



Faculty of Social and Life Sciences

Ronak Bozorgi

# Attitudes and Adaptation Towards the EU

A Case Study of the Swedish Social  
Democratic Party and the Moderate Party

Political Science  
D-level

Term: Spring 2010  
Supervisor: Hans Löden

## Abstract

Political Science, D-level Thesis by Ronak Bozorgi, Spring Semester 2010.

Tutor: Hans Lödén

"Attitudes and Adaptation Towards the EU – A Case Study of the Swedish Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party"

This study focuses upon the adaptation of the Swedish Social Democratic Party and Moderate Party towards the European Union. Adaptation is explored by examining attitudes the political parties have on different issues related to the EU. In other words it is assumed that adaptation is dependent on attitudes, amongst other things, and the attitudes are examined by studying officially expressed opinions by the parties in party programmes and in parliamentary protocols. By expanding the study to three years possible alterations in the attitudes can be detected and something can be said on the level of adaptation the parties show towards the EU in each research question. The questions are (1) *Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?*, (2) *Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?*, (3) *Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?*, (4) *Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?* and (5) *Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?* The three years of research are 1995, 2006 and the first half of 2010. Two of the questions are developed by utilising the fusion perspective, that is a part of the fusion approach, which is also the theoretical framework of this study.

The findings of this study show that both the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party experience attitudinal alterations in almost all the questions investigated. This causes some shifts in their level of adaption towards the European Union. Furthermore the results show that the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party are adapted towards the Union in most of the years researched.

**Keywords:** *Attitudes, Adaptation, the Social Democratic Party, the Moderate Party*

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Choice of subject	1
1.2 Objective and Perspective	2
1.3 Problem Development and Earlier Research	3
1.4 Theoretical Framework	5
1.5 Research Questions	9
1.6 Definitions	10
1.7 Method and Material	11
1.8 Disposition	19
<b>2. Results</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?	20
2.2 Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?	22
2.3 Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?	24
2.4 Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?	26
2.5 Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?	28
<b>3. Analysis</b>	<b>31</b>
3.1 Attitudes on "Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?"	31
3.2 Attitudes on "Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?"	32
3.3 Attitudes on "Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?"	34
3.4 Attitudes on "Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?"	36
3.5 Attitudes on "Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?"	38
3.6 Summarising Alterations and Adaptation	40
3.7 Theoretical Implications	41
<b>4. Conclusions</b>	<b>44</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Choice of subject

Political parties exist in an ever changing world to which they must adapt. The parties are both a function of the environmental demands as well as an instrument for affecting the same. Over time the role of political parties has changed indicating that they are dynamic. Even though political groups have been around since the birth of politics itself, the modern Swedish party system was formed in the 19th century. From this point on the parties were built on robust, nationwide organisations and they had features such as extensive programmes, increased party discipline and a more open approach to happenings in the surrounding world.<sup>1</sup> The development of the Swedish political parties is closely related to some great historical events. One of these is the dispute on tariffs taking place in the 1880s. In those days Sweden had tariffs on agricultural products entering the country to protect the domestic market, which was a rather unusual solution at the time. In order to avoid reprisals from other countries, though, the tariffs were abolished. Now competition from giants like United States of America and Russia combined with much improved communications, led to a substantial drop in prices on Swedish agricultural products and the farmers found themselves in severe crises. When one considers the context, more than 70 percent of the working population were farmers, the rise of a mass mobilisation for bringing back the tariffs is not surprising. For the first time in the nation's history two very clear opposite political stands emerged. On one side were those parties demanding a reinstalling of the tariffs and on the other side those promoting status quo. During the following election the parties campaigned on roads and town squares, features of politics never seen before in Sweden. The significance of the dispute is that it essentially broke the political apathy, leading to a deep political gap and new ways of campaigning.<sup>2</sup>

A more modern example of external pressures altering the political parties is the Swedish membership of the European Union in 1995. Around this time the question on EU became a clear cleavage point between and within the political parties. The Left Party and the Green Party were against a membership (in 2008 the Green Party changed its standpoint on this issue<sup>3</sup>), the Moderate Party and the Liberal Party were most enthusiastic while the other parliamentary parties, that is the Social Democratic Party, the Christian Democratic Party and the Centre Party all had internal

---

<sup>1</sup> Bäck, M. & Möller, T., *Partier och Organisationer*, Gothenburg, 1992, p.24f.

<sup>2</sup> Möller, T., *Svensk politisk historia 1809-1975*, Lund, 2005, p.35ff.

<sup>3</sup> Miljöpartiet (2010), *Mp ska inte förorda att Sverige ska lämna EU*

division regarding the question.<sup>4</sup> The next step in the European integration process was to take a standpoint on the single currency. Initially the Moderate Party promoted the monetary union but eventually a growing dissidence started to formulate in the party. The members of the Liberal Party were mostly pro, the Social Democrats, the Christian Democrats and the Centre Party were all divided on the issue. The Left and the Greens were against.<sup>5</sup> The internal opposition in the Social Democrats resulted in the breaking out of some members that went on creating *Junilistan*, an EU sceptical party<sup>6</sup>.

The current situation the political parties find themselves in is rather messy. The nation state is undergoing transformation due to increased interdependence between nations and pooling of sovereignty that comes with being a member state in the European Union<sup>7</sup>. This situation is outlined more below. As we have just witnessed political parties are dynamic and external influence, amongst other factors, can make them change.

## 1.2 Objective and Perspective

The objective of this study is to research and analyse the *level of adaptation Swedish political parties show towards the European Union by studying their attitudes on issues related to the EU and possible alterations in these attitudes*. The assumption is that attitudes say something about adaptation. Adaptation is defined as dependent on, amongst other things, attitudes. This means that adaptation is also dependent on other factors, for example institutional adaptation, as we will see in section 1.4. However I choose to examine it from the perspective of attitudes. The attitudinal perspective directs the study to a certain theoretical approach, namely the fusion perspective. The fusion perspective incorporates assessments of the attitudes held by national actors and is partly used in this study. Before we go in on this let us discuss why the choice of subject is interesting from a political science view.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tallberg, J., Aylott, N., Bergström C F., Casula Vifell, Å. & Palme, J., *Europiseringen av Sverige*, Stockholm, 2010, p.25

<sup>5</sup> Johansson, K. M., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.381

<sup>6</sup> Löden, H., & Miles, L., *The Swedish Left and European Integration: Linking Laval and Lisbon*, Unpublished ms., p.1

<sup>7</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.2

### 1.3 Problem Development and Earlier Research

The importance of studying political parties in a EU context is embedded in the important societal role that the parties possess. This can be understood considering that they are a linkage between the state and the society which means that they are closely associated with the public opinion and its will. They can act as intermediary structures and express the interests and needs of society, or they can act as a linkage between institutions and constituencies within the system.<sup>8</sup> Political parties are also, to some extent, a part of creating national policy. This makes it important to study the impact that the EU has on national political parties since it effects how the politics is organised within the member state.<sup>9</sup> This said, Wolfgang Wessels *et al.* set out to understand the domestic adjustments (reactions and adaptations) the member states have made to the Union<sup>10</sup>. It is explored if, but foremost how, the European Union has affected the national systems<sup>11</sup>. The actors investigated are both governmental<sup>12</sup> and non-governmental<sup>13</sup>. The main conclusion regarding political parties is that they are slow and reluctant adaptors to the integration process but at the same time most of them support the integration.<sup>14</sup> The section on Swedish parties is mostly dedicated to the collaboration constellations in the European Parliament. It is stated that issues on the Union have disrupted the cohesion within the parliamentary parties leading to conflicts. A political party might try to avoid clear-cut positions by putting the lid on and simply not discussing sensitive questions like the monetary union. This way of management effectively hinders further Europeanisation.<sup>15</sup>

Most research on political parties is conducted from an Europeanisation perspective and a prominent researchers in this field is Robert Ladrech. Europeanisation is a term used to describe a process of transformation in the domestic politics and polices as well as in the EU institutions themselves, brought on by the European integration. What Ladrech does is to link the Europeanisation process with the activity of the political parties and in that sense the term might be understood as the adaptive response by actors, or the process by which they respond to the changed

---

<sup>8</sup> Wessels, W., Maurer, A., Mittag, J., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.16

<sup>9</sup> Ladrech, R., *Europeanization and National Politics*, Houndmills, 2010, p.128

<sup>10</sup> Wessels, W., Maurer A., Mittag, J., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.3

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15

<sup>12</sup> Johansson, K. M., *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.372ff.

<sup>13</sup> Wessels, W., Maurer A., Mittag, J., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.15

<sup>14</sup> Mittag, J., Wessels, W., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p. 418

<sup>15</sup> Johansson, K. M., Chapter in *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, 2003, p.380f.

or changing environment taking place inside the arena they act in, the national political system.<sup>16</sup> It is suggested that Europeanisation can be detected in five areas of party activity, namely (1) programmatic change, (2) organisational change, (3) patterns of party competition, (4) party-government relations and (5) relations beyond the national party system. Studies have shown that the EU has only little or no impact on these five areas and it is concluded that this is due to the attitudes held by the citizens in the member states. When voting in national parliamentary elections their behaviour is not that affected by their stance on the EU (this is more the case when voting in elections for the European Parliament). This means that the political parties, that are sensitive to shifts in the public opinion, do not need to change very much.<sup>17</sup>

The effects fifteen years of membership in the EU has had on the Swedish political parties is the subject of a brand new report. It is stressed that any changes in party politics are more likely to be of indirect forms than direct forms. This is because the Union does not put any formal demands on the party politics at the national level. Three areas of party politics are investigated and they are (1) the relation between party and voters, (2) the development of the party system and (3) the internal organisation of the political parties.<sup>18</sup> It is concluded that changes in party politics that are due to EU membership are limited. No great alterations in internal party structures, for example, have an obvious connection to the EU<sup>19</sup> and the introduction of a party system at the supranational level have not had any great effects on the national party level<sup>20</sup>.

