	The Social Democratic Party.....	34
7.3	The Moderate Party	35
8	Convergent ideologies.....	38
8.1	Discussion	39
9	References.....	40

1 Introduction

It has now been 25 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the collapse of the Soviet Union. Francis Fukuyama wrote an article on how the victory of the western liberal democracy resulted in the death of ideology. Three years later an extended version of the article was published as a book, *The end of history and the last man*. Fukuyama emphasized the triumph of western liberal democracy in history, that the end of the Cold War was an expression of the evolutionary victory for western liberal democracy and that there can be no progression from liberal democracy to an alternate system, since history is an evolutionary process (Fukuyama, 1992). The number of states considered to be “free” liberal democracies has increased over time (House, 2003), which strengthens the thesis of Fukuyama. The European Union has expanded and today many countries in Europe share the same currency, the Euro. Around 10-20 years before 1989 Anthony Giddens, among others, developed a new form of social democracy in Britain. The name of the new orientation was the “Third Way” (Bobbido, 1996; Giddens, 1994). Critics of the “Third Way” refer to it as a Post-political order of society. Post-politics describe the lack of pluralism and the aim for consensus among politicians as a problem, resulting in right-wing and populist parties getting increased space in the political landscape when the established parties abandon their ideologies in order to find a "third way" (Mouffe, 2005; Mouff, 2008; Mouffe, 2009; Zizek, 2000; Ranciere, 2004; Crouch, 2011). Thereby conflict free partisan politics are established which erases ideology from the political sphere. If this is true, we may be talking about an arising liberal democratic hegemony that is impossible to challenge through the classical partisan politics.

Kjell-Olof Feldt, Swedish Minister of Finance for the Social Democrats from 1982 to 1990, mentions the “Third Way” in his autobiography. He writes:

The third way is permeated by the market economy and its ability to generate growth and increased incomes. I found it, to say the least, unwise to simultaneously persevere in social democracy's goal to abolish capitalism and the market economy, which is its companion and condition.¹ (Feldt, 1991:190)

The above excerpt illustrates the notion of the “Swedish model”. The “Swedish model” can be described as a social system that combines a strong economy with social security (Andersson, 2009). Hence, the model is a way between capitalism and socialism (Andersson, 2009), which tends to conform to the “Third Way”.

In 2004 a great change took place in Swedish politics. A coalition between the conservative and liberal parties was created. They named the coalition Alliance for

¹ My translation

Sweden, and its purpose was to challenge the Social Democrats for power in Sweden. In the election of 2006, Alliance for Sweden won majority in the parliament and formed a government. This political change in Sweden combined with the earlier rise of the “Third Way” in Great Britain and the criticism of a post-political society are of interest in this study. The thesis will analyze whether, and if so how, the Social Democrats, the Left Party and the Moderate Party have changed their ideologies over time in Sweden.

1.1 Aim of the Study and Research Question

The aim of this study is to analyze ideological changes of three political parties in Sweden, the Moderate Party, the Social Democrats and the Left Party. By conducting a comparative case study over time, it will be possible to analyze if the parties have abandoned their earlier main ideologies, and if so in what way. According to Lewin (2002), parties tend to change in accordance with new times to attract new voters and adapt to new important ideas in the given time (Lewin, 2002:272f). This is of interest to the community as we are constantly in a process of change. Society is changing, hence politics are changing. Studying this change is vital for counteracting indifference to politics among members of society.

In order to examine if there has been any ideological changes in the three parties, the research question will be:

To what extent can we see an ideological change in political parties over time?

To answer the research question three sub-questions will be asked. The three sub-questions will guide the research together with the analytical tool. The three sub-questions are:

- Has the Left Party changed its ideology over time and to what extent?
- Has the Social Democratic Party changed its ideology over time and to what extent?
- Has the Moderate Party changed its ideology over time and to what extent?

These three questions will be used to detect and analyze if the ideology has shifted over time and in what direction. The comparative analysis will enable investigation of coherence in the development of the ideologies of the political parties. The analytical tool is built on previous research and will present ideal types of the different ideologies studied in this thesis.

1.2 Limitations of the Study

To examine if any ideological changes have occurred, I have limited the study to concentrate on the Moderate Part, the Social Democratic Party and the Left Party in Sweden. The empirical material of the research consists of party programs. Thus, there will be no analysis of debate articles in newspapers, media and parliamentary debates. The realpolitik is not under investigation, therefore the perception of politics by the society is not of interest, only the possible shift in ideology in the text produced by the parties. To investigate the possible alterations in ideology, the time period studied is from around 1969 to 2014. This period can provide an understanding of whether the third way has affected parties and if the critics who argue that we have moved towards post-politics have relevance in their claims. In order to perform a comparative case study, I will contribute to the empirical research field of Swedish politics with a study that focuses on more than one political party over time. Thereby it is possible to reveal an eventual consensus between the parties in ideological orientation. The study will also constitute a contribution to further research on the possible differences between ideology politics and realpolitik in other countries. If ideologies becoming less clear is the case in Sweden, and perhaps in the rest of Europe as well, more research needs to analyze the effects on the political system in general.

2 A Short History of Swedish Politics

To understand the political landscape in Sweden today it is necessary to tell a short narrative. An important point regarding the narrative is that we structure our experience through it (Czarniawska 2004; Larsen 2002; Giddens 1991; Somers 1992). It is the narratives that help us understand our present and structures our experience (Larsen 2002). Thus, a short historical background of Swedish politics is in place.

Today, there are eight parties in the parliament, the Moderate Party, the Centre party, the Liberal People's Party, the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats, the Green Party, the Left Party and the Swedish Democrats. Two of these parties are relatively new, the Swedish democrats, in parliament since 2006, and the Green party, in parliament since 1988. Between 1921 and 1988 there were no new parties elected into the parliament. The Social democratic party reigned in government between 1932 and 1976, with exception for 1936, and between 1982 and 2006, with exception for 1991 to 1994. Thus, it is not an exaggeration to highlight the important role the Social democratic party has played during the last 100 years. Sweden has until 2006 been categorized as a social democratic welfare regime according to Esping-Andersen. Esping-Andersen's book, titled *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, has been an important influence on research in political science and sociology. It was published in 1990 and it categorized the capitalist world into three different regimes, Liberal, Corporatist-Statist and Social Democratic (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Although this typology has now been questioned, there are clear signs in the societies in the north of a heritage of a long period of social democracy (Kautto, 2001). We can conclude that in large extent, the same actors have governed for 90 years without major crises and Sweden has not been involved directly in the wars. Another way of defining different welfare states is to use the concept of liberal market economies (LME), e.g., U.S., U.K., Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Ireland, and coordinated market economies (CME), e.g. Germany, Japan, Sweden and Austria, designed by Peter A. Hall and David Soskice. The concept is based upon how countries manage wages, vocational training and education in terms of generalist or specific, corporate governance, competitive or collaborative and relations with employees (Hall & Soskice, 2001). Sweden is here categorized as a coordinated market economy, a categorization made before the election 2006, which may mean that Sweden would be placed in the liberal market economies now, in 2014. These different ways of defining Sweden is of interest, however this study will focus on the possible ideological changes, while the categorization of LME and CME are probably more focused on realpolitik.

This leads to the change in the equilibrium of the last 20 years and especially since 2006 when the Alliance for Sweden received a majority in the Swedish parliament. In the last 25 years there has been three, nearly four, new parties in the

parliament. New democracy was elected into the parliament between 1991 and 1994. The Green party has stabilized in the political system in Sweden and is now in the government. The Swedish Democrats is in the parliament since 2006 and are still growing. Feminist Initiative is the fourth party, they were elected into the European Parliament and almost reached the latch for the Swedish parliament in 2014.

What has happened over the last 25 years in Europe? The “Third Way” was developed by researchers and intellectuals in The U.K and after that spread to other countries such as Australia, Italy, USA and the Netherlands. Researchers and intellectuals who stand for a new form of Social Democracy focusing on combining the market and the state have contributed to the development. This will be developed further in the theory chapter of this thesis. In 1990 many scholars condemned the political parties in Sweden because they had decreasing amounts of members and low recruitment of new members (Håkansson, 1995). The political voters to fight for are in the middle of the traditional right-left scale, according to SOM-institute research (Holmberg, 2002). Holmberg (2002) refers to a development in Sweden which seems increasingly similar to elections in USA or U.K where they have two-party systems. This development may have contributed to the creation of Alliance for Sweden² before the election of 2006 and the project of the Red-Greens³ before the election of 2010. After the last election, in 2014, the Alliance had problems deciding if they wanted to continue with their coalition or if the parties needed to develop themselves without a common name and budget. The Red-Greens’ alternative ended after the defeat in 2010 and at the election in 2014 they entered as individual parties. The possible emergence of a two-party system in Sweden (Erlingsson & Brommesson, 2010: 137) became more entrenched at the last election in 2014. However, research has also pointed out that the rise of the Populist radical right parties has not had any effect on party systems in Europe (Mudde, 2014). The political leaders were stuck in the trenches, resulting in three blocks: one consisting of the Alliance, one consisting of the Social Democrats and the Green party with support of the Left party and one block consisting of only the Swedish Democrats. The election results showed that none of the blocks won a majority in parliament, which nearly resulted in a government crisis.

² Alliance for Sweden was the former name for today’s Alliance. It is the name of the four liberal/bourgeois/conservative parties in Sweden. They have a common name and election manifesto although they are still four different parties.

³ The Red-Greens was the name of the coalition of the Social democrats, the Green party and the Left party. Before the election 2010 they created a common government alternative to challenge the incumbent government.

3 Previous Research

Research in this subfield of political science in Sweden has historically been especially prominent by Herbert Tingsten (1967), on the Social Democrats. Torbjörn Aronson (1990), Jan Hylén (1991), Stig-Björn Ljunggren (1992) and Torbjörn Nilsson (2003) on the Moderate Party, and Lindkvist (1982) and Hermansson (2010) on the Left Party. The “Third Way” in Sweden has been investigated by Isaksson (2010), Andersson (2009) and Rojas (1999) for example.

Torbjörn Nilsson's (2003) research analyzed the Conservatives' policy during the eventful period of 1976-1991. Nilsson gave a new image that emphasized the major differences between different policies when it came to the degree of liberalization, the party's relatively slow acceptance of the liberal market theories. However, there was a turn from conservatism towards neoliberalism starting in 1983 (Nilsson, 2003). Before Nilsson (2003), Aronson (1990), Hylén (1991) and Ljunggren (1992) wrote their dissertations of the ideological development of the Moderate party in Sweden. Martin Lindström (2000) writes in the Political science journal⁴ that these three dissertations differ in conclusions (Lindström, 2000). The conclusion of Hylén is the contrary to the others. Hylén claims that the ideology of the Moderate party has shifted towards liberalism instead of conservatism (Lindström, 2000). The other two dissertations conclude that conservatism still is prominent in the party and that no shift has taken place (Aronson, 1990; Ljunggren, 1992). The research on the Left-Party has also mostly been focused on the time period prior to 2000. Lindkvist's (1982) research was conducted on the Left party's idea and party programs from 1917 to 1972. Hermansson (2010) asked the question whether the communist ideology was still prominent in the party's texts. He concluded that the Left Party's history is problematic and advocates further research on the party's heritage (Hermansson, 2010:217). Isaksson's (2010) research of the Social Democrats describes a gap between the ideological views of the voters and the party executive board. Other findings in the study were that the Social Democratic politicians in general had made a turn towards a more liberal approach over time in relation to their voters (Isaksson, 2010). Tingsten argued that the time of ideologies had come to an end. When liberal socialism and social liberalism in principle agreed on the welfare project there was no room left for an ideological debate. This view is shared by Rojas who writes:

The Social Democrats and the Moderate Party conducted a startling movement toward the center, which has transformed the old one-party state to a kind of "one-ideology state", system-conserving and pragmatic, consensus-based and management-oriented. Thus disappeared all the controversy about everything that

⁴ In Swedish: Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift.

rises above the everyday porridge. It is a gray age for ideologies and visions for society, but necessary for providing Sweden with the stability and strength that has made the country Western Europe's brightest shining star. ⁵(Rojas, 2012 in Svenska Dagbladet)

Research on voters' behavior in Sweden has showed that they believe that there has been a shift towards a "middle way" in politics (Holmberg & Oscarsson, 2011). Another theory about the political parties' attempts to attract voters is called "Catch-all parties" which refers to attracting as many voters as possible by leaving old ideological issues behind (Krouwel, 2003). This is made through focusing on policy preferences instead of ideology (Krouwel, 2003: 29). Chantal Mouffe addresses the problem of leaving the ideology behind and developing a more consensus based politic (Mouffe, 2008:13). A rational consensual policy based on dialogue and deliberation will mean that we leave the agonistic confrontation which leads to the destruction of democracy (Mouffe, 2008:35f). This discussion is highly theoretical, but this study will aim to investigate if there is any truth behind this post-political critique by analyzing possible ideology changes in Sweden. The new political landscape with two or three blocks results in me finding it interesting and necessary to continue researching whether ideologies still changes over time. To conduct the study a comparative case study will be used.

⁵ My translation

4 Theory

This section will present the theoretical framework in this study. Since the study aims to find out if any ideological changes have appeared in the three political parties, the Moderate Party, Left Party and Social Democrats, five different political theories will be in use. They will be Communism / Marxism, Socialism, “Third Way”, Neoliberalism and Conservatism. Particularly the theory of the “Third Way” is going to be prominent in this study. Since all ideologies, except “Third Way”, is well-known in political science, I will explain the "Third Way" more in detail in comparison to the other ideologies. The theories will be used as models for an analytical tool to analyze the text in the different party programs. Thus, the theories will be designed as ideal types for the different ideologies. A more detailed explanation of how this will be done and how to use it concretely will be presented in the methodology section of this study.

4.1 Communism / Marxism

Marxism originates in England, as a reaction to the rise of capitalism, in the 19-th century. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were two of the most prominent advocates of communism and also writers of the communist manifesto. An ideology which has taken many different turns dependent on country, e.g. Mao in China and Lenin and Stalin in Soviet (Heywood 2012:117). This section will focus on the classical view on communism, based on Marxist theory. The classical view stems from Marx and Engels description of communism. Their philosophy is built on “historical materialism”, a key term in Marxism, which can be described as: ” [...] fundamental to all form of social and historical development” (Heywood, 2012:117f). In other words, Marx highlighted the importance of the power over the means of production as the most crucial of all human activities (Heywood, 2012:118). In the economic field, Communism focuses on alienation, a concept illustrated in the following passage:

To be separated from one’s genuine or essential nature; used by Marxist to describe the process whereby, under capitalism, labor is reduced to being a mere commodity. (Heywood, 2012:119)

This is the reason for the class struggle by the workers (proletariat). Communism uses the words proletariat and bourgeoisie regarding the two classes in a capitalist

society (Heywood, 2012:19). In this society the bourgeoisie was the ruling class, comprising the power over the production, the law, and the economic and political power (Heywood, 2012:120; Marcuse, 1958: 120). The ruling class has, according to Marxism, established hegemony over the others in society (Obo & Coker, 2014:530). The hegemony concept, or cultural hegemony, is further developed by especially Antonio Gramsci in his work, *Prison Notebooks* (2011). Cultural hegemony is explained in terms of the capitalist society not only being maintained through state violence, but also in a different and more sophisticated way. This other way is a cultural one whereby the bourgeoisie leads us to believe that the bourgeois state has become the norm for the whole society. Hence, the proletariat needs to start a revolution against the ruling class, the bourgeoisies. A revolution with the goal to establish full communism by a “dictatorship of the proletariat” as a process between today's society and full communism. The “dictatorship of the proletariat” is a concept which will rule after the revolution and before a fully functional communist state is in order with common ownership, a classless society and central planning (Heywood, 2012:121,132). The struggle is dual, it needs to develop a movement among the exploited proletariat and get them to realize what the struggle implies (Månson, 1997: 101).

4.2 Conservatism

Conservatism can be described as dual. One tradition originates from Edmund Burke and another from Joseph de Maistre (Lindström, 2000:331f). The dualism is presented after a presentation of six premises that define conservatism, taken from Russel Kirk in Lindström (2000).

- There exists a transcendent moral order
- Principle of social continuity
- Wisdom of our ancestors, the so called principle of prescription
- Principle of prudence and virtues
- Principle of variety with focus on affection for the long-established social institutions and modes of life.
- Principle of imperfectability which leads to man being imperfect, no perfect social order can be created. (Kirk 1982, pp. XV-XVIII, in Lindström, 2000)

Maistre, contrary to Burke, focuses on the meaning of God who, according to Maistre, provides the moral and ethical dimension in society (Lindström, 2000:332). Maistre claimed that the death which followed the revolution around the world was God's punishment to the people, hence God is the source of all power in society (Lindström, 2000:332). Maistre and Burke have different orientations and this study is based on Edmund Burke, since he is considered to have had more influence on conservatism. Edmund Burke's view on conservatism is built on social

order and what he calls a “natural law”. In his work, *Reflections on the revolution in France*, Burke uses a moralistic approach to politics (Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009:269). Conservatism strives to maintain the social order in the society (Heywood 2012:66, 68) because of the complex structure of the society which cannot be redesigned without misery and death as consequence (Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009:269f). In contrast to many other ideologies, the conservatives have a different opinion on equality and inequality (Heywood, 2012: 76f). The inequalities in the society is “natural” which benefits the one with power and wealth (Heywood, 2012:77). Thus, inequality is not bad, it just indicates the social differences in the society (Heywood, 2012:77). Edmund Burke and many others argued for the “natural law” which implies that the order in society is based on tradition which involves those who are dead, alive as well as future generations (Heywood, 2012:76; Alexander, 2014; Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009:269). Conservatives often support a strong state with responsibility to provide authority and discipline and to protect the society from disorder and chaos (Heywood, 2012:144). They do not perceive humans as inherently good. Conservatism is a strong advocate of law and order with freedom which involves “doing one’s duty” (Heywood, 2012: 72f). Thus, the society should provide for tradition, authority, common morality and private enterprise (Heywood, 2012:73, 108). Public policies should thereby originate from tradition and social values of the embedded structures in the society and not from voters or stakeholders (Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009:274).

4.3 Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is a complex concept which I will use as one of the ideologies in this study. Since the definition of an ideology is made in the methodological chapter, it is possible to find what characterizes neoliberalism in the literature. This section will consist of two parts, the first one is about the intellectuals who describe neoliberalism and the second part will consist of the politicians that describe and has used neoliberalism in their political projects.

Neoliberalism as an academic or intellectual phenomenon can be said to originate from the “Chicago Boys”, Milton Friedman and Arnold Harberger, who advocated a new economic policy and the “Public-Choice school” which advocated a marketization of the state (Rehann, 2013:271). In order to establish this new way of thinking, a dismantling of the welfare state is necessary, along with reducing the power of the unions and increasing free-market and competition between individuals in the society, leading to a growth for capitalism and consumerism (Cervantes, 2013; Rehann, 2013; Flew, 2014). Neoliberalism can be classified as a reaction on the Keynesianism which dominated the economy during the 1970s (Rehann, 2013:273). The true recognition of this new way of thinking was when Hayek and Friedman won the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics in the 70s (Rehann, 2013:274). The new idea of economic policies spread worldwide after the

Nobel Prize through organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization (Cervantes, 2013:27; Flew, 2014:56f). These organizations legitimized neoliberalism and spread it on as a universal approach to economics. This has led critics to try to define and understand how neoliberalism works. One of the most prominent critics of neoliberalism is David Harvey who defines it as:

‘[...] a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong property rights, free markets and free trade’’. (Harvey, 2005: 2)

The state should provide mechanisms to encourage a free-market society (Peck, 2004), or the neoliberalism is a class-based project to develop the capitalism further which results in "accumulation by dispossession", according to Harvey (2005). Harvey explains this: “”Accumulation by dispossession” appears by centralization of power and wealth in the hands of a few by dispossessing the public of their wealth or land” (Harvey, 2004). The free market, low taxations, strong property rights and an economic discourse are according to neoliberals the best way to solve problems and it is not the state that should be the problem solver, it is the free-market (Flew, 2014:56).

The advance of neoliberalism is often attributed to Margret Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Ronald Reagan in United States of America with their origins in economics (Flew, 2014:50f). Giddens (2000a) defines neoliberalism as ” a political project, in terms of a mix between libertarianism and conservatism”. The state should be as minimal as possible in this point of view and the free market is necessary for economic development (Giddens, 2000a:8). The individual shall bear the cost for school, hospital and family without subsidies from the state, which means that the welfare of the state should only be available as a safety net when all other possibilities are gone (Giddens, 2000a:8f). Inequality is not inherently bad, rather the opposite, since it drives the development forward for companies, citizens, innovations and education which must be profitable (Giddens, 2000a:8). Thus, economic inequality is natural in a society. This is a form of economic Darwinism, thereby inequality in wealth and social position is natural and the state should not try to change the economic order in a society (Heywood, 2012:49), and also a form of market fundamentalism; the market is superior to the state to solve economic and social problems (Heywood, 2013:49f). The politicians had critique against the big states that had appeared as a consequence of Keynesianism and therefore they advocated small states and minimal interventions in economic and social policies (Heywood, 2013:87). The political characteristics of neoliberalism is deregulation, the citizenships’ responsibilities, private welfare, competition at the labor market, minimalistic state and low social expenditures (Heywood, 2013:87ff; Powell, 2000).