In the above we have seen that political parties have an important societal role which makes them interesting entities to investigate. It has also been implicated that it matters to examine their relation to the European Union. This makes it important to study the attitudes political parties possess on different issues related to the Union, which then can tell us something about their adaptation towards the collaboration. Because even if the parties according to the above have not changed in their structures, it does not mean that they are not adapted towards any aspects of the Union. The attitudes of the parties are partly studied by utilising the fusion perspective as the theoretical approach of this study.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ladrech, R., "Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis", *Party Politics*, 2002:8, p.391f.

<sup>17</sup> Ladrech, R., *Europeanization and National Politics*, Houndmills, 2010, p.135ff.

<sup>18</sup> Tallberg, J., Aylott, N., Bergström C F., Casula Vifell, Å. & Palme, J., *Europiseringen av Sverige*, Stockholm, 2010, p.85f.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p.94

## **1.4 Theoretical Framework**

The fusion perspective is the chosen theoretical approach of this study since it incorporates assessments on the attitudes held by the national actors. The fusion perspective is one element of the fusion approach, which needs to be outlined.

### **1.4.1 Fusion Approach**

The fusion approach is an attempt to understand the impact European integration has on the macro and micro level and it offers three explanatory concepts that are all linked; (1) the macro fusion thesis, (2) the institutional fusion and (3) the fusion perspective. The macro fusion thesis addresses the EU development at a supranational level, while institutional fusion and the fusion perspective address the micro-level fusion techniques that explain the national adaptation and the perspectives of national policy-makers.<sup>21</sup>

#### **1.4.1.1 Macro Fusion Thesis**

The macro fusion thesis (MFT) was created as an attempt to understand the development of the EU at the supranational level. MFT also provides important information about the national level, making understanding of the micro-level easier. The fusion concept claims that interdependence amongst countries has made it difficult to use domestic instruments in order to provide welfare. The welfare needs of citizens can no longer be provided for by only using national mechanisms and policies. This realisation and the need to secure the welfare system is the motivation making the political elite promote membership in the EU. They take part in the European integration process and accept the obligations coming with being a member state of the Union for the sake of national interests. The integration process, though, is as a cross between an intergovernmental collaboration and a federal collaboration making the governance unclear and the competencies between the subnational, national and supranational fuse together. The competencies become blurry and it is hard for the citizens to claim accountability. This state of messiness is in fact liked by the national political elites since it leads to (more) cooperation and gives them somewhat more free hands (linked to weaker legitimacy sources). The MFT also identifies some indicators, like the growing extent of EU binding decisions affecting the national actors and their action, for the sake of detecting ongoing fusion in the EU. Finally it is assumed that the European integration is pushed by

---

<sup>21</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union* Nordeuropa Institut Conference, Berlin, 2007, p.1

binding agreements but also by socialisation of national and supranational political elites. A socialisation process made possible by the blurry system of governance described above.<sup>22</sup>

#### 1.4.1.2 Institutional Fusion

Institutional fusion (IF) explains adaptation of national institutions to the policy-making in the EU by examining Europeanisation in terms of the *”changing and increased focus of attention by actors towards the EU policy-making<sup>23</sup>”*. This is done to make an assumption on whether the national actors are strong or weak adaptors to the Union. The IF also makes an assessment *”of the degree of horizontal and vertical institutional adaptation of national procedures and mechanisms to handle EU business<sup>24</sup>”* to judge if the actors are merely acting at the national level or in a multi-level democracy. The assessments on Europeanisation and institutional adaptation are translated against two fusion indicators, presented next.<sup>25</sup>

#### IF1: Europeanisation of Attention and Actions of National Policy-makers

The first IF indicator examines Europeanisation and assumes that the national actors are undergoing Europeanisation if they are aware of the EU. Awareness can be expressed by a greater and stronger focus of attention to Union related matters and is brought on by the top-down process of EU business that affects the everyday work of national policy-makers. In time the national actors will also try to upload their interests to the supranational level to promote their interests. This effectively means that the change in attentions lead to changed actions. The uploading actions lead to a fusion of competencies between the national and EU actors and when it occurs the national actors are in fact acting as multi-level players.<sup>26</sup>

#### IF2: Institutional Adaptation

*”The degree of institutional adaptation of national procedures and mechanisms to handle EU-related business<sup>27</sup>”* is explored in this second IF indicator. This adaptation consists of two elements. The first is the extent of horizontal procedural adaptation among the domestic institutions, which is

---

<sup>22</sup> Miles, L., *”National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States”*, *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nord Europa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.2f.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5

important if one wishes to collaborate on EU related questions and successfully make the national voice heard at the supranational level. The second element is the degree of vertical procedural adaptation, a critical element in order to upload national perspectives to the EU. The IF indicator thus enables judgements to be made on whether the national structures have adjusted well or not to the European Union.<sup>28</sup>

#### 1.4.1.3 Fusion Perspective

The third concept of the fusion approach, the fusion perspective (FP), is developed as a complement to institutional fusion. The institutional fusion does not try to extend its evaluations beyond institutional formats and therefore does not incorporate the implications for the national policy-makers or for policy analysis. What the fusion perspective does is to try to understand the attitudes (and the nuances in them) and policy-priorities of the national policy-makers formulating the nation's EU policy by drawing upon the assumptions of MFT and IF. The fusion perspective stresses that the policy-makers have a set of values affecting their attitudes and policy making towards the EU and the European integration. The value set consists of performance fusion, political fusion and compound fusion and can either be permissive, balanced or negative regarding the EU. The value set reveals if the actors want further integration of the national institutions and policies into EU policy-making or not. In other words the FP uses the fusion as a set of values affecting the national policy-makers when making national policies towards the EU. Since it utilises, clarifies and extends the assumptions made by the more general MFT and IF it is more of a perspective than it is a thesis.<sup>29</sup>

#### FP1: Performance Fusion: An Output-Related Attitude to European Integration

The first indicator, deriving from the MFT, states that the national policy-makers realise that the nation state no longer can provide welfare and necessary service for its citizens alone due to the current interdependence. This makes them acknowledge that EU membership is in the best interest of the nation for the sake of securing the welfare system. They are willing to accept the obligations and take part of European integration as long as the EU provides them with economical and political results they no longer can provide themselves. Consequently they adopt the attitude of performance fusion. They are willing to fuse with the Union since it provides output benefits. The

---

<sup>28</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.5f.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4ff.

actors are aware that the integration process alters the nation state and leads to pooling of sovereignty. These integration effects can lead to scepticism by the citizens whereas it becomes important for the actors "to sell the EU domestically"<sup>30</sup> in order to keep experiencing performance outputs.<sup>31</sup>

## FP2: Political Fusion: A Third Way Attitude

The FP indicator makes assumptions on the direction that the national policy-makers would like the European Union to take in the future and it is believed that they have a third way attitude on the issue. They promote an alternative between two disliked options. The disliked options are intergovernmental cooperation that is believed to have limited effectiveness, and federal solutions that are considered a threat to the constitutional and national character of the nation. The latter also has a strong political symbolic that might not be approved by the citizens. The national policy-makers instead promote a European integration that is a middle way between intergovernmentalism and federalism. They want a largely pro-supranational integration but are sceptic to a federal solution. This means that they advocate some sensitive policy sectors as subject for intergovernmental collaboration, otherwise the EU should come up with supranational solutions. This makes their attitude to be political fusion. The mixed approach to the Union gives the actors the possibility to push for further European integration still they do not shut the door for discussions with citizens that are EU sceptic.<sup>32</sup>

## FP3: Compound Fusion: Attitudinal Preference for a Compound Polity

The ongoing European integration (leading to fusion) leads the national policy-makers to take on two attitudinal perspectives that make up the compound fusion. To begin with the elite interpret the EU as an organisation with a compound polity, due to its complex structure and blurry governance, providing output benefits. Even though the overall structure of the collaboration is not optimal and rather messy, it impossible to have a clear division of competencies, nor is it even necessary. It is also believed that actors at the national and supranational level have a common responsibility for the European Union. Secondly, the national policy-makers like the compound structure and the fusing of competencies whereas they promote a continued compound EU structure. This flexible

---

<sup>30</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.7

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8

structure enables the participation of intermediary national groups in influencing the EU. The compound polity is an advantage when promoting further integration and the elite do not want a clear division of competencies.<sup>33</sup>

### **1.4.2 Applicability**

The fusion approach is in fact not a full-feathered theory, yet. It is a rather new theoretical perspective in the academic field that does not, for example, state casual relationships. This does create some difficulties regarding the analysis as there cannot be a profound connection to the fusion perspective. A complete theory would be easier to use since it would be more steadfast and easier to make an analysis upon. Still I believe the framework to be good since the fusion perspective takes attitudes into account and helps formulate some of the research questions for this study.