4.4 Social Democracy

Classical Social Democracy is based on providing state involvement in social and economic life. Instead of civil society as ground for the citizens, it is the state that should govern (Giddens, 2000a:7). Contrary to the purely socialist approach, Social Democracy tries to integrate capitalism and socialism (Heywood, 2012:99; Martell, 2013:31). Ideas and values are core concepts in Social Democracy and the previous thought of revolution has been replaced with a reformism or revisionism (Heywood, 2012:99; Beech, 2012:135). Revisionism was Eduard Bernstein's way to criticize Marx's revolutionary approach (Martell, 2013:135). Martell (2013) describes the Social Democracy as an ideology that legitimizes capitalism and regards the purpose for the politicians to be a harmonization of capitalism and creating stable institutions for the society (Martell, 2013:131f; Heywood, 2012:128). Thus, Social Democracy consisted of a new parliamentary strategy and new aims for the politics (Heywood, 2012:128). The approval of the capitalistic system generated new approaches to make the society as "humane" as possible. Social and economic interventions are provided by the state, while believing that capitalism is the way to wealth and that changes in the society should always be peaceful (Heywood, 2012: 129f). This new mixed economy policy resulted in the creation of big welfare states and universalism in social policies to guarantee a minimum standard of living for the poorest in the society. Policies aimed to achieve equality in the outcome of the politics (Wetherly, 2001:101; Heywood, 2012:103), i.e. the social divisions should be as minimal as possible. Progressive taxation and cooperation were two concepts that worked against social divisions in the society. Thus, the rich should provide more to the society and thereby reduce the social divisions and the cooperation should minimize the competition between individuals (Heywood, 2012:102,106). The state should provide the citizens with help and support 'from cradle to grave' (Giddens, 2000a:7).

4.5 The Third Way

"Third Way" is a term which has been used to define a mixture of ideologies and political approaches. These ideas were implemented by progressives in the early 20th century. One of the most prominent persons who used the concept was Harold Macmillan, British Prime Minister. Macmillan predicated his philosophy of government on what he referred to as "The Middle Way". The concept of "The Third Way" in this thesis will be based on how Giddens and others use the term and especially how it affected the Labour Party in England and the Social Democratic party in Sweden.

[...]Something different and distinct from liberal capitalism with its unswerving belief in the merits of the free market and democratic socialism with its demand management and obsession with the state. The Third Way is in favor of growth, entrepreneurship, enterprise and wealth creation but it is also in favor of greater social justice and it sees the state playing a major role in bringing this about. So in the words of... Anthony Giddens of the London School of Economics, the Third Way rejects top down socialism as it rejects traditional neo liberalism. (BBC News, 1999)

The third way is a concept developed during the cold war as a reaction to the “old” left and the “new” right (Powell, 2000; Giddens, 2000a; Giddens, 2000b). The Social democrats, especially in Britain, shaped a new direction for the Labour Party as a reaction to the growing neoliberalism driven by Thatcherism, Hayek and Reagan (Giddens, 2000a:5). The thriving capitalism in America and the communist system in Soviet were two ideas that the third way wanted to get away from (Giddens, 2000b:2). Thus, this new idea needed to distance itself from the “old” left and build a new concept without socialism and communism as part of the history. In the Labour party’s policy review in 1987, a roadmap was created by seven groups of experts, to step away from the “old” left. This process started in many countries almost at the same time. An example of this is to be found in Norway, which had a similar debate about a new direction for the Social democratic party. The debate in Norway stated that a balance between private and state is necessary and that the perspective of individuals is not inherently bad (Giddens, 2000a:17f; Heidar, 2005; Kitschelt, 1994).

The behavior of the voters was changing from “scarcity voters” to “post-material values” (Giddens, 2000a:20f) which was a reason for the political parties to try to find new ways to attract voters. A remarkable change in values about sex and the state’s function contributed to a more complex behavior of the voters than the usual class-based voting (Blundell & Gosschalk, 1997, Giddens, 2000a:23). The social democratic class, which previously consisted of blue-collar workers, was now much weaker (Kitschelt, 1994:33). Two groups broke the mold especially: women and young people, and this was particularly evident in Sweden (Giddens 2000a:23). The dissociation from the “old” left was clear in spoken and written words. From collective and state as protector of the family and citizens, there was a change in the discourse towards personal responsibility, equal opportunities, and arguing that the state can no longer be trusted fully; the people need to take care of themselves (Giddens, 2000b:3). Now the Social Democrats was aiming towards the creation of wealth rather than redistribution of wealth by using efficiency in work and innovation (Giddens, 2000b:3f). Scharpf (1998) divides European welfare states into four institutional groups, which all share common aims, structures and history.

- The UK system, which emphasizes health and social service, but tends to also have income-dependent benefits.

- Nordic or Scandinavian welfare states, having a very high tax base, providing generous benefits, universalist in orientation and well-funded state service including health care.
- Middle European system, having a relatively low commitment to social service, but well-resourced benefits in other respects, financed mainly from employment and based upon social insurance contributions.
- Southern systems, similar in form to the middle European ones but less comprehensive and paying lower levels of support. (Scharpf in Giddens, 2000a:6f).

The focus of the dissociation from “old” left is described by Giddens in the book *The Third Way – The renewal of Social Democracy*. He addresses various characteristics of “old-style social democracy” and neoliberalism. Hence, an explanation of how Giddens categorizes classical social democracy (the old left) and neoliberalism (the new right) follows.

As mentioned in previous sections, the Third Way is a position that tries to go beyond traditional right-wing and left-wing politics by urging a variety of right-wing economic and left-wing social policies. The development was supported by social democratic parties and social movements around the world with emphasis on a change and revival of the power the Social democracy had before the rise of neoliberalism (Lewis & Surender, 2004; Richardson, 2001). The project was especially driven by Tony Blair and the New Labour Party in Britain and evidence of this is to be found in policy documents and from sympathizers (Miliband, 1994: 87; Commission on Social Justice, 1994; Mandelson and Liddle, 1996:17–8; Blair, 1998; Giddens, 1998). New Labour was driven by an idea which was “what counts is what works” (Leggett, 2004:12) and argued that if the world changes, so must also politics change (Rose, 2000:1395). Leggett (2004) understands this statement as a move towards a possible post-ideological climate. Such a climate would probably result in politicians only reacting against emerging problems, rather than counteracting future problems (Leggett, 2004:12).

Different scholars have tried to find another word that highlights the core/values of the Third Way. One acronym is CORA, which stands for community, opportunity, responsibility and accountability (Powell, 2000:42). Another is RIO; responsibility, inclusion and opportunity (Powell, 2000:42). Even though these two acronyms are only ways to describe how the third way can be characterized, it tells us that responsibility and opportunity important factors as they are included in both CORA and RIO. Equality has for the old left been a question on the outcome of policies, but is now about equal opportunity in life (Powell, 2000). Lister (1998) describes this as a new way of looking at the welfare states’ duties. Blair himself said: “the main source of value and competitive advantage in the modern economy is human and intellectual capital” (Blair, 1998). “Hence the overriding priority New Labour is giving to education and training” (Blair, 1998: 10). Education is one of the best policies to improve a country's economy, according to the Third Way (Powell, 2000:43). It is the paid work and education that lead to inclusion in society and this is an important mechanism in a welfare country. The goal is to make a shift towards a more obligation based welfare state (Powell, 2000:43, 46; Power &

Whitty, 2010). Powell wrote the following passage to illustrate the inclusion/exclusion idea of the New Labour Party:

According to Stepney et al. (1999: 120), this means that all ‘who can’ should be given the opportunity to maximize their productive contribution to the formal economy. It follows that individuals are responsible for developing their full potential, defined in terms of productive rather than human potential, so that formal economic activity takes precedence over cultural, political, environmental, social or even nurturing activity (even child-care). (Powell, 2000:46)

This section of this thesis is built on Leggett (2004) and intends to shortly explain how values are affected by the Third Way. Both Blair and Schroeder suggest that, ‘modernisation is about adapting to conditions that have objectively changed’ (Blair and Schroeder, 1999:159). Leggett (2004) explains that instead of trying to give the idea a normative content, this approach tries to elaborate core values as a functional response to the social processes identified by third way theory (Leggett, 2004:13). Per se, this is a position that is based on the sociology of the elaboration of right and left, closely related with Giddens (Leggett, 2004:13). According to Giddens, “socialism collapsed because core elements, such as its adherence to a teleological vision of historical progress and attachment to command and control systems, were no longer tenable in an increasingly individualised and ‘detraditionalised’ world” (Giddens, 1994 in Leggett, 2004:13). The Third way sees values as an effect of a post facto, rather than developed from a priori bases (Leggett, 2004:13). Leggett (2004) explains this as “updating values means that the third way considers that new times is the basis for in which way values should be updated “(Leggett, 2004:14). In this way traditional party supporters have a guarantee that old values will be maintained, but it also enables changes in policy shifts for new times (Leggett, 2004:14). Gordon Brown describes this new way of thinking about values: “To modernize our policies – like our organization – is not to change or dilute our values: it is instead to revive them and make them relevant for these new challenges” (Brown, 1994a:122). The use of updating values is important to highlight for new and core voters to show how the party can adapt to the future (Leggett, 2004:14). Blair and Schroeder (1999) points out that there are still values that are timeless, such as social justice and fairness, liberty and equality of opportunity, responsibility and solidarity to others (Blair and Schroeder, 1999).

5 Methodology

This chapter presents a review of the method used in this thesis. The first section will present the research design and the second will present why I chose Sweden and the three different parties and why I based the study on a comparative case study. A description of ide and ideological analysis is made and an analytical tool is designed to conduct the analysis with clarity. A discussion of reliability and validity for the research is reported to explain the advantages and disadvantages of the study.

5.1 Research Design

To examine whether the ideologies of the political parties in this study have changed or not, the study will use a comparative case study as method. Case study is a common method in political science and it will therefore be useful for this study. The choice of conducting a comparative case study is made to get a balanced picture of political ideologies in Sweden. Bent Flyvbjerg (2006) writes that the choice of method should be dictated by the problem to be studied. Flyvbjerg continues to write the following:

One can often generalize on the basis of a single case, and the case study may be central to scientific development through generalization as supplement or alternative to other methods. But formal generalization is overvalued as a source of scientific development, whereas “the force of example” is underestimated. (Flyvbjerg 2006:228)

With Flyvbjergs words in mind, I will conduct a case study to get knowledge about whether there are any changes in ideology in the three parties in Sweden. The main task is not to obtain knowledge of all parties in Sweden at all times, but to gain knowledge about the period 1967 to 2014. The case study method is well suited to understand and learn about a phenomenon (Flyvbjerg, 2006: 236), in this case, ideological changes. Case studies lend themselves well to close in on real life situations and to test ideas directly on reality (Flyvbjerg, 2006: 235). This study will focus not only on one, but three different parties, and thereby it will be easier to tell if ideological changes may be a pattern in the Swedish context. This comparative approach will not generate general knowledge, but it will increase the validity. The use of textual analysis in order to examine the text towards the analytical tool will

increase the reliability in the research (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson & Wängnerud, 2013). A more comprehensive discussion of validity and reliability will be presented later in this chapter. In the following section, an explanation on the selection of cases, the choice of methods and how to use them in the study will follow.

5.2 Moderate Party, the Left Party and the Social Democrats in Sweden

As presented in the section previous research, a lot of research is made in Sweden on ideological change, but it mostly aims at merely one party in a historical period. Thereby, this research will be cumulative in that sense it will use previous research as base for this new one. The choice of Sweden is made strategically and not randomly. Thus, the study aims only to understand the context and the possible ideological changes in Sweden. One of the most crucial criteria is the possible effect the Alliance government had between 2006 and 2014. The effect of the Alliance government, the spread of the “Third Way” in Europe, the former strong categorization of Sweden as a Social Democratic welfare state and the debate on post-politics all affected the choice of Sweden as a single case. These factors make Sweden interesting to investigate.

The three parties in this comparative case study is selected on basis of their different ideological standpoints and because most of the previous research is conducted on them. The two parties, the Moderate party and the Social Democrats, are the two big parties in Sweden. Hence, they are expected to have power. The Left party is selected because of the research on the “Third Way” in Britain and the party’s relation to the Social Democrats, especially with focus on the fact that both parties originate from socialism, albeit historically. In order to challenge the theory of those who advocate that we have end up in a post-political society, these three parties with their different ideologies will function as an empirical test for this hypothesis.

5.3 Idea and Ideology Analysis

This study will use an idea and ideology analysis that will categorize the different features of the different ideologies. An ideology is, according to Borgström and Boréus (2012), a targeted and systematic summary of a political standpoint (Borgström & Boréus, 2012:139f). In this thesis an ideology will be defined as a

system of ideas (Borgström & Boréus, 2012:149) with the premises of Tingsten. Herbert Tingsten's approach to the concept of ideology is that it that ideology consists of three different premises which combined create "social beliefs". These are:

- Value premises (e.g. human nature or justice)
- Concrete recommendations (e.g. a road map towards a better society)
- Reality reviews (e.g. about the effects on the economic relations in the society) (Borgström & Boréus, 2012: 141)

An idea and ideological analysis can be conducted in different ways. Examples of this are contextual idea analysis, descriptive idea analysis and functional idea analysis. The functional analysis is concentrated on the effects of the ideas which can explain why a political party changes within (Bergström & Boréus, 2012:147). The contextual analysis is about analyzing the logic in argumentation in a political ideology (Bergström & Boréus, 2012:146). In this thesis a descriptive idea analysis will be performed. In Sweden, Hylén (1991) is a well-known researcher on the Moderate party's shift in ideology between liberalism and conservatism, conducted in a descriptive idea analysis (Bergström & Boréus, 2012: 146). To implement the study, different ideal types will be constructed on the basis of the different ideologies presented in the theory chapter. The use of ideal types is strongly associated with Max Weber and Durkheim and sociology analysis (Bergström & Boréus, 2012:150). The ideal types are used as models and they will not aim to describe reality in itself and cannot be used in reality; they will only function as an analytical tool (Borgström & Boréus, 2012:150). The analytical tool will be designed to examine if ideological changes have appeared, to make possible changes clear and to interpret the political ideas. The use of ideal types to illustrate social phenomena builds on previous research and is recommended according to Essaiason et al (2010). Therefore, the thesis will use this method to answer the research question.

Alternative methods to use would be critical discourse analysis to uncover power within the Swedish policy or to see how the discourse has changed in the same manner as Fairclough (2000) does with New Labour in the U.K. Additional methods pursued would have been to use a statistical analysis, for example to see how often certain words are used in the texts and thus see how the written language has possibly changed over time.

5.4 Operationalization and Analytical Tool

To conduct this study an analytical tool is in use. It is important to use a theoretical tool or framework to highlight the features of the different ideologies (Bergström & Boréus, 2013). The match between the theory and empiric material needs to be operationalized in order to analyze the party programs. I will use this tool with

inspiration of Jan Hylén and his research on the conservative party (Borgström & Boréus, 2013; Hylén, 1991). In that way I apply previous research to carry out this study. More precisely, I apply Hyléns research of using concepts (parameters) which include view of the state, economy, human nature, and social divisions.

Figure 1: Analytical tool.

	Conservatism	Neoliberalism	Third Way	Social Democracy	Communism/ Marxism
View on the State	The role of the state is to provide authority and discipline against chaos. A strong state with a good relation with the civil society is needed.	Minimalistic state with focus on providing possibilities to the free-market. Deregulations combined with low social expenditure.	Pragmatic view on social expenditure. Capitalism and the free market are good for the wealth in the society and should not be thwarted by the state.	Provider of social and economic interventions. A big state to establish welfare with a universal approach. Social expenditure can be high to guarantee the wealth for the citizens.	A communist state ruled by the proletariat. This to minimize the class division and in the end erase all classes. Authoritarian state with a dictatorship of the proletariat, thus a state of the people/proletarian.
View on the Economy	The state should provide help if needed but private enterprises are preferred. If the state make too many interventions, there is a risk of an unstable society.	The free-market should be providing for the economy with deregulation. The market should be responsible for the safety in the society. Inequality is not inherently bad.	The economy should be both public and private. Inclusion in society is necessary. Public-choice is good for the society and more actors than the state is needed to provide good service for the citizens.	Capitalism is crucial but needs to be controlled by the state and institutions. High taxes and redistribution is a way to prevent inequality in outcome, which means that the divisions in the society should be minimized.	Common ownership and absolute social equality. State collectivization and central planning. Hence, the economy is owned by the people and there should be no private enterprises or solutions.
View on the Human Nature	Humans are essentially limited and security-seeking. This draws humans to the known and familiar. Since humans are not rational, we are unreliable. The social order between humans is natural and from God.	This view is built on individualism and self-seeking. Every individual needs to take care of themselves. Competition is in the nature of human kind and develops the society.	Humans are social creatures and shaped by society. We are rational in our decisions and generate social development in everyday life.	Social creatures shaped by society. Rational and especially shaped by labor together with cooperation. It is not nature that shaped us, it is ourselves in relation to others, not individually.	Social creatures shaped mostly by the capitalist system which needs to be overthrown. Change is possible through cooperation and thereby needed to establish absolute equality.

View on the Social divisions	Responsibility and duties. Inequality is not bad, just a result of the social order in the society. Social divisions should not be opposed.	Responsibility and duties. Inequality is not bad, it is just a result of you own choices in life. The state should only provide equality in the form of choice. Thus, no high taxation or redistribution.	Both rights and responsibilities. Focus on inclusion rather than equality as outcome. What is important in society is to work and contribute.	Rights and equality as outcome. Redistribution and progressive taxation are good for the entire society.	Absolute equality between the citizens. Rights to the citizens and workers. All social divisions are bad and must be avoided.
------------------------------	---	---	---	--	---

Comment: The figure illustrates the Analytical tool based on the theory chapter in this thesis.

5.5 Validity and Reliability

In order to guarantee result validity, both validity and reliability need to be high (Esaiasson et al, 2012:57). Validity is the concept of the relationship between the theoretical definitions and operational level (Esaiasson et al, 2012:57f) used in this study. The different ideologies in this study are on a high level of abstraction and thereby it is harder to guarantee high validity. In order to create good validity the operationalization will be cumulative and empirical criteria will be used in the analytical tool. I will make it clear that the changes in ideologies are only in the party programs. Hence, this study will not investigate possible changes in the realpolitik in Sweden. There will always be differences between the ideology in politics and the realpolitik, which I am aware of. The analytical tool will also be helpful to achieve high reliability since it makes it possible to categorize the different ideologies. Categorization will clarify for other researchers to understand what the results in this study derives from and how the operationalization is made.

5.6 Empirical Data

The empirical data in this thesis will consist of party programs. The time period studied will be from 1969 to 2013⁶. It is crucial to clarify the difference between the idea or ideological politics and the realpolitik. The data will function as research material with a manifest message, thereby I will recognize that the actual actions from the parties in “reality” can be separated from the data material. Thus, it is the

⁶ The Social Democratic party programs are 1975, 1990, 2001 and 2013. The Left party programs are 1970, 1987, 2000 and 2012. The Moderate party programs are 1969, 1984, 2002 and 2013.

parties' own representation in text that I will analyze and it will probably differ from the common perception in the society.

6 Results of the Study

The results will be presented annually. This will make it easier to carry out a comparison on whether the ideologies have changed in the end. The sections that follow will first present an excerpt from the party program that highlights the most important text, according to me, and after that an analysis based on the analytical tool applied on the entire party program will follow. This approach serves to illustrate a short brief of the empirical data and then an overall analysis of the material in relation to the analytical tool.

6.1 Party programs 1967, 1969 & 1975

The left party, or the Left Party-Communists as they were called back then (from 1967 to 1990), clearly declare in their party program of 1967 that their politics are built on a socialist tradition with influences of Marxism. This means that the people should own the means of production and obtain the profits of their labor. This socialist movement lays the ground for the change into a classless society without capitalism and imperialism. A democratic socialism is preferable and the Social Democrats have failed to make that happen. They have simply managed the capitalistic system without changing the order of society. The employees want, need, and should have power over their own labor in the state and in private enterprises. Thereby, they can plan and provide good personnel policies in their own interest. The state can provide a better economic policy and thereby contribute to the creation of the socialistic alternative to the capitalistic state. The economy needs to be planned and the public sector needs to be developed to help the citizens. It is also crucial for the society that the people have the power over the banks and the big corporations and not the capitalists. This is important because the owners of banks and big corporations have the power to determine which way the economic development will go. Guaranteed minimal social standard, progressive taxation and an economic planning which is emanating from the workers' interests are important in a socialist society. The following excerpt from the text illustrates the core of the party program. (The Left Party program, 1967).

Socialism is not a stationary conflict-free condition. The vital means of production are jointly owned. The systematic development of social life works to make people satisfy their material and cultural needs, eradicate class differences and create opportunities for free development of the people. There remains disagreements between causes of the people and groups, ideas and interests. They prevented and

distorted no longer the old class society power-relations. They can be discussed freely and rationally resolved. Freedom of opinion becomes conscious driving forces in social development.⁷ (The Left Party program, 1967)

The people have the power to create this new society, if they work together. Only the people can achieve cooperation and joint owning of the means of production. (The Left Party program, 1967)

With the help of the analytical tool it is possible to categorize the party program from the Left-Party Communists. The view on the state is easy to demonstrate in the manifesto. The state should provide the common good, because the market will not meet citizens in an equal manner. Planned economy is required to offer everyone a just society, therefore the state should be strong. A strong democratic state, with the goal to establish a democratic socialism in the country is more consistent with social democratic ideal types. Common ownership and collectivization is important for the economy. The big differences are in the view of the democratic point of view on the state. The Left-Party Communists stress the importance of democracy, tone down the use of violence and find the dictatorships in other countries reprehensible. Only the democratic socialism can overcome capitalism and imperialism to reduce inequalities in the society in order to ultimately achieve a classless society.