### **1.5 Research Questions**

The objective of this study is extended into the overall question, *Has the political parties level of adaptation towards the European Union changed as it is expressed by their attitudes on issues related to the EU and possible alterations in these attitudes?* The question is broken down to five research questions all representing issues related to the Union. It is assumed that adaptation is dependent on attitudes and that attitudes can be detected by examining officially expressed opinions by the political parties. By expanding the study to three years possible alterations in the attitudes can be detected enabling something to be said on the level of adaptation between the years. So by examining officially expressed opinions on five issues and at three different points in time, an answer is provided for the overall research question. The parties of investigation are the Swedish Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party making the five research questions revolve around their attitudes;

- 1. Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?*
- 2. Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?*
- 3. Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?*
- 4. Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?*
- 5. Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?*

---

<sup>33</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.8f.

The first question is extensive and important since it sets out to explore each party's stance on whether Sweden should be an active member state of the EU or not. Questions two and three have been developed by taking into consideration important traits of the fusion perspective, namely FP1 and FP2 (see section 1.4.1.3). The issue on what Sweden gains from taking part in the Union always seems up for discussion but the question is extended to international collaboration, not just the EU. This is because the empirical material does not always mention the Union explicitly and sometimes it is just international collaboration that is in focus. Still the question will indicate if the parties believe there to be output benefits from the Union since EU is an international collaboration. The third question on decreased national sovereignty is also often up for discussion. It is also the bridge from the more general questions to the two last questions dealing with security aspects. These two questions are important since security policy is high politics and an important part of national sovereignty. If the parties show adaptation on these issues it is fairly reasonable to assume that they are adapted in areas belonging to low politics as well. The questions are also chosen since the topics of military non-alignment and security are given much attention in the empirical material. The fourth question can give an idea of to what extent the parties are willing to involve the EU in high politics. The fifth question shows if the parties believe participation in EU's security policy to be important.

## **1.6 Definitions**

"Attitude" is the most important concept in this research and it refers to the stance on a given specific issue. The beholder of the attitude might be aware or not of his, her or its stance, but in this study it is most likely that they are aware. The variable attitude can have following three values; Positive, Negative or No attitudes expressed. This means that the parties can express positive or negative attitudes on the issue at hand, but they can also omit expressing any attitudes at all. When discussing attitudes it might be of importance to clarify that while the fusion perspective looks at the national policy-makers attitudes towards the European integration, this study does not solely look at the political parties attitude on the integration process (research question one). Instead attitudes regarding different EU related issues are examined which then tells us something about the parties adaptation towards the Union. It might be perceived as if their attitudes on the integration process are indirectly explored by all the questions. This is not the intention. Further the categorisation of the attitudes into positive, negative and no attitudes expressed is my own. This means that fusion perspective's categorisation into permissive, balanced and negative is not used and this is simply due to the empirical findings that require a different approach.

”Adaptation” refers to how well the political parties have adjusted to the idea of Sweden as an integrated part of the European Union. That is, how much should Sweden be a part of the Union, but also how far should the continuing collaboration and integration be extended. The concept is defined at an ideational level, as expressed in the parties programmatic documents (party programmes) and parliamentary statements. The variable can have two possible values; Adapted or Not adapted.

”Level of adaptation” regards the possible differences in the adaptation between the three years of study in each of the five questions. The variable values are; Stronger or Weaker adapted.

The ”political parties” examined are the Swedish Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party. This means that national policy-makers, which are the focus of analysis in the fusion perspective, are translated into these two political parties. Below the approach for studying them is outlined.

## **1. 7 Method and Material**

### **1. 7. 1 Approach**

Attitudes of the Swedish Social Democratic Party and Moderate Party are studied by examining their officially expressed opinions on five specific issues. By expanding the research to three years possible alterations in their attitudes can be detected. The findings are then used to suggest something about each party’s level of adaptation towards the EU in each of these issues. Accordingly it is assumed that attitudes can be detected through examining opinions and that attitudes can tell us something about adaptation. The theoretical approach of this study consists of the fusion perspective, but as have been indicated earlier the connection to the perspective is not strong. The fusion perspective is utilised since it has an attitudinal approach and it is the inspiration source for two of the research questions (questions two and three). In the analysis the findings from these two research questions are discussed in relation to the perspective. The main focus in the analysis is instead on the empirical findings and my interpretation of these. This study does neither set out to test the validity of the fusion perspective, it is a descriptive research of the attitudes held by the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party. The attitudinal findings are compared internally in each of the parties and then compared between them.

I have an ambition to generalise the results from the empirical observation. If the parties show adaptation towards the EU in questions four (*Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?*) and five (*Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?*) belonging to high politics, it might be assumed that they also are adapted in the other research questions belonging to low politics that are not as "sacred" for the nation state. If this turns out to be the case it is presumed that there is a connection between being adapted in high politics areas and low politics areas. This also means that the two parties could be adapted in other EU issues belonging to low politics that are not investigated in this study. In the conclusion chapter something will be said on the possibility to generalise.

### **1. 7. 2 Delimitations**

The Swedish Social Democratic Party and Moderate Party are subjects of investigation and the reason is two-fold. First and foremost they are the largest political parties making it of special interest to investigate their attitudes and level of adaptation towards the European Union. Furthermore there could be some differences between them since there was an internal opposition within the Social Democratic Party when the government applied for membership in the European Union whereas the Moderate Party did not have the same internal battle (see section 1.1).

The second delimitation is the three chosen years of research. They all represent some form of external influence to the national political scene; 1995 representing the year Sweden became a member state of the European Union, 2006 representing the shadow of the Madrid- and London bombings and finally the first half of 2010 representing the first year under the Treaty of Lisbon. The years are chosen since each of them might have contributed to attitudinal alterations in the political parties.

Finally, the theoretical delimitation consists of the choice to use the fusion perspective that is one of three concepts of the fusion approach. Even if it would be interesting to include a behaviouralism approach, represented by institutional fusion, in addition to the attitudinalism approach represented by the fusion perspective, I only utilise the latter. This is because attitudes, as I understand it, is more of an unexplored phenomenon than institutional adaptation is.

### 1.7.3 Material

Two main empirical materials are used for the study, programmatic documents (hereafter referred to as party programmes) and parliamentary protocols, which are also my primary sources. Both are considered good sources for finding attitudes of political parties on issues related to the European Union. The Social Democratic party programme for 1995 was adopted as early as in 1990, that is five years before Sweden became a member state of the EU. The party's latest programme was adopted in 2001 making it valid for both 2006 and 2010, whereby there cannot be observations of possible attitudinal alterations between these years. The Moderate Party's party programme for 1995 was adopted two years prior and the very same programme was annulled in 2005 whereas the party did not have a proper party programme in 2006. Instead I have been referred to a brief document, adopted when the programme was annulled, manifesting some core standpoints. The Moderate party programme for 2010 consists of two separate documents, an idea program from 2001 and a programme of action adopted in 2007. The second type of material, parliamentary protocols, are all from the yearly foreign policy debate (*Utrikespolitiska debatten*) held in the Swedish parliament in February/March<sup>34</sup>. The foreign policy debate is conducted in the following way; the foreign minister starts the debate presenting the governments foreign policy declaration (*Utrikesdeklaration*) and talking about the nations foreign policy. Then a representative from each party makes a statement on his or her party's view of the declaration and on the nations foreign policy. The comments are made in order of size of the party. After all "first" inputs have been made the general debate starts. I work with the readjusted protocols from the debates of 1995, 2006 and 2010. The preliminary record is adjusted within some weeks after the debate so that eventual misinterpretations or mishearing by the secretariat during the debate can be corrected. It has been discussed whether this might lead to bias from politicians calling for adjustments of their inputs in the debate, still the readjusted version is the definitive document.<sup>35</sup>

Information in documents such as party programmes and parliamentary protocols can be categorised as opinions, making truthfulness in the expressed opinions and their representativeness important<sup>36</sup>. One can only assume that political parties have an interest in expressing their beliefs whereas they are candid in party programmes and when official statements are made in the national parliament. I consider the representativeness of the opinions expressed in the party programmes to

---

<sup>34</sup> Löden, H., *Konflikt och konsensus i svensk utrikespolitik: Fallet Afghanistan*, Gothenburg, 1994, p.30

<sup>35</sup> Leth, G., & Thurén, T., "Källkritik för internet", Stockholm, 2000, p.86

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p.22f.

be high since the programmes are adopted during annual party meetings or congresses, making them the official political stance of the party. The representativeness of the inputs made by party representatives during the foreign policy debate might be more challenged. Still this is not a great concern since the first comment made by each party representative, usually the parties foreign policy spokesperson, is commonly considered as to express the most important stance of the political party<sup>37</sup>. In other words it can be assumed that the party representative responsible for the first comment does express the party's official stance whereas the input is representative. This reasonably means that when later inputs are made by the same person they are more in line with the official stance of the party, than when made by party colleagues. I keep this in mind when working with the parliamentary protocols, a process described further below.

#### **1. 7. 4 Methods for Data Collection and Data Analysis**

Some of the party programmes have been digitally sent to me from the information staff at the Social Democrats respective Moderate Party's head office. In those cases I have found the documents myself, at each party's official web page, I have still been in contact with personnel at the offices to make sure that the material at hand is correct. The parliamentary protocols have been found at the library of Karlstad University with exception of the protocol from 2010. This has not yet been published whereas the Swedish Parliament's web page has been used to get access to the document.