In their party program of 1969, the Moderate Party concludes that the development of the society should be based on the needs and wishes of the individuals in the society. Freedom and responsibility for human beings are important in a society. The abilities, proficiency and natural advantages of the individuals are also important and lead to a growing wealth for the people in the society. The municipalities' administration should become smaller units and the expansion of the public sector needs to be under control. Competition is important to develop the services for the citizens. The creation of wealth ownership is crucial for the society, thereof the citizens become independent and a sense of empowerment and responsibility is created. The taxation needs to be low and the progressivity should be abolished. (The Moderate Party program, 1969)

According to the analytical tool the manifesto for the Moderate Party is almost identical to the conservative doctrine. The state's function is to maintain the law, order and property protection. The public sector should not be bigger than necessary to support individuals in their development to create their own wealth. The economy is built upon competition and the property of wealth is important. The state should not, in line with the conservative ideal, redistribute and take out a progressive tax for the citizens. Individuals contribute to the development of society and it results in them becoming more independent in relation to the state. Capitalism is the only way for a society to achieve prosperity, which correlates with the conservative ideology combined with the neoliberal ideals.

The Social Democratic party program from 1975 emphasizes a socialist order in the society based on freedom, equality, democracy and solidarity. Equal sharing of property, income and power are crucial in a Social Democratic society.

⁷ My translation

Economic power must be distributed among the majority instead of ending up among the few in the society. The capitalist system has only replaced the old of privileges, this implying that capitalism exerts new forms of repression against the workers. Oppression is also present in the states that are characterized by the Leninist principle. In the Leninist kind of dictatorships power is gathered around the few and it is no better than capitalism. Thus, the Social Democratic Party strive for a democratic socialism through peaceful methods because the armed struggles lead to war and devastation. In the transformation into democratic socialism, the people are crucial and above all, the belief is that the people have the ability and the means to transform society. Planned management of the economy is to be desired since it strengthens the civic influence. The public sector must meet citizens' needs, which means that the public sector can never be too large. Cooperation in the business sector is necessary to give consumers control over organizations. All this will lead to class boundaries being eliminated, equal rights for everyone and a fair distribution of wealth and income. (The Social Democratic Party program, 1975)

The Social Democrats seems to be a mix of social democracy and communism according to the analytical tool at this point. The party program has the traits of reformism while also raising the planning of the economy as necessary. Planning of the economy can be a little bit controversial and is not something that should be found in the manifesto according to the analytical tool. Hence it can be concluded that the party program is more radical than the traditional ideal type of social democracy in terms of the view on the economy. The view on the state is as it should be according to the ideal type, meaning that the state should provide services and welfare to the citizens. It is also the state that will ensure an egalitarian society where social divisions are minimized as far as possible. Solidarity between people is a morality principle that should be applied in democratic socialism. This party program is most dissimilar to the ideal type of the analytical tool, in comparison to the other two. The view of the human nature is positive, which can be seen in solidarity between people and their actions being able to change society for the better.

6.2 Party programs 1990, 1987 & 1984

The Social Democratic party adopted the party program on their 31st Congress in 1990. It highlights the importance of freedom, equality and solidarity. The rights and freedoms of the citizens are contrary to the old privilege society, which was unequal with big social divisions. Freedom for the individuals and the right to create organizations is crucial in a democracy. The people is always interdependent, because of our human nature, therefore we need to cooperate with each other to build the welfare state. An antagonistic struggle between humans is reprehensible, therefore the society requires solidarity. The class differences have been declining, but they still exist. Thus, it is the state's responsibility to counteract them. In conjunction with the class differences having decreased, even class voting

decreased and turned into a form of opinion voting. This means that there is a need for a democratic socialism to prevent class differences and in order to establish an egalitarian society. (The Social Democratic Party program, 1990)

The social democratic way is to change the authority over production and production earnings that distributed in the society. The formal ownership over the production of the means and needs to be achieved with appropriate methods. The power over the production is a necessary condition for the realization of the democratic socialism.⁸ (The Social Democratic Party program, 1990)

The capitalism, or rather the market economy, needs to be controlled by using the law because the market creates inequality in society if not controlled. Prosperity and growth interacts and are therefore desirable in society. (The Social Democratic Party program, 1990)

The view of the state's task is accomplishing a transformation towards a society of democratic socialism. The state should also, according to the excerpt above, find a way to redistribute the means of production rather than to own it. This is a big difference between the Social Democratic and Communist/Marxist ideal types in the analytical tool. The market is still considered "dangerous" if it is able to act freely without interference by the state, thereby the state's task is to maintain an egalitarian society. This view interacts with the approach on the economy. The state should be big and control the economy in terms of redistribution of wages, progressive taxes and even out the power in society. Thereof the social division in the society is minimized. This is strongly associated with social democracy in the analytical tool. The view of man correlates strongly with the ideal type that means that the people has the power and is made for cooperation in work and have the opportunity to feel solidarity with each other. There are no predetermined places in society, thus the people can create their own success if society allows it. As the party program determines: "*Freedom for the individuals and for these to create organizations is crucial in a democracy*". It is only through freedom, democracy and solidarity the society can erase inequalities.

The Left Party-Communists adopted their party program on their 28th congress in 1987. The party program is essentially about how the Left Party-Communist will establish socialism in Sweden. Socialism will contribute to communism, a classless society and human emancipation. Today, the ruling class has power over the society supported by the economic system, laws and the state. To overturn this system it requires that workers go together in a common struggle. Therefore, in the current system, the rights and freedoms that the citizens have are under constant attack from the ruling class. The Marxist theory will be adopted from Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Thus, capitalism will be challenged and the state power transferred to the people. Since capitalism is without planning, it will consistently fail which will afflict the workers and the socially vulnerable the hardest. Therefore, a planned economy is needed. (The Left Party program, 1987)

⁸ My translation

The driving force in the society is the human development in harmony with nature. International solidarity and a global responsibility for ecological requirements determine the direction of the Left Party. The freedom and equality is a reality. This will create communism⁹. (The Left Party program, 1987)

The important thing is that the people implements the democratic socialism without any attempts of coups or via undemocratic methods. The social transformation must be legitimate for citizens and thereby implemented by the people. (The Left Party program, 1987)

The analysis of this party program gives a good hint about the ideas that are of interest and how it should be implemented. The view on the state is that it can be tamed. The state is under bourgeois rule but through a social revolution its power can be readmitted to the people. It is a very negative picture in the party program, but that the state is extremely important is clear. There should not be any authorities, rather full democracy with the intention to reduce the class differences. It corresponds only partly to the ideal type. The criteria to minimize the social divisions and the introduction of a classless state is achieved but it says nothing about the dictatorship of the proletariat, not even as a transition. On the other hand, Leninism is mentioned as extremely negative with the core values of socialism missing. The view on the economy is conflicting in the text. There is a section which says that common ownership of the production is the object and that it is possible for the state to minimize gaps, which is the task of the state. Previously, the analysis have been based on what the goal is, so therefore I will continue to do so resulting in the party program being based on a Marxist view of the economy. This is because the goal is common ownership of production and the means of production and this will give the power to the people, so that human liberty can be achieved. It also means that it involves an absolute equality in society and not just about redistributing assets. This is the object of the policy, but nothing that will be achieved in a day. Therefore the task of the state is important until the proletariat is in power. In the view on human nature there is no big difference between social democracy and Marxism. According to the analytical tool both ideologies believe in human power which will enable people to take control of their own lives. The system of today, read 1987, have shaped human condition along with a capitalist model that must be abandoned in order to achieve socialism. This is clearly expressed in the party program which supports the Marxist ideology.

The Moderate Party program was adopted in 1984 consisting of an idea and action program. The program is based on individual citizens' freedoms and rights combined with Christian values. The ideology for the Moderate Party is conservative with influences of liberal ideas, according to the party program. All humans are unique and have an intrinsic value. This must be protected for fair conditions for citizens to prevail in society. The freedom of the individuals should interact with responsibility and collaboration, which leads to a society that develops to the better for each individual. Changes in the society should only be carried out

⁹ My translation

in stages and may not inhibit the free market. The free market is necessary to achieve growth and prosperity. The Moderate party requires that the state has low taxes to encourage entrepreneurship, savings and labor. The party program also argues that human beings inherently seek security and freedom of choice. Security can be found in the laws and regulations that exist in society and freedom of choice should be guaranteed by the free market in the capitalist system. The capitalist system built on the free market is the most superior economic system in the world. As a result of the free-market system, the public sector can be minimal, thus avoiding bureaucratization and collectivization, in the society. (The Moderate Party program, 1984)

This party program of the Moderate Party begins with a conclusion that the ideology is conservative with elements of liberal ideas. This is clear in the view on the state. Neoliberalism argues that the market is important, and thereof the state should be minimal while the conservatism highlights the state's authoritarian role. In the party program are both of these traits are prominent, especially the importance of the free market. Unlike the neoliberalism, the state should still have good safety net for citizens, but it should not be taken for granted. Either way, welfare is important though it may not restrict competition in the market. The view on the economy tend to be more neoliberal rather than conservative. It is characterized in the constant repetition of the importance of a free market and growth combined with peoples striving for individual freedom. There is almost nothing about inequality in outcome or progressive taxation. Equality is mentioned in terms of that all citizens should have the same rights and opportunities to make money, be free and develop themselves. The right to own and create a property is important for the Moderate Party. Thereof, social division is nothing that is mentioned as bad or good, all people should have the same opportunity and there should be a safety net guaranteed by the state. The view on the human nature is a combination between the conservatism and neoliberalism according to the analytical tool. This is because people are looking for both security and fulfillment.

6.3 Party Programs 2000, 2001 & 2002

The Left Party adopted the party program on their 33rd Congress in 2000. The program writes in the introduction that the party is socialistic, and that it is people's liberation from the oppression which is of importance. The abolition of capitalism is an important part in the establishment of a socialist state and to create a classless society. In a socialist state democracy, freedom of expression and freedom of press are crucial factors. It is therefore that projects such as the EU is reprehensible because it gives power to the capital rather than to the people. To achieve power to the people, the representative democracy must be respected. It is through the parliament the change can take place, while civil non-violent disobedience may be necessary. It is important that the laws should be respected in the country, while the citizens should have good access to legal help and information. Economically, the free market is reprehensible since it leads to inequality and gives power to those

who have large assets in the society. It is therefore important that society redistributes wealth in society and that the means of production are owned in common. To achieve this by economic politics it will be necessary to introduce planned economy. Planned economy will result in people being able to work together for common goals and not be reduced to customers oppressed by the market economy philosophy. (The Left Party program, 2000)

The view on the state is between the Social democracy and Marxist view. The big difference from pure Marxism is that the state should not be taken over by an armed revolution and the difference towards social democracy is that society should be classless. This is clearly seen in the party program that emphasizes the importance of making use of parliamentary in order to achieve their goals towards a socialist society. Despite this, it illustrates the Marxist idea that society should be classless and that people, not the upper class, should have the control over production. The Social Democracy ideal type is content with the fact that only distributing the earnings of production and not the actual ownership of the production is necessary. The production itself should be guided by the needs and a planned economy is therefore necessary together with the abolition of capitalism which means that the party program ends up on the Marxist ideal type on the view on economy. As the wealth should be reallocated, it is clear that an absolute equality is desirable in the party program which means that even the perception of class differences apply to Marxism according to the analytical tool. The view of human nature permeates the entire party program. It is the people's ability to resist the ruling class that will lead the fight to victory. This together with people's ability to show solidarity and cooperate illustrates how the view of human nature is facing the Marxist view, rather than a social democratic view on human nature.

The Social Democratic Party adopted the party program in 2001. It is permeated by democratic ideals and human beings' equal value. There are three key words that characterizes the entire document: freedom, equality and solidarity. Freedom is about the right of the people to decide over their own lives, equality is about individual rights and equal opportunities in life, and solidarity is about human interdependence. The class differences should decrease and this can be done by using a mixed economy. Social insurance and services, such as education, health and social care must never be reduced to goods in a market. This means that the so-called public-choice model, that is popular in the market-liberal politicians, is not consistent with social democracy. The logic of the capitalist market and competition do not belong to the public sector, however, Social democracy should encourage freedom of choice in the public sector. The market is still seen with skepticism but it is obvious that it is impossible to ban capital accumulation. It requires companies to make a profit and it is not incompatible with business and entrepreneurship in a social democratic society. (The Social Democratic Party program, 2001)

This party program has characteristics of the "Third Way" in the analytical tool. From being all about abolishing class boundaries there is now talk about removing class differences. The use of the word exclusion also correlates with the Third Way ideal type according to the analytical tool. Further examples of the Third Way is revealed in how it talks about rights and responsibilities for receiving welfare, and the economy depending on a free market, while the free market may not get the

upper hand against democracy. Therefore a mixed economy is necessary based on democratic ideals to control the free market. Growth is driving the welfare state forward and therefore a market economy is necessary. A free market being considered needed, and even considered helping Welfare Society forward, suggests that the party program falls under the social democratic ideal type in views on both economy and state, with clear tendencies that connects the party program with the third way. The view of social divisions in society has shifted towards the Third Way, because concepts such as exclusion has occurred and equal opportunities has been given a clearer dimension in the document rather than equality in outcome. As in the two previous party programs the Social Democrats have a positive view of human nature, which means that it is the people who can create change through collaboration.

The Moderate Party adopted the party program in 2002. In this party program the term liberal-conservative is mentioned. The concept of freedom is highlighted consistently in the text. All individuals are unique and have an intrinsic value which results in the conclusion that individuals must shape their own lives. This cannot be done under state coercive and therefore the public sector should only manage the most necessary in terms of welfare because freedom must be first priority. Our prosperity is based on market economy and all forms of regulation and high taxes prevent people's welfare and empowerment. The collectivist idea which existed in the past must disappear. Collectivist ideas inhibit people from making their own choices and taking the consequences of these. Equality is therefore all about preventing oppression of the individual and recognizing equal value. When it comes to morality, the Christian values should apply in Sweden and traditions should not be overturned but can be gradually changed. This should give each individual the greatest possible power to shape their own lives, without incorporation from the state. (The Moderate Party program, 2002)

This party program is more influenced by neoliberal ideas than the conservatives. The state should only manage the most necessary tasks and only if no other actor can do the same task. The importance of freedom, which permeates the document, results in the conservative ideas beginning to disappear from the party program. The rhetoric about freedom being necessary for human development suggests that neoliberalism started to get a grip on the party. This, along with the arguments that the free market is necessary for welfare and politics development, implies that it is characterized by neoliberalism according to the analytical tool. In view on the state, there are only traces of conservatism in the paragraphs that relate to the importance of property rights, laws and civil society. It is clear that the program builds on the historical legacy that consisted of social democracy and would do anything to take distance from those kinds of societies consisting of collectivism and equitable distribution in terms of outcome. The view on the economy in the party program tends to go in a neoliberal direction because it believes that the state makes people passive. The view on social divisions builds on every human's own ability to develop in the society through the free choices that people can make in their lives. From this it follows that the view of human nature is based on individualism and competition. It is the competition and the desire to evolve that drives society forward. It is therefore clear that this party program

results in that the Moderate party can now be classified as a neoliberal rather than a conservative party.

6.4 Party Programs 2012 & 2013

The Left Party adopted their party program in 2004 but there is a new revised version from 2012. The Left Party declares itself a socialist and feminist party working for a society based on democracy, equality and solidarity. This society will be built by and for the people. To achieve this it is important to work ideologically and not be blinded by the actors who argue that classes have disappeared. The social divisions between and within countries have increased, and this is because of capitalism. Capitalism has even grown while Social Democrats has been in government which have contributed to increased inequalities in Sweden. People using their power in the Parliament and high taxes to equalize income and wealth inequality is required to change this development. The public sector must increase to secure welfare in the form of education, health and social care for all citizens. The private interests must never rule over welfare services because they, unlike the municipality and state, want to make profit rather than prioritizing the best for the society. It is also important to emphasize that it is not about planned economy nor market economy anymore. Both planning and market mechanisms are needed in a modern economy. The key is that the market cannot prevail over the people. The economy must always be based on the people's best. It is also important to recognize that the socialist ideas which historically has taken place in communist states were not democratic nor socialistic in the Left Party's meaning. Democracy always goes first in a socialistic society. The main goal of the politics is to create a classless socialist society. (The Left Party program, 2012)

This Left party program is reminiscent of the one from 2000, while it differs from the 1967 program, but more on that in the conclusion. The view on the state continues to fit into the social democratic model since there is no talk of a revolution to achieve the goal. The program does not mention anything about that the state should be overthrown into communism, instead it is about how the state should become larger to reduce disparities in society. This means that the view on the State does not fall under a Marxist view, but rather a social democratic view. The view on the economy has changed and now the party recognizes that market mechanisms are needed along with planning in the same way as the capitalists today are planning the market. Progressive taxation and redistribution of wealth is still important along with a universal welfare policy. To achieve this it is necessary to make use of parliamentary government, and opposing all forms of marketization of the public sector, which combined with the market mechanisms means that the view on the economy falls into the Social democratic ideal type according to the analytical tool. The aim of the politics is still a classless society and the abolition of capitalism since only that can guarantee equality between people. Therefore, the view on social divisions is continued to be Marxist. This also applies to the human nature because they believe in people's ability to change society. Society has changed in the past

and can still be changed but only through a common struggle against injustice. Therefore, the view on human nature is Marxist.

The Social Democrats adopted their party program in 2013. The party program is based on that society has been changed in the past and it can change in the future, hopefully toward democratic socialism (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 3). In order to change the society a gradual change should be in place in a reformist tradition (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 5). This will lead to equalization of the power differences and class differences in society (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 5, 10). The market and democracy needs to interact but the market can never get the upper hand in that relationship (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 10). It is important to point out that the market is not the same as pure capitalism, the abolition of capitalism remains important (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 11). The society must be based on solidarity and equality, not like now when we see that economic incentives are becoming more crucial in the society. Competition and profitability calculations should never operate the public sector (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 19). There is no conflict between entrepreneurship and the state in society (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 30), both the private and public sectors are needed to achieve full employment and growth (29). General welfare must be protected and the welfare should never be governed by profit (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013: 30). (The Social Democratic Party program, 2013)

The view on the state has tendencies to be more of the “Third Way” rather than a Social democracy in terms of ideal types. This is because the market is needed and there is an interaction between market and state that is needed to achieve the objectives of the policy. In this way the market is legitimized as something good that sometimes needs to be controlled, which is in line with the “Third Way”. Despite the fact that taxes should continue to be progressive, the party program does not highlight businesses’ and private interests in the welfare clearly. The market should not govern, but it says nothing about whether private interests can appear. In terms of education, health and social care it is same thing; the market should not rule but nothing is written about whether private business can establish themselves in the welfare sector. Therefore, the result is that the view on the economy also tends to fulfill the “Third Ways” conditions. It is not as clear as before what equality is defined as. The words inclusion and exclusion are not mentioned but it is obvious that the focus is on equal opportunities rather than equality in outcome. Despite that, I find that the Social Democrats tend to end up in the social democratic ideal type regarding social divisions and human nature. Thus, the party is divided between the “Third Way” and Social Democracy in this party program.

The Moderate Party adopted their party program in 2013. It consist of an idea and action program. The program is based on people and their ability to develop in freedom and responsibility. The State shall guarantee citizens the ability to make free choices and personal fulfillment. The idea tradition of the party program is based on liberalism and conservatism. The economy is to stimulate jobs and therefore the taxes must be low so it will be worthwhile to work. To achieve this,

the work principle¹⁰ is necessary to decrease exclusion and get everyone to work in the community. The welfare must increase its quality and this can be achieved with the help of other actors than the state. This is needed to increase growth and guarantee all citizens a safety net in society. (The Moderate Party action program, 2013; The Moderate Party idea program, 2013)

This program contains elements of the “Third way” rhetoric combined with a neo-liberal philosophical tradition. It shows in how concepts such as solidarity, welfare and exclusion are used but with a new neo-liberal meaning. Solidarity in this context is about people being able to achieve their full potential, welfare can be supplied by both the state and private companies contrary to the older ideas that welfare must be based on the state to make public benefit, and exclusion is about people outside the labor market - a term advocated by the Third way. Despite this, the view on the state is that it should be small and preferably not perform tasks that other actors can perform. An example of this is the companies in welfare that have started health clinics and schools which is in line with neoliberalism. Another example of this is that taxes should be low for all people so they know that it pays off to work. A high tax burden reduces the willingness of people to take risks and to educate themselves. This is also consistent with neoliberalism, rather than conservatism which has been less focused on the market and freedom of the individual. The view of the economy also tends to be neoliberal. Equality is defined as equal opportunities and it is the free market that leads to prosperity and growth in the community. The part that is most clearly from conservative tradition is how civil society must be protected and that it is primarily the family and traditions that give people security. The view on social divisions tend to be neoliberal when it comes to people taking responsibility for their choices in life and everyone having the same opportunity to succeed. This is in contrast to the more conservative vision that emphasizes the importance of a social or natural order probably given by God. Views on the human nature is also neoliberal because it is clear that individualism and the market is the foundation of a good society. Creating competition between individuals will push the society forward. Based on the analytical tool it is concluded that the Moderate party program of 2013 is neoliberal and that conservatism has lost its position in the party.

¹⁰ Arbetslinjen in Swedish.

7 Analysis of the Results

In this chapter each party will be analyzed separately and in the end of this chapter the main question, *to what extent can we see an ideological change in political parties over time?*, will be answered. All analysis is based on the analytical tool which is based on the theory chapter.