When working with the party programmes the entire documents are read to start with in order to get a comprehensive picture of the work material. The next step is to detect data relevant for the research. All of the programmes have one or more specific sections on the European Union and these are objects of analysis. While utilising the parliamentary protocols it is the debate inputs made by the Social Democratic Party's and Moderate Party's representatives that are the centre of attention. If no opinions of relevance are expressed in the first input made by each party's representative or if the information is very scant, later inputs are analysed. The foreign policy debate of 1995 has a somewhat different structure than those of 2006 and 2010, it is categorised into different themes. The debate starts off dealing with Sweden's general foreign policy (the general debate) and thereafter it is divided into three categories, the EU policy, the aid policy and what is categorised as other issues<sup>38</sup>. When studying the inputs in the category EU it becomes

---

<sup>37</sup> Löden, H., *Konflikt och konsensus i svensk utrikespolitik: Fallet Afghanistan*, Gothenburg, 1994, p.31

<sup>38</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.1

evident that most of the important principles on the Union are in fact presented in the general debate. This section is therefore the most utilised. We have now seen how the empirical material is worked with. Let us turn to how the research questions are answered when using the documents just discussed.

### **1.7.5 Operationalization**

Attitudes in party programmes and parliamentary protocols are detected by making qualitative text analysis of the documents. When examining the texts it becomes obvious that some attitudes are much easier to pin down than others, simply because they are stated fairly obviously. This is what Peter Esaiasson *et al.* call manifest and latent messages. In a text manifested messages are easy to find whereas latent messages are information that cannot be found as directly since they are hidden under the obvious (text) surface.<sup>39</sup> This means that when working with the materials sometimes broader interpretations are needed to answer the research questions.

The first research question "*Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?*" is measured in the following way; if the opinions coming across in the documents are that Sweden should develop, push or improve the EU in any way, it is interpreted as showing a positive attitude on the issue. It also means that the question is given an affirmative answer. Sometimes it is not stressed that Sweden as a nation should take actions, instead it is outlined what the party itself should or wants to do. This is still interpreted as if Sweden should be active. The possibility that the parties directly state that they do not wish Sweden to be an active in the integration is rather slim since it probably would not render very well for them. Opinions that the nation should not be active can instead be detected by stressings that Sweden should be somewhat reserved in the integration process, that is to await actions from other member states in for example policy areas that are new or unfamiliar. This is interpreted as showing a negative attitude on the issue and will also lead to a rejecting answer to the question. A positive attitude on this issue indicates adaptation towards the European Union since the parties believe that Sweden should be an active member state. A negative attitude on the other hand indicates that the parties are not adapted to the EU, they do not believe that Sweden should be an active member state of the Union.

---

<sup>39</sup> Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H. & Wängnerud, L., *Metodpraktikan - Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Stockholm, 2007, p.250

The second question *”Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?”* is measured in the following way; if the opinion coming across in the documents is that there are or will be output benefits from international collaboration or the EU that the nation no longer can provide, for example in terms of security, the attitude is interpreted as positive on the issue. This means that the research question is given an affirmative answer. Sometimes the documents do not directly stress that the nation state cannot provide the results itself. Instead it is mentioned that international collaboration is the only way to or is required to, for example, prevent conflicts. Indications like these are translated as if the nation cannot provide these results alone. Negative attitudes on the issue can be detected through opinions that the nation state itself is capable of providing the same results as the international collaboration. A positive attitude on the issue indicates adaptation towards the European Union since the parties realise that participation in international collaborations provides the nation with output benefits that cannot be provided by the nation alone. A negative attitude on the other hand indicates that the parties are not adapted to the EU. They believe that the nation state is capable of providing the same results as is the outcome of international collaboration.

The third question *”Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?”* is measured in the following way; if the opinions in the documents are that decreased sovereignty is problematic, by stressings that the right to self determination is important or that intergovernmental solutions to problems are preferable, the attitudes are interpreted as being positive on the issue. This also leads to an affirmative answer to the question. If the opinions on the other hand are that pooling of sovereignty is not problematic it can be indicated through reasonings such as that the EU needs substantial power or that some problems are better solved by supranational collaboration. This is interpreted as showing negative attitudes on the issue and the question will be given a rejecting answer. Here some extra attention is required; a positive attitude on the issue indicates that the parties are not adapted towards the Union since they reject the idea of decreased national sovereignty. A negative attitude, on the other hand, indicates adaptation since the parties have accepted the idea of decreased national sovereignty.

The fourth research question *”Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?”* is easier to measure than the previous question since the data is rather clear on this issue. If the opinions coming across in the documents are that military non-alignment is important it is interpreted as if the attitudes are positive on the issue. This also means that the question is provided with an affirmative answer. Opinions that military non-alignment is not important can be detected through

stressings that Sweden should become a member in the organisation North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Expressions like that is interpreted as if the attitude is negative and lead to a rejecting answer to the question. Like in the previous question a positive attitude on the issue indicates that the parties are not adapted towards the EU. They most likely do not want EU to be involved to much in high politics areas. On the contrary a negative attitude implies that the parties are adapted since they probably would not mind EU to be more involved in high politics. Sometimes the data does not specify if it is political or military non-alignment that is being discussed but the information is deemed to be usable. The important thing is what each of the parties express on the policy of non-alignment. This means that a standpoint that might relate to political non-alignment is still valid.

Finally, the fifth and last question *”Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?”* is measured in the following way; if the expressed opinions are that Sweden should actively participate in the common European security policy, by for example contributing to its development, or that we should deepen our engagement in it, the attitudes are interpreted as being positive on the issue. This also means an affirmative answer to the research question. Opinions that participation is not important can be detected through statements that Sweden should not participate actively, not be active in for example its development and improvement. This is interpreted as if the attitude is negative on the issue and leads to a rejecting answer to the research question. A positive attitude on this issue indicates that the parties are adapted to the EU since they have realised the importance of Sweden participating in the common European security policy. A negative attitude on the other hand indicates that the parties are not adapted towards the Union since they do not believe that participation in the security policy is important.

We have now seen how expressed opinion will be interpreted. As mentioned earlier there is also a possibility that there are no opinions expressed (see section 1.6). In the parliamentary protocols the party representatives sometimes omit expressing anything on some of the issues above. As a consequence there cannot be any attitudes detected in the document, but since both party programmes and parliamentary protocols are used for each research year (1995, 2006 and 2010) there can still be something said about the attitude. The statement made in the party programme will then determine the outcome of the attitude as well as the answer to research question for that specific year. This means that the attitude as well as the answer to the research question will be vaguely (either positive or negative depending on the attitude in the party programme, respectively

affirmative or rejecting) since it is only expressed in one of two documents for that year. Before we move on a brief summary is in order. A positive attitude in research questions one, two and five indicate that the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party have adapted towards the European Union. A negative attitude in research questions three and four indicate adaptation towards the Union.

The empirical findings of the second and third research questions are, as we know, related to the analytic framework by discussing them in relation to the fusion perspective. The findings are more precisely discussed in relation to fusion perspective indicators performance fusion (FP1) and political fusion (FP2). Some suggestions can then also be made on if the two parties seem to have traces of performance fusion and political fusion in their attitudes, or not.

### **1.7.6 Validity and Reliability**

The definition of attitude (stance on a given specific issue) is not far from the general held understanding of what an opinion is. This makes me believe that there are no obvious risks in measuring attitudes by examining opinions. By keeping the interpretations of attitudes very close to the expressed opinions I try to eliminate any risks that still might exist. Even if there are other possible ways of measuring attitudes, like conducting interviews or making a questionnaire study, I judge qualitative text analysis of party programmes and parliamentary protocols to be most adequate for this study. This is because other ways of conduct could be problematic regarding the representativeness of what is expressed (see section 1.7.3). When it comes to translating attitudes into judgements of adaptation there are more potential risks. These interpretations might be seen as rather bold since they lead to statements being made on whether Sweden's two largest political parties are adapted or not to the Union. However I believe that attitudes can tell us something about the sort of adaptation this study refers to. I do not claim to know anything about their *de facto* adaptation in, for example, an institutional manner. The adaptation here regards an ideational level, that is how well the political parties have adjusted to the idea of Sweden as an integrated part of the European Union.

I have tried to obtain a high level of reliability by going over the empirical data several times to ensure that the expressed opinions have been understood correctly and that statements are not read into the data if they are not stressed. I have also checked the analysis several of times to make sure that its conclusions are reasonable. There has not been any time for replication of the study but by

being explicit in the how the operationalization is conducted transparency is provided whereas the results of the study should be the same given that the same material and tools of analysis are used. Consequently I believe the reliability to be good. Since the study has both concept validity and reliability the result validity can be presumed to be good<sup>40</sup>.

## **1.8 Disposition**

This first chapter is the base upon which the rest of the study is conducted. Here the choice of subject, perspective, research questions and method amongst other things are presented. Chapter two is the substance chapter of this study. In this part the results from the empirical observation are presented. The opinions the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party express in their party programmes and in the parliamentary protocols are presented for each of the five research questions in a chronological order. The third chapter is the analysis chapter, here the findings in the previous chapter are translated into attitudes and we will see if the parties experience any attitudinal alterations. Furthermore answers are provided for the questions and assessments are made on the level of adaptation the parties show to the European Union. The political parties are also compared with each other. A feedback to the fusion perspective is also done by discussing the findings in the second and third questions in relation to the perspective. In the fourth chapter, that consists of conclusions, some reflections are made on the findings and an answer is provided for the overall question of this study.