7.1 The Left Party

The sub-question that has guided the study of the Left Party is: *Has the Left party changed their ideology over time and to what extent?* The answer is complex and built on the ideal types available in the analytical tool. The preconception I had before I started with the analysis was that the Left Party probably had changed the most out of the three parties, but this does not seem to be the case. The four Left party programs I have researched range from 1970 until 2012. A lot has happened in those years. The Soviet Union has fallen and industrialism is behind us here in Sweden. The Left Party programs will be analyzed in the following paragraphs.

When it comes to the view on the state and its task the Left Party has almost always tended to be within the framework of social democracy according to the ideal type in the analytical tool. An armed struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat has not been mentioned and the value that is most prominent is democracy. High and progressive taxes taken out by the state is the same now and then. This means that the party has hardly changed regarding the view on the state itself according to the analytical tool. It is obvious that the rhetoric has become more cautious and criticism of Leninism and other Soviet states around the word has clearly increased over time. In the program of 1970, there was still a form of romanticizing about the Soviet Union and armed struggle was considered right in other countries.

The biggest change can be found in the view on the economy. Here there has been a real shift from a Marxist approach to pure social democracy. The party has always had an anti-capitalist agenda which has permeated party programs throughout the investigated period. Another aim which is consistently included is the establishment of a classless society and socialism. It is important to achieve this aim since all inequalities need to disappear. The aim has certainly been dimmed year after year but still exists in every party program. What has changed is the opinions on how to govern the economy. From having advocated a planned economy to admitting that market mechanisms are necessary in the society, a major ideological step. The recognition of the market as a necessary mechanism suggests that the Left Party left the Marxist view on the economy and switched to the Social

democratic view. A view which is based on the market being necessary but must be controlled and that the State shall maintain a universal welfare policy in the public sector without the involvement of private actors, according to the analytical tool.

The view of the social divisions that exist in society has changed. This change is not as obvious but it is possible to discern tendencies that the Left Party has moved towards social democracy ideal type and thereby placed between Marxism and Social democracy according to the analytical tool, since the classless society still is the aim, and that equality should prevail in society. The absolute equality that was described in the previous party programs have received less space while the high and progressive taxes are still a goal, in accordance with social democracy. Hence, it is my opinion that the Left Party will fall between these two ideologies in the view on social divisions.

The view of human nature is largely unchanged and this may be due to both Social Democracy and Marxism basically having the same view of this according to the analytical tool.

The conclusion is that the Left Party has changed its ideology over time gradually in some areas, and not in others. This kind of investigation is complex but by using an analytical tool it has been possible to analyze the political texts in relation to the ideal types of the ideologies. The political field that has changed the most for the Left Party is undoubtedly the view on the economy that has become much more market-friendly over the years.

7.2 The Social Democratic Party

The sub-question that has guided the study of the Social Democratic Party is: *Has the Social Democratic Party changed their ideology over time and to what extent?* The preconception I had before I started with the analysis was that the Social Democratic Party probably had changed in a direction towards the “Third Way”. The four party programs I have researched range from 1975 until 2013. A lot has happened in those years. The rise of New Labor in the U.K, the entry into the European Union internationally, and the Moderate Party in government power in Sweden in recent years. The analysis of the Social Democratic Party programs is following in the subsequent paragraphs.

The view on the state has been changing over the years. In the Party program from 1975 there was almost a tendency which leaned more towards Marxism than social democracy. This can be exemplified by the authority over production that should be in the hands of the people, and a sharp criticism of the capitalistic system and its effects. Despite this criticism, there is no clear features that would place the Social Democratic Party in the Marxist view on the state. On the contrary, there are clear signs that the large public sector is essential and progressive taxes and a striving toward a democratic socialism is the aim of the politics. This image has slowly changed and in the last party program, there are traces of the “Third Way”. The change has been open and progressive in every party program. Previously, the party was critical against growth but now it is considered necessary in society. The

free market is also crucial but it needs to be controlled by the state. It is unclear whether private companies may act as actors in the welfare sector. The Party program is blurry in this issue and what it says is that companies do not get to control welfare. These changes in the view of the state tend to end up in the “Third Way” ideal type in the analytical tool.

The view on the economy is in between “Third Way” and Social Democracy. This policy area has slowly changed over the last few years and now it is between the two ideal types as mentioned above. The big change occurred between 1990 and 2001. Previously, the Social Democratic Party demanded legislation to control the free market and today private actors can operate in the public sector. Hence, the party has moved towards a more liberal attitude towards the economy. Another example is the terminology used in the later programs. Words such as inclusion and choice in welfare sector can be found. Words which originate in the “Third Way” according to the theories of this thesis. Although a more liberal attitude has occurred, it is still the case that the Social Democratic Party has the same view on economy as the social democratic ideal type. This because it is clear in the latest Party program that the market is not allowed to have the advantage over democracy and that competition in the society can never be more important than solidarity between people. Solidarity and equality are still the ideals that have the strongest stronghold of the Social Democrats in the view on economy.

The view on the human nature is static over time but in the latest party program, it has changed slightly. The view on human nature is still that humans are social creatures that work best when they collaborate. What has changed, however, is the freedom of choice in the public which leads to that citizens must make decisions in terms of choices regarding health care and schools. In this way the state forces the people to try to act "rationally" in their decision which is what the “Third Way” pursued. Thus, there is a tendency for the Social Democrats to move towards the “Third Way” ideals, but for the moment it is still in the Social democracy ideal type.

The same pattern as previously can be found in the view on social divisions. From being focused on owning the means of the production and thus equalizing the gaps, there is still indications that the Social Democrats have not moved appreciably in this policy area over time. One of the most important tasks for the Social Democratic Party is still to equalize inequality by progressive taxation and redistribution of wealth. The outcome of the policy is important and there are no signs that the party has moved towards an approach that strives for equal opportunities rather than equal outcomes. Thereby the Social Democratic Party is still in the Social democracy ideal type according to the analytical tool.

The conclusion of this is that the Social Democrats has slowly moved towards the “Third Way” but shows no distinct features that make it possible to place them as a party with an ideology base on the “Third Way”. Therefore they are between the “Third Way” and Social democracy according to the analytical tool.

7.3 The Moderate Party

The sub-question that has guided the study of the Moderate Party is: *Has the Moderate Party changed their ideology over time and to what extent?* The preconception I had before I started with the analysis was that the Moderate Party probably had changed their rhetoric rather than their ideology. The four party programs I have researched range from 1969 until 2013. A lot has happened in those years. The rise of New Labor in the U.K combined with the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s and the entry into the European Union internationally and in Sweden. The Moderate Party has been in government power in the recent years, two terms of office, which historically has been rare. The analysis of the Moderate Party programs follows in the subsequent paragraphs.

The Moderate Party has most clearly changed their ideology, or tradition of ideas as they call it, towards a more liberal belief. In the first party program they write that the party is built on conservatism, and in a later programs it has changed into conservative and liberal ideas, and in the latest program are they describe themselves as a liberal/conservative party with focus on human freedom. The view on the state has not changed significantly but a small difference is that Christian values have declined in the party programs over time and that the natural conditions has been replaced by equal opportunities. Thus, the conservative ideals have decreased and the neoliberal ideal type has the advantage. The neoliberal ideology with peoples' freedom in the center is extremely clear in the latest party program. Thus, it is possible to say that the view on the state has gone from being conservative to being neoliberal according to the analytical tool.

Regarding the view on the economy, there has been a major change and this is where the liberal ideas has had most of their impact. Even in the earlier party programs competition, ownership of capital and freedom are important to the party. In later party programs there has been a further shift towards freedom, competition and the free market in the latest party program. It concludes that is must pay off to work and the motivation is lower taxes and deregulation. In the welfare sector private actors should perform services in schools, health and social care because the state should not interfere if it is not necessary. The quality is most important for the Moderate Party and who performs the welfare services is irrelevant. Since the focus is on market solutions and individualization of society, the Moderate Party tend to end up moving from the conservative ideal type towards the neoliberal according to the analytical tool in the view on the economy.

The view on human nature and Social divisions coincide for the Moderate Party. The view tends to be in the between conservatism and neoliberalism. The tradition and heritage was evident in the earlier party programs, but traces of it still remains. The difference is especially the last party program which highlights the choices and responsibility of every citizen. This means that the form of rhetoric tends to correlate with the neoliberalism while the welfare state should be retained in practice. The welfare sector should only be reformed so that companies can manage tasks that the state has previously had. Hence, there is still a social safety net in the society and the individuals will not be left alone. There is no mention of any "natural order" of society anymore but it is clear that the family and heritage is important for the party. Therefore they tend to be between the two ideal types, conservatism and neoliberalism.

The conclusion of this is that the Moderate Party has slowly moved towards neoliberalism according to the analytical tool. There are still traces left of the conservatism but they becomes more blurred each year.

8 Convergent ideologies

The research question is: *to what extent can we see an ideological change in political parties over time?* To answer this question, three subqueries were asked regarding three political parties in Sweden. Hence, the result presented is only applicable to the Swedish context and the party programs the study has been based on.

In this study of the party programs, it is evident that a shift in ideology can be demonstrated. The main findings are how the view on economic policies have changed in all parties. The two parties that traditionally stand to the left in the political scale has adapted more than the Moderate party. The result means that I concur with Hylén's (1991) results which claim that the Conservatives have gone from being conservative to more liberal. The time when most programs were changed were from 1990 to 2000. Many external world events are likely to have affected the policy in Sweden, for example, the Cold War ended, and there was a transition from industrial society to knowledge society, but whether anything influenced more or less is unclear. The theory of "Catch-all" (Krouwel, 2003) is interesting, but it is unclear to what extent it affects the Swedish partisan politics. After reading party programs a plausible explanation is that the policy in itself has changed. The older programs do not focus on solutions to the same extent as the new ones. The older party programs are more interested in ideas. This would mean Mouffe is partially correct in her criticism of today's political landscape. The post-politics criticism is about how ideas have disappeared in favor of reforms or policies instead of politics in the liberal democracies. Nevertheless, ideology has not disappeared from the documents. There are still sharp differences between the various parties in view of human nature, the state and social divisions. It is thus only the view on economy that has gone from having been about planning versus market, to now being about how much power the free market will have in the society. It is also clear that the Social Democrats have left some words from the past in the latest party program that are constantly redefined over time. An example of this is the term democratic socialism. From the definition being a way to achieve a society in which the workers should have the power over production and the means of the production, it now recognizes that the free market is needed in the community. The Left Party also uses this term and gives it a more radical meaning. The reason for this is unclear, but the parties has changed their ideologies towards the center of the ideological scale according to the analytical tool. It is hard to believe that such a development would result in the death of ideology as Fukuyama talked about in 1992. The economic policy is the policy areas where all parties tend to harmonise but this will not necessary mean that the ideologies are dead. Politics are about so much more. The study does not intend to analyse the realpolitik, thereby it is difficult to say how much of the investigated material the citizens may

have access to. An ordinary citizen is unlikely to be interested in reading the party programs. It is likely that citizens follow the debates on television and in newspapers. This could possibly be one of the reasons that many believe that ideologies are dying out. It is probably easier for a politician to speak about how much money a person will have left after taxes each month rather than discussing the human nature or the ideals that the state must work for. It is clear that individualism is more prominent in Sweden now than 30 years ago, but this does not mean that collectivism is dead. It is enough to look at the party programs of the Social Democrats and the Left Party to find different views on the politics and various ideological inputs. In comparison to the Moderate party they both differ tremendously in ideological view, even if they tend to move towards a consensus on economic policies. The conclusion of this study is that all the parties have tended to move away from their original ideology and instead converge towards liberalism, or more precisely, a liberal view of the economy. In view of human nature, social divisions and the state, the change is not as evident as in the view of economics. The third way seems to be close both for the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party in the view on economy, while the Left Party tends to have gone from a Marxist party to a classic Social Democracy party according to the analytical tool.