---

<sup>40</sup> Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H. & Wängnerud, L., *Metodpraktikan - Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Stockholm, 2007, p.63

## 2. Results

In this chapter the findings from the empirical observation are presented. They are presented in a chronological order for each question and for each political party. Where it is judged needed there are some suggestions given on how the stressings might be interpreted. This to make the understanding of the analysis, that is the chapter after this, easier.

### 2.1 Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?

#### 2.1.1 The Social Democratic Party

The party programme of 1995 mentions the Western European collaboration that is the EU of that time. It is stated that Sweden has a strong interest to participate in the further development of this economical, social and cultural collaboration as much as possible with regards to the neutrality policy. Furthermore, it is mentioned that Sweden can also participate in the integration work and contribute (to the collaboration) with its experience of working for full employment and for a good work environment, amongst other things.<sup>41</sup> Since it is stated that the nation has a strong interest in participating in the collaboration, the stressing that "we can"<sup>42</sup> participate in the integration work might be interpreted as that we in fact should participate. The parliamentary protocol from the foreign policy debate of 1995 states that Sweden should work for a liberalisation of EU trade policy in favour for the less develop countries and for a better quality and more efficient aid policy within the Union. We should also try to increase the collaboration's engagement with the United Nations and work for a future membership for the Central and Eastern European countries. It is also mentioned that Sweden should take an active part in the development of EU's common foreign and defence policy.<sup>43</sup>

The Social Democratic party programme that is valid for both 2006 and 2010 stresses how the party should push the EU. As mentioned in the operationalization section when it is expressed that the party should participate in the integration process it can be judge as if the nation should be active in the process. The programme states that the party will continue to push for a European policy on full employment inside the EU, built on respect for the rights of employees. Furthermore, the party

---

<sup>41</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.145f.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p.146

<sup>43</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.2f.

wants to develop the Unions institutional work forms so that the democratic aspect is increased, and to enable a set up allowing the member states to develop after their own conditions simultaneously as they have close collaborations.<sup>44</sup>

The parliamentary protocol of 2006 mentions that the government wants to strengthen the role of the EU as a global foreign and security actor and that it continues to push for enlargement of the Union.<sup>45</sup> It is also stressed that Sweden will continue the work for an ambitious refugee policy inside the EU built on respect for asylum rights<sup>46</sup>.

In the parliamentary protocol of 2010 it is put forward that Sweden should be an active voice in the European Union for a just and sustainable world<sup>47</sup>. It is stressed that we should push demands for disarmament through the Union (interpreted as if the nation first must push this question within the collaboration). It is also stated that the party wants to get the EU states to raise their aid and that it wants to work for abolishing the Unions trade barriers against, for example, Africa. Finally it is mentioned that Sweden should be the nation that hardest pushes for abolishing the European collaborations agriculture subventions.<sup>48</sup>

### 2.1.2 The Moderate Party

In the party programme of 1995 it is stressed that Sweden should actively participate in deepening the European collaboration by taking part in developing the economic and monetary collaboration further. It is also mentioned that Sweden should, in a constructive and open manner, take part in the development of a new European security order and fully participate in the common foreign and security policy.<sup>49</sup> The nation should also work for a coordinated migration policy inside the Union and actively promote values like human rights by engagement in the European council, amongst other institutions<sup>50</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol of 1995 the input by the party representative indicates a yearning for Sweden to become an active nation in the European collaboration. This is exemplified by the argument that we must become the "engaged European"<sup>51</sup> after centuries of

---

<sup>44</sup> *Partiprogram för Socialdemokraterna*, 2001, p.34f.

<sup>45</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.3

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7

<sup>47</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.62

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, Debate input nr.70

<sup>49</sup> *Handlingsprogram*, 1993, p.7

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35f.

<sup>51</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.9

being the ”*steadfast nationalist*”<sup>52</sup>. It is also mentioned that Sweden should participate in building a common security within the Union.<sup>53</sup>

The document functioning like the party programme in 2006 is rather brief and it is just stated that Sweden should have an active and actuate role in the Union<sup>54</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol it is declared that the nation should push the European Union to act more in order to protect the people of Darfur from the genocide taking place.<sup>55</sup> It is also stated that Sweden should support the negotiations for a Turkish membership in the Union<sup>56</sup>.

Four years later, in 2010, the party programme stresses that Sweden should belong to the core of the European Union. We should take an active part in making the collaboration open, effective, dynamic and firmly established amongst the citizens in Europe.<sup>57</sup> Sweden as a nation belonging to the core of the collaboration is also emphasised during the foreign policy debate. It is stressed that Sweden pushes and supports further enlargement of the European Union and that the government will work to strengthen the EU’s internal market and work for closure of ongoing free trade negotiations between the Union and important associates. It is also stressed that the nation is an active force in the Unions work for global human rights and that the government will make further efforts in this area (probably indicating that they will push the issue of human rights even more in the EU). Finally it is mentioned that the government will push the development of the EU’s civilian and military crises management.<sup>58</sup>

## **2.2 Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?**

### **2.2.1 Social Democratic Party**

The Social Democratic party programme for 1995 mentions that no nation alone can ensure its security and survival whereas collaboration is needed.<sup>59</sup> In other words, international collaboration

---

<sup>52</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.8f.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p.8f.

<sup>54</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.51

<sup>55</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.9

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p.29

<sup>57</sup> *Vår tids arbetarparti - Handlingsprogram för nya moderaterna*, 2007, p.21

<sup>58</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.1

<sup>59</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.112

for the sake of peace and prosperity, is needed. Furthermore, Sweden is dependent on the global economy and trade whereas international collaboration is needed for the nations economical development and for the citizens standard of living.<sup>60</sup> In the parliamentary protocol it is stressed that cross-boarder collaboration is needed to prevent conflicts that can threaten the security of all<sup>61</sup>. This can be interpreted as if the nation state alone cannot prevent these types of threats.

The party programme for *2006 and 2010* stresses that the nation state no longer can claim some domestic goals like high degree of employment or control on crime on its own. International collaboration through the EU is an opportunity to claim political goals like these and others. Furthermore, no nation state can solve environmental issues on its own, making international collaboration a necessity. The international collaboration gives strength to the domestic policy. It is also stated that borderless threats like terrorism and violations against human rights require international collaboration.<sup>62</sup>

In the parliamentary protocol of *2006* it is mentioned that some threats, like organised crime and human trafficking, can only be dealt with through increased (international) collaboration<sup>63</sup>. This indicates that the nation state cannot deal with these types of threats alone. If we turn our attention to the foreign policy debate of *2010* instead, there are no opinions expressed on this issue.

## 2.2.2 The Moderate Party

In its programme for *1995* the party states that a broad European collaboration is the only way to deal with economical, social and environmental threats<sup>64</sup>. This can be interpreted as if the nation cannot deal with these threats alone. In the parliamentary protocol for the same year it is stressed that the European engagement, besides our national defence, is Sweden's best chance for peace and security<sup>65</sup>. Consequently both international collaboration and our domestic capacity is given attention.

---

<sup>60</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.145

<sup>61</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.1f.

<sup>62</sup> *Partiprogram för Socialdemokraterna*, 2001, p.33ff.

<sup>63</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.3f.

<sup>64</sup> *Handlingsprogram*, 1993, p.35

<sup>65</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.11

The document of 2006 functioning like a party programme lays down the opinion that the European Union should solve tasks that are common for the European countries since these are better solved at the international level. Other tasks that are better solved at domestic level should also be taken care of at this very level.<sup>66</sup> The first statement might imply the belief that international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide. There is no mentioning of this issue in the foreign policy debate of 2006.

The party programme of 2010 stresses that the European Union should be a tool for the member states and its citizens for dealing with issues that cannot be as successfully dealt with at national level<sup>67</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol it is mentioned that the world faces great challenges that can only be dealt with through a broad collaboration. Collaboration is the key for peace and security, development and climate challenges, amongst other things. It is also mentioned that a strong Union is the best way for Sweden to secure its values and interests in an ever so complex world.<sup>68</sup>

## **2.3 Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?**

### **2.3.1 The Social Democratic Party**

In the party programme of 1995 it is stressed that the need for international collaboration sometimes must be given priority over the ambitions of the nation state<sup>69</sup> but that the international collaboration, that is inevitable due to the interdependency, must build on each nations right to self determination<sup>70</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol it is mentioned that EU's common foreign and security policy should essentially consist of intergovernmental collaboration between the countries<sup>71</sup> and later it is stated that the entire second pillar should be intergovernmental<sup>72</sup>. This can be interpreted as indicating the importance of the right to self-determination.

In 2006 and 2010 the opinion in the programme is that the EU should be a flexible organisation with different forms of collaboration depending on work area. The member states should be able to collaborate with each other in different constellations. The commitments the nations take on can be

---

<sup>66</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.51

<sup>67</sup> *Idéprogram*, 2001, p.26

<sup>68</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.1

<sup>69</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.113

<sup>70</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.141

<sup>71</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.30

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71

reached by common law or by common goals, enabling them to choose the best way to reach the goals.<sup>73</sup> The statement above most likely indicates that both supranational and intergovernmental forms of collaboration should be used within the Union.