8.1 Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to investigate whether and to what extent the ideologies have changed in Swedish partisan politics. The answer is that they have changed gradually over time and that the ideology is very much alive. The result means that anyone who is interested in politics should dispel the myth that tells us that ideologies have disappeared. With the help of ideology analysis, the parties' party programs have been analyzed with an analytical tool that has contributed to the Classification of the party programs. The result would probably have been different if the study had intended to analyze the realpolitik instead of party programs. The decision to analyze party programs was made because of interest in the visions and aims of the different parties.

Is the result credible? The result is credible according to the methodology and the analytical tool used in the study. It also builds on previous research that examined essentially the same phenomenon historically. The comparison is made between the parties and over time, which makes it possible to discern a pattern in the politics. The theory section had been better and more specific if liberalism had also been involved in the analytical tool. Therefore it is difficult to see whether the Moderate Party has become neoliberal or liberal. Future research should include more ideologies and even investigate whether the party programs differ from the party manifesto and how politicians have spoken in political debates over time. That would contribute to a clearer comparison between the idea policies and realpolitik.

9 References

- Alexander, J. (2014). The major ideologies of liberalism, socialism and conservatism. *Political Studies*
- Aronson, T. (1990). Konservatism och demokrati. En rekonstruktion av fem svenska högerledares styrelsedoktriner. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- BBC News, (1990). What is the Third Way?.
- Beech, M. (2012). A social democratic narrative of British democracy. *Policy Studies*, 33(2), 133-144. doi:10.1080/01442872.2011.601205
- Blair, T. (1998). *The third way: new politics for the new century* (Vol. 7). London: Fabian Society.
- Blair, T., & Schröder, G. (1999). Europe: The Third Way/Die Neue Mitte. *London: Labour Party and SPD*.
- Blundell, J., & Gosschalk, B. (1997). *Beyond left and right: the new politics of Britain*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Bobbido, N. (1996). *Left and right: The significance of a political distinction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Boréus, K., & Bergström, G. (2012). Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text-och diskursanalys.
- Cervantes, J. (2013). IDEOLOGY, NEOLIBERALISM AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *Human Geographies -- Journal Of Studies & Research In Human Geography*, 7(2), 25-34. doi:10.5719/hgeo.2013.72.25
- Commission on Social Justice. (1994). *Social justice: strategies for national renewal: the report of the Commission on Social Justice*. Vintage/Ebury
- Crouch, C. (2011). Postdemokrati. Daidalos
- Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. Sage.
- Dryzek, J., & Dunleavy, P. (2009). *Theories of the democratic state*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erlingsson, G & Brommesson, D (2010). "Partier i förändring". I *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*. Vol. 112, no. 2, s. 131-142.
- Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., & Wängnerud, L. (2012). Metodpraktikan. *Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, 3
- Esping-Andersen, G (1990) "The three worlds of welfare capitalism." Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, new language?*. Psychology Press.
- Feldt, K. O. (1991). *Alla dessa dagar--: i regeringen 1982-1990*. Norstedt.
- Flew, T. (2014). Six theories of neoliberalism. *Thesis Eleven*, 122(1), 49-71
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York, 1992). *Fukuyama The End of History and the Last Man 1992*.

- Giddens, A. (2000a). *The third way and its critics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Giddens, A. (2000b). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Giddens, A., & Pierson, C. (1998). *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making sense of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). Modernity and self-identity, Cambridge. *Polity*, 109.
- Gramsci, A. (2011). *Prison Notebooks, Volumes 1*
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford University Press.
- Harvey D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2004). The 'new' imperialism: accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist Register* 40: 63-87
- Heidar, K. (2005). Norwegian parties and the party system: Steadfast and changing. *Western European Politics*, 28(4), 807-833.
- Hermansson, J. (2010). Vänsterpartiet. Med historien i framtiden. *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift*, 112(2).
- Heywood, A., & Gamble, A. (2012). *Political ideologies: an introduction*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Holmberg, S & Oscarsson, H. (2011). Åttapartivalet 2010. Stockholm: Statistiska Centralbyrån.
- Holmberg, S. (2002). Kampen om mitten. *Det våras för politiken*.
- House, F. (2003). Freedom in the world: The annual survey of political rights and civil liberties 2003. *Washington, DC: Freedom House*.
- Hylén, J. (1991). Fosterlandet främst?: konservatism och liberalism inom högerpartiet 1904-1985. *Norstedts juridikförl.*
- Håkansson, A. (1995). Kris för de svenska partierna?. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 98(1).
- Isaksson, C (2010). *Den nya vän(S)tern*. Stockholm: Ekerlids förlag
- Kautto, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Nordic welfare states in the European context*. Psychology Press.
- Kitschelt, H. (1994). *The transformation of European social democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, R. (Ed.). (1982). *The portable conservative reader*. Viking Adult.
- Krouwel, André (2003). "Otto Kirchheimer and the catch-all party". I *West European Politics*, vol. 26, no. 2, s. 23-40
- Larsen, P. (2002). "Mediated fiction", I Bruhn Jensen, Klaus (red.) (2002), *A handbook of media and communication research*, London: Routledge.
- Leggett, W. (2004). Social change, values and political agency: the case of the third way. *Politics*, 24(1), 12-19.
- Lewin, L. (2002). Ideologi och strategi. *Svensk politik under 130 år*.
- Lewis, J., & Surender, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Welfare State Change: Towards a Third Way?: Towards a Third Way?*. Oxford University Press.

- Lindkvist, K. (1982). *Program och parti* (Vol. 16). Arkiv för studier i arbetarrörelsens historia.
- Lindström, M. (2000). The Ideology of the Swedish Conservative (Moderate) Party: An interpretation of the Political Science Debate of the early 1990s. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 103 (4), 329-343
- Ljunggren, S. B. (1992). *Folkhemskapitalismen: högerns programutveckling under efterkrigstiden*. Tiden.
- Mandelson, P., & Liddle, R. (1996). *The Blair revolution: can new Labour deliver?* (p. p17). London: Faber & Faber.
- Marcuse, H. (1985). *Soviet Marxism: A critical analysis*. Columbia University Press.
- Martell, L. (2013). Social democracy after the crisis in Europe and the crisis of social democracy. *Renewal* (0968252X), 21(4), 31-38.
- Miliband, R. (1994). *Socialism for a sceptical age*. Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (2009). *The democratic paradox*. Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (2008). *Om det politiska*. Tankekraft.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *The return of the political* (Vol. 8). Verso.
- Mudde, C. (2014). Fighting the system? Populist radical right parties and party system change. *Party Politics*, 20(2), 217-226.
- Månson, P. (1997). *Karl Marx: en introduktion*. Daidalos.
- Nilsson, T. (2003). *Moderaterna, marknaden och makten: svensk högerpolitik under avregleringens tid, 1976-1991*.
- Obo, U. B., & Coker, M. A. (2014). The Marxist Theory of the State: An Introductory Guide. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(4), 527.
- Peck, J. (2004). Geography and public policy: constructions of neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(3), 392-405.
- Powell, M. (2000). New Labour and the third way in the British welfare state: a new and distinctive approach?. *Critical social policy*, 20(1), 39-60.
- Power, S., & Whitty, G. (1999). New Labour's education policy: first, second or third way?. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(5), 535-546
- Rancière, J. (2004). Introducing disagreement 1. *Angelaki: journal of the theoretical humanities*, 9(3), 3-9.
- Rojas, M.(2012). Svensk politiks nya landskap. Svenska Dagbladet. Retrieved: 2014-11-13 from http://www.svd.se/opinion/ledarsidan/svensk-politiks-nya-landskap_7782072.svd
- Rojas, M (1999). *Efter folkhemmet*. Göteborg: Elanders Graphic Systems. Andra upplagan.
- Rose, N. (2000). Community, citizenship, and the third way. *American behavioral scientist*, 43(9), 1395-1411.
- Scharpf, F. W. (1998). *Interdependence and democratic legitimation* (No. 98/2). working paper.
- Somers, M. R. (1992). Narrativity, narrative identity, and social action: Rethinking English working-class formation. *Social Science History*, 591-630.
- Tingsten, H. (1967). *Den svenska socialdemokratins idéutveckling* (Vol. 2). Aldus/Bonnier.

- Wetherly, P. (2001). The reform of welfare and the way we live now: a critique of Giddens and the Third Way. *Contemporary Politics*, 7(2), 149-170. doi:10.1080/13569770120064171
- Žižek, S. (2000). *The ticklish subject: The absent center of political ontology*. Verso.

Party Programs

- The Social Democratic Party program from year 1975, 1990 and 2001. Retrieved: 2014-12-05 from the Swedish National Data service (SND). <http://snd.gu.se/sv/vivill/party/s>
- The Social Democratic Party program from year 2013. Retrieved: 2014-11-27 from the Social Democrats website. <http://www.socialdemokraterna.se/Var-politik/Partiprogram-och-riktlinjer/>
- The Left Party program from year 1970, 1989 and 2000. Retrieved: 2014-12-01 from the Swedish National Data service (SND). <http://snd.gu.se/sv/vivill/party/v>
- The Left Party program from 2012. Retrieved: 2014-11-23 from the Left Party's website. <http://www.vansterpartiet.se/material/partiprogram>
- The Moderate Party program from 1969 and 1984. Retrieved: 2014-12-13 from the Swedish National Data service (SND). <http://snd.gu.se/sv/vivill/party/m>
- The Moderate Party idea program from year 2002. Retrieved: 2014-12-15 from the Moderate Party's website. <http://www.moderat.se/aldre-politiska-program-och-plattformar>
- The Moderate Party action program from year 2013. Retrieved: 2014-12-22 from the Moderate Party's website. <http://www.moderat.se/politiska-program-och-plattformar>
- The Moderate Party idea program from year 2013. Retrieved: 2014-12-22 from the Moderate Party's website. <http://www.moderat.se/politiska-program-och-plattformar>