In the parliamentary protocol of 2006 the only input close on touching this issue states that Sweden's international commitment need to be built on independence, when talking about the military non-alignment.<sup>74</sup> The expressed opinion is judge to be of no any use since it most likely just has independence *vis-à-vis* the military alignment in mind. The parliamentary protocol of 2010 does not mention anything on this issue.

### 2.3.2 The Moderate party

In its party programme of 1995 the Moderate Party approaches this issue in a somewhat different way than what we have seen above. It is mentioned that the need for a cross-border collaboration at the continent is so great that intergovernmental solutions for dealing with every issue or opportunity is not fruitful. Intergovernmental solutions could lead some countries to avoid taking actions and await the others to act. This could potentially lead to no actions being taken at all. The solution is instead an organisation competent of acting. The party goes on stressing that the European collaboration must have substantial power of decision making and of action in areas that are of common nature and border crossing. At the same time it is mentioned that the principle of subsidiarity is central but must be applied in such manner that a further integration process is benefited.<sup>75</sup> In the parliamentary protocol it is declared that the European Union must have power to be able to make decisions and to develop the collaboration and that this power is essential. Furthermore, the balance of power between the common (that is the EU) and the national must be of such sort that the collaboration is powerful but still allows insight and control by the nation states.<sup>76</sup> The stressings of power and substantial power above most likely indicates that some pooling of sovereignty is not considered problematic.

The brief document of 2006 stresses that the collaboration forms of the Union must be so strong that the EU can resist potential threats against peace and stability in Europe<sup>77</sup>. This might indicate

---

<sup>73</sup> *Partiprogram för Socialdemokraterna*, 2001, p.35

<sup>74</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.4

<sup>75</sup> *Handlingsprogram*, 1993, p.6ff.

<sup>76</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.49

<sup>77</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.51

that some pooling of sovereignty is not problematic. The issue is not mentioned in the parliamentary protocol for the same year.

The party programme of 2010 mentions that the European collaboration is partly and on good grounds a supranational organisation, furthermore some questions are better solved by supranational collaboration rather than intergovernmental<sup>78</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol for the same year it is put forward that the European Union needs to be strong and resolute. The stressing of a strong collaboration is emphasised a few times in the input.<sup>79</sup> Just as in above it might indicate that some decreased sovereignty is not a problem.

## **2.4 Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?**

### **2.4.1 The Social Democratic Party**

The party programme for 1995 declares that Sweden must have a non-alignment policy so that a neutral position can be maintained in events of war<sup>80</sup>. It is not specified if it is military or political non-alignment but as outlined in the operationalization section even if it is the first it is still valid for this question. In the parliamentary protocol the opinion is firmly that military non-alignment is in the best interest of the nation and the best way for us to contribute to security and peace building at the continent<sup>81</sup>.

In the party programme for 2006 and 2010 it is stressed Sweden must be military non-aligned as it is an important political security tool enabling the nation to keep a neutral stand in events of war. The role of Sweden, in case of an international conflict, is to act as a mediator within the UN framework.<sup>82</sup>

The issue of military non-alignment is also mentioned in the parliamentary protocol of 2006. It is stressed that the policy is important enabling Sweden to have independence in its international engagement and at the same time enables participation in international collaborations for peace and

---

<sup>78</sup> *Idéprogram*, 2001, p.25f.

<sup>79</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.1

<sup>80</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.141

<sup>81</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.2

<sup>82</sup> *Partiprogram för Socialdemokraterna*, 2001, p.35

security.<sup>83</sup> The parliamentary protocol of 2010 stresses that Sweden must continue on the path of military non-alignment<sup>84</sup>.

#### 2.4.2 The Moderate Party

In the party programme of 1995 it is put forward that the nations security policy with non-alignment and a strong defence as the core, for the benefit of neutrality in occasion of war, need to be rethought due to the changing situation in Europe. We need to engage in a broad collaboration with the rest of Europe and we need to take part in military operations.<sup>85</sup> In the above it is not specified if the party has the military or political non-alignment in mind, but it seems like both of them could be included into the statement. In the parliamentary protocol the opinion is that military non-alignment is the best path for Sweden at the moment and for as long as we possess the possibility for a satisfactory defence. At the same time it is stressed that the nation should not be restricted in participating in the European foreign, security and defence collaboration.<sup>86</sup>

In the party programme for 2006 the party envisages, assumed the existent of a broad parliamentary support, a future membership in the organisation NATO. A membership is believed to be the natural next step for the nation.<sup>87</sup> This probably means that the party visualises Sweden leaving the traditional stand on military non-alignment. In the parliamentary protocol for the same year there are some vague indications for support of a potential NATO membership. These indications come across by the way the discussion goes between the representative for the Moderate Party and the representative for the Social Democratic Party<sup>88</sup>, but as mentioned it is not easy to pin down the stressing that is vague and blurry.

The party programme for 2010 states that with being a member state of the European Union comes common responsibilities that eventually will replace Sweden's traditional non-alignment<sup>89</sup>. The opinion is given in a context discussing the nation's security, but it is not specified if they refer to political or military non-alignment. It is also mentioned that Sweden should consider a NATO

---

<sup>83</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.4

<sup>84</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarans protokoll*, Debate input nr.2

<sup>85</sup> *Handlingsprogram*, 1993, p.35f.

<sup>86</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.10

<sup>87</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.53

<sup>88</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.36f.

<sup>89</sup> *Idéprogram*, 2001, p.26

membership, given a support amongst the citizens and a broad parliamentary support<sup>90</sup>. In the parliamentary protocol of 2010 it is expressed that the government aims to push the development of civilian and military crises management within the framework of NATO (and the EU and the UN)<sup>91</sup>. Later on it is stated that the government has a very clear interest in a near collaboration with the organisation and would like to develop this collaboration<sup>92</sup>. This most likely reveals an interest to be even more involved with NATO and might be interpreted as if the party consider the principal of military non-alignment to be obsolete.

## **2.5 Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?**

### **2.5.1 The Social Democratic Party**

The party programme of 1995 does not mention a European security policy, but it is stressed that security in a time and age of nuclear power is a question of common security, a security reached by collaboration.<sup>93</sup> The common security includes (besides collaboration) easing of tensions, agreements on mutual disarmament and it is important that the Social Democratic Party, in different ways, support the efforts for realisation of this scenario.<sup>94</sup> The above can be interpreted as if participation in European security is important since it is implied that participation in international security is important and Europe is a part of the latter. In the parliamentary protocol it is declared that Sweden should, in an active way, contribute to the development of a European security community where military solutions to conflicts are no longer an option. It is also stressed more explicitly that we should constructively participate in the development of EU's common foreign- and security policy<sup>95</sup>.

In 2006 and 2010 there is no mentioning of EU's security policy in the party programme, but it is stressed that borderless threats in Europe, like terrorism and violation on human rights, are required to be dealt with through a broader security policy built on international collaboration with other means than military. Earlier in the programme it is stated that the Social Democratic Party's goal is

---

<sup>90</sup> *Vår tids arbetarparti - Handlingsprogram för nya moderaterna*, 2007, p.23

<sup>91</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.1

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, Debate input nr.12

<sup>93</sup> Misgeld, K., *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Stockholm, 2001, p.112

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p.142

<sup>95</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95:64, p.2f.

a Europe of peace and collaboration.<sup>96</sup> When put together it can be interpreted it as if the party believes it important to contribute to a collaboration for security in Europe.

In the parliamentary protocol of 2006 the opinion held forward is that by participating in the Unions security policy our own security is strengthened, and that the government wants to strengthen the Unions foreign and security policy in order to meet threats<sup>97</sup>. This stressing can be interpreted as if it is important that Sweden takes part in a common European security policy. When it comes to parliamentary protocol of 2010 the Social Democratic Party does not mention anything on this issue.

## 2.5.2 The Moderate Party

In the party programme of 1995 the opinion is that Sweden should participate completely, that is all the way, in the Unions work for a foreign and security policy. It is also stressed that the nation should, in a constructive and open manner, participate in developing a security order for the continent.<sup>98</sup> In the parliamentary protocol it is mentioned that Sweden certainly must take part in building a common security based on common values within the EU and in collaboration with the European countries. We should be engaged in the European foreign and security policy.<sup>99</sup>

The brief party programme of 2006 stresses that Sweden's security policy is guided by the Unions security strategy and that the question on security is common whereas we as a nation must take our part of the responsibility and increase our participation in international operations to a much higher extent.<sup>100</sup> This can be interpreted as if it is important that Sweden to participates in EU's common security policy. The parliamentary protocol for the same year does not stress anything on this issue.

In the party programme of 2010 the Moderate Party mentions that community and collaboration with other countries is the ground for Sweden's security and that the Unions security strategy sets the core principles for our security policy. Furthermore, the nation should deepen its engagement in the Unions security and defence policy.<sup>101</sup> In the parliamentary protocol it is stressed that Sweden

---

<sup>96</sup> *Partiprogram för socialdemokraterna*, 2001, p.34f.

<sup>97</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06:73, p.3f.

<sup>98</sup> *Handlingsprogram*, 1993, p.7

<sup>99</sup> Riksdagens Protokoll 1995/95:64, p.9f.

<sup>100</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.53

<sup>101</sup> *Vår tids arbetarparti - Handlingsprogram för nya moderaterna*, 2007, p.23

has a loyal responsibility for the security situation in Europe and that due to the Treaty of Lisbon the Unions common foreign and security policy is much more intervened with the nations foreign policy. This provides both new responsibilities as well as opportunities to work for peace, freedom and redemption globally, both of which the government is prepared to take on.<sup>102</sup> The desire to take on further responsibilities can be interpreted as if it is important that the nation participates even more in the Union's security policy.

---

<sup>102</sup> Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, Debate input nr.2

### 3. Analysis

In this chapter statements are made on the findings in the previous chapter from an attitudinal perspective. It is outlined if the attitudes are positive, negative or if there are no attitudes expressed and if there are any alterations in them (that if there are any changes in the attitudes). Answers are also provided for the research questions and there are assessments made on the level of adaptation the each political party shows towards the European Union in each of the questions. The analysis results are then compared between the parties. Furthermore there is a section summarising the analysis results and here an overview of the results is presented in form of two diagrams. The very last part of this chapter is dedicated to the fusion perspective that is discussed in relation to the findings in the second and third questions. Before we begin the analysis a quick reminder might be good; a positive attitude in research questions one, two and five indicate adaptation towards the European Union. A negative attitude in research questions three and four indicate adaptation towards the Union. If one of the documents for a year omits expressing anything on the issue the attitudinal findings in the other document for the same year will determine the outcome (for this year) which though will be vague.

#### 3.1 Attitudes on "Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?"

##### 3.1.1 The Social Democratic Party

*1995* - In both the party programme and in the parliamentary protocol it is implied that Sweden should take an active part in developing the European Union. This is interpreted as if the Social Democratic Party has a positive attitude on the issue on whether the nation should take an active part in the European integration process or not. This also means an affirmative answer to the research question. *2006* - The party programme and the parliamentary protocol both indicate that the nation should be active in improving the Union which is interpreted as if the party has a positive attitude on the issue. The research question is also given an affirmative answer. *2010* - Both documents reveal that the Social Democratic Party wants the nation to take an active part in the Unions work. The attitude is interpreted as being positive on the issue, which also means an affirmative answer to the research question.

Consequently the above show that the Social Democratic Party has a totally unanimous attitudes on the issue in all three years. The attitudes are positive and there are no alterations in them. The positive attitude indicates that the party is adapted towards the European Union in all years since it believes that Sweden should be an active member state of the Union.

### 3.1.2 The Moderate Party

*1995* - The party programme and the parliamentary protocol mention that Sweden should take an active part in developing the EU, indicating a positive attitude on the issue on whether the nation should take an active part in pushing the integration process or not. This also means an affirmative answer to the question. *2006* - In both documents it is expressed that the nation should take an active part in the Union. It is interpreted as if the party has a positive attitude on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2010* - Once again it is, in both the party programme and in the parliamentary protocol, stressed that Sweden should be active and strive to improve some aspects the Union. The attitude is understood to be positive and the question is given an affirmative answer.

The study shows that the Moderate Party has totally unanimous attitudes throughout the three years. The attitudes are positive on the issue and no alterations are observed. The results indicate that the party is adapted towards the European Union in all the years. It believes that Sweden should be an active member state within the Union.

### 3.1.3 Comparison between the political parties

Neither the Social Democratic nor the Moderate Party experience any attitudinal alterations in this question. They both have positive attitudes on the issue in all the documents. Furthermore, they are both adapted towards the EU in the three years of study.

## **3.2 Attitudes on "Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?"**

### 3.2.1 The Social Democratic Party

*1995* - In the party programme and the parliamentary protocol it is put forward that there are output benefits from international collaboration that the nation state no longer can provide. The attitude is

interpreted as being positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2006* - The opinions coming across in both documents are that international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state cannot provide. Consequently the attitude is understood as positive on the issue and an affirmative answer is given the question. *2010* - The party programme stresses that there are output benefits from international collaboration the nation no longer can provide and the attitude is interpreted to be positive. Nothing is expressed in the parliamentary protocol. This makes the attitude expressed in the programme determine the outcome for this year making the attitude vaguely positive and a vaguely affirmative answer is given the research question.

The empirical observation shows that the Social Democratic Party has a slight attitudinal alteration in such as one document omits expressing anything on the issue. Otherwise the attitudes are positive but with regards to the above the last year of study shows a vaguely positive attitude. This also means that the level of adaptation is not as high in the last year as it is in the two previous. The judgement is still that the party is adapted towards the Union in all years. It has realised that some results no longer can be provided by the nation state alone and international collaboration is needed to provide these.

### 3.2.2 The Moderate Party

*1995* - The party programme stresses that there are output benefits from European collaboration that cannot be provided by the nation. In the parliamentary protocol, on the other hand, it is believed that while international collaboration is important for peace and security we still possess the potential to provide peace and security ourselves by utilising the national defence. In other words there are output benefits from the collaboration but Sweden can still provide the same results. We see an interesting division in what is expressed and there cannot be one answer provided for the research question. The answer has to be two-fold; the party programme is interpreted as expressing a positive attitude and therefore an affirmative answer to the research question, meanwhile the parliamentary protocol is interpreted as stressing a negative attitude and a rejecting answer to the question. *2006* - In the programme it is implied that there are output benefits from participating in the EU that cannot be provided by the nation and the attitude is interpreted as being positive. The parliamentary protocol omits expressing anything on the issue. This makes the attitude expressed in the programme determine the outcome for this year making the attitude vaguely positive. It is also means a vaguely affirmative answer to the research question. *2010* - In both the party programme

and the parliamentary protocol it is mentioned that there are output benefits coming with participating in the Union and these results cannot be provided by the nation state. This is interpreted as if the attitude is positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer.

In the above a rather interesting attitudinal alteration is discovered. The first year of study shows positive as well as negative attitudes, making the Moderate Party adapted to the EU in one document, only. In the second year there are both positive attitudes and no attitudes expressed making the party adapted, but not as much as if both documents would have shown positive attitudes. The last year unanimously shows positive attitudes indicating adaptation towards the Union. The Moderate Party goes from low adaptation/having traces of adaptation to stronger adaptation to being adapted. When considering the findings the judgement must thus be that the party is only adapted in the second and third years since it does in fact show adaptation in these years but only traces of adaptation in the first year. Consequently the party is adapted in two out of three years. In the two last years it shows the realisation that international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide.

### **3.2.3 Comparison between the political parties**

The empirical observation shows that there are attitudinal alterations in both parties. It is interesting that the Social Democratic Party starts off strong in its adaptation which then takes off somewhat in the last year. In the case of the Moderate Party it is the other way around. Since the Social Democratic Party is adapted in all three years and the Moderates in two out of three years, the first party is slightly more adapted towards the Union on this very issue.

## **3.3 Attitudes on "Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?"**

### **3.3.1 The Social Democratic Party**

*1995* - In both the party programme in the parliamentary protocol it is implied that the right to self-determination is important. It is interpreted as if the attitude is positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2006* - The party programme indicates that both supranational and intergovernmental forms of collaboration are good whereas pooling of sovereignty is probably not viewed as problematic. The attitude is interpreted as being negative on this issue. In the parliamentary protocol there is nothing mentioned of use and it is interpreted as if

there are no attitudes expressed. This makes the attitude expressed in the programme determine the outcome for this year, making the attitude vaguely negative and leading to a vaguely rejecting answer to the question. *2010* - As in above the party programme stresses that both type of collaboration forms are good and the attitude is interpreted to be negative, pooling of sovereignty is not problematic. Somewhat surprisingly there is once more nothing expressed in the parliamentary protocol and the attitude expressed in the programme determines the outcome for this year. The attitude is vaguely negative and a vaguely rejecting answer is provided for the research question.

This is the most obvious case of attitudinal alterations for the Social Democratic Party. The party has positive attitudes the first year while the second and third years both are characterised by negative attitudes and no attitudes. This means that the party goes from not being adapted the first year to being so the two following (the level of adaptation in the two last years would be higher though if the attitudes were unanimously negative). The verdict is that the political party is adapted towards the EU in two out of three years. In these years it has accepted the idea of decreased national sovereignty. The above might indicate that it took some time getting used to the idea.

### 3.3.2 The Moderate Party

*1995* - In both the party programme and in the parliamentary protocol it is indicated that pooling of sovereignty is not problematic and the attitude is interpreted as negative on the issue on whether pooling of sovereignty is problematic or not. The research question is provided with a rejecting answer. *2006* - In the party programme it is stressed that the EU needs to be strong. The expression "so strong<sup>103</sup>" is understood as if the member states are required to give up necessary amount of sovereignty so that the collaboration becomes powerful enough. Consequently pooling of sovereignty is not viewed as problematic and the attitude is interpreted as negative. The parliamentary protocol does not express anything leading the attitude expressed in the programme to determine the outcome for this year making the attitude vaguely negative. This also means a vaguely rejecting answer to the research question. *2010* - The opinions expressed in both documents are that pooling of sovereignty is not problematic and the attitude is interpreted to be negative on the issue. A rejecting answer is given the question.

---

<sup>103</sup> Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill moderaterna*, 2005, p.51

The empirical observation shows that Moderate Party experience one slight alteration in its attitudes in such as one document omits expressing anything on the issue. Otherwise the attitudes are negative but with regards to the above the attitude in the middle year is vaguely negative. This also means that the level of adaptation is not as high in this year as in the two others. The party is still adapted to the Union in all three years. It has accepted the idea of decreased national sovereignty.

### 3.3.3 Comparison between the political parties

The Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party both experience attitudinal alterations in this question. While the first party is adapted in two out of the three years the Moderate Party is adapted in all three years.

## 3.4 Attitudes on "Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?"

### 3.4.1 The Social Democratic Party

*1995* - The party programme stresses the importance of non-alignment, but it is not specified if it is political or military non-alignment. Even if it is the first advocating of it can be translated as if military non-alignment is also important since the essence is the same, non-alignment is important for Sweden. As a consequence the attitude is interpreted to be positive on the issue. In the parliamentary protocol it is mentioned that military non-alignment is important and the attitude is interpreted as being positive on the issue. This leads to an affirmative answer to the research question. *2006* - The party programme as well as the parliamentary protocol express that Sweden should be military non-aligned and the attitude is interpreted as being positive on the issue on whether the policy is important or not. The question also is given an affirmative answer. *2010* - Once more both the party programme and the parliamentary protocol mention that military non-alignment is important and the attitude is understood to be positive and the question is given an affirmative answer.

The results show that the Social Democratic Party has a totally unanimous attitude on the issue all three years, whereas there are no alterations in them. The positive attitude indicates that the party is not adapted towards the European Union in any of the years. Since it holds the principle of military non-alignment important it probably does not want EU to be too involved in high politics areas.

### 3.4.2 The Moderate Party

*1995* - The opinion in the party programme is that Sweden should reconsider its policy on non-alignment. It is not specified if it is political or military non-alignment but the statement is deemed relevant for military non-alignment. The essence is the same, non-alignment is important for Sweden. The parliamentary protocol, on the other hand, stresses that we should keep the policy for as long as we have a satisfactory defence capacity. As we see there is a division between the opinions in the documents and there cannot be one answer provided for the research question this year. The answer has to be two-fold. The party programme is interpreted as showing a negative attitude and therefore a rejecting answer to the research question, meanwhile the parliamentary protocol indicates a positive attitude and an affirmative answer to the question. *2006* - The party programme implies that the principle of military non-alignment should be abandoned since membership in the organisation NATO is advocated. The opinion in the parliamentary protocol, on the other hand, is not as straight forward. It is blurry and vaguely suggested that the party would like to see a future membership in NATO on Sweden's behalf. Still it is interpreted as if both documents show a negative attitude (even though the last is vaguely negative) on the issue and the answer to the research question is rejecting. *2010* - In both documents it is indicated that the party is not unfamiliar with the idea of Sweden leaving the principle of non-alignment. The attitude is interpreted as negative on the issue. This provides a rejecting answer to the research question.

In the above we see a rather interesting alteration in the attitudes of the Moderate Party. The first year shows both positive and negative attitudes, making it adapted to the EU in just one of the documents. In the second year there are negative and vaguely negative attitudes (since one of the documents is rather blurry in its articulation) indicating that the party is adapted. The last year, on the other hand, shows unanimously negative attitudes whereas the party is adapted. This makes the political party go from low adaptation/having traces of adaptation in the first year, to stronger adaptation in the second to being adapted in the last year of research. When considering the findings the judgement must be that the party is only adapted in the second and third year, since it shows adaptation in these but only traces of adaptation in the first year. This means that the Moderate Party is adapted in two out of three years. Since it does not hold the principle of military non-alignment important in these years it probably does not mind if the EU becomes more involved in high politics areas.

### 3.4.3 Comparison between the political parties

The empirical findings show that the Social Democratic Party does not experience any attitudinal alterations but that the Moderate Party does, which might indicate that the Social Democratic Party is more sure on its taken stance. Further the party is not adapted in any of the three years while the Moderate Party starts of showing traces of the same lack in the first year just to be gradually adapted in the next two years. The question on the importance of military non-alignment is the most obvious dividing line between the two political parties. The Social Democrats advocate the importance of the policy while the Moderate Party find it to be more or less obsolete.

### **3.5 Attitudes on "Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?"**

#### 3.5.1 The Social Democratic Party

*1995* - Even though the party programme does not mention the European security policy in this early document, it implies that it is important that Sweden participates in international collaboration for a common security. Since Europe is a part of the international it is interpreted as if participation in a common European security policy also is viewed as important. The parliamentary protocol mentions that it is important to participate in EU's common security policy. The attitude is interpreted as positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2006* - In the party programme there is no mentioning of the European security policy but it is implied that it is important that Sweden participates in a collaboration for security at the continent. In the protocol from the same year it is indicated that participation in the European security policy is important. This makes the attitude to be interpreted as positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2010* - In the party programme there is no mentioning of the European security policy but it is indicated that it is important that Sweden participates in a collaboration for security at the continent and the attitude is interpreted as positive. In the parliamentary protocol there is no mentioning of this issue. This makes the attitude in the programme determine the outcome of the year making the attitude vaguely positive which also means a vaguely affirmative answer to the research question.

The empirical observation shows that the Social Democratic Party has one slight attitudinal alteration in such as one document omits expressing anything on the issue. Otherwise the attitudes are positive, but with regards to the above the last year of study shows a vaguely positive attitude.

This also means that the level of adaptation is not as high in the last year as it is in the two previous. The judgement is still that the party is adapted in all years. It has realised the importance of Sweden participating in the common European security policy.

### 3.5.2 The Moderate Party

*1995* - The opinion expressed in both documents is that it is important that the nation participates in a common European security policy. The attitude is interpreted as positive on the issue and the research question is provided with an affirmative answer. *2006* - In the party programme it comes across that the party believes it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy. It is interpreted as if the attitude is positive on the issue. The parliamentary protocol does not mention anything on this issue. This makes the attitude in the programme determine the outcome for this year. The attitude is vaguely positive and it means a vaguely affirmative answer to the research question. *2010* - In both the party programme and the parliamentary protocol it is expressed that participation in a common European security policy is important. It is interpreted as if the attitude is positive on the issue on whether it is important for the nation to participate in the common European security policy, or not. The research question is provided with an affirmative answer.

The Moderate Party experience unanimous attitudes with one slight alteration. This is due to one of the documents not expressing anything on the issue. Otherwise the attitudes are positive but with the exception just mentioned that makes the attitude of the middle year vaguely positive. As a consequence the level of adaptation is not as high in the middle year as in the other two. Still the party is adapted towards the Union in all the years. The Moderate Party has realised that it is important that Sweden participates in the common European security policy.

### 3.5.3 Comparison between the political parties

Each of the political parties have slight attitudinal alterations due to the lack of any mentioning in the parliamentary protocols. Still both of them are adapted in all three years.

### 3.6 Summarising Alterations and Adaptation

In the above we have investigated five research questions in three years which adds up to a total of fifteen years of investigation. The questions, as a reminder, are; (1) *Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?*, (2) *Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?*, (3) *Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?*, (4) *Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?* and (5) *Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?*. The researched years are 1995, 2006 and the first half of 2010. Below two diagrams are presented with the results from the analysis.

The study has shown that there are attitudinal alterations in both political parties and that both of them show adaptation towards the European Union in most of the years researched. The Moderate Party experience attitudinal alterations in one more question than the Social Democratic Party. The reason is as follows; both parties have totally unanimous attitudes, meaning that there are no attitudinal alterations at all, in the first (1) question. The Social Democratic Party furthermore has totally unanimous attitudes regarding in fourth (4) question. This effectively means the Moderate Party experience attitudinal alterations in one more question. The party experience attitudinal alterations in a total of four questions. The Social Democratic Party, on the other hand, experience alteration in three out of the five researched questions. As the analysis also has outlined the Moderate Party shows adaptation towards the European Union in more years per question. While the party is adapted in all the years in questions one (1), three (3) and five (5) it is also adapted in two out of the three years in questions two (2) and four (4). Consequently the party shows adaptation in thirteen years out of a total of fifteen years that are studied. The Social Democratic Party on the other hand is adapted in all the years in questions one (1), two (2) and five (5). It is also adapted in two out of three years in the third (3) question but not adapted in any of the years regarding the fourth (4) question. This means that the party shows adaptation in eleven years out of the total fifteen years of study. In other words, both political parties experience attitudinal alterations but the Moderate Party shows alteration in one more question than the Social Democratic Party. The Moderate Party also shows adaptation in more years per question than the Social Democratic Party. In the conclusion chapter these results will be discussed further. Before we make a resubmit to the theoretical approach of this study, the fusion perspective, let us look at an overview of the results.

<b>The Social Democratic Party</b>	<b>Attitudes 1995</b>	<b>Attitudes 2006</b>	<b>Attitudes 2010</b>	<b>Sum of adaptation</b>
Question 1	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Adapted all years
Question 2	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Positive & No mentioning	Adapted all years
Question 3	Positive & Positive	Negative & No mentioning	Negative & No mentioning	Adapted 2 out of 3 years
Question 4	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	No adaptation any year
Question 5	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Positive & No mentioning	Adapted all years

<b>The Moderate Party</b>	<b>Attitudes 1995</b>	<b>Attitudes 2006</b>	<b>Attitudes 2010</b>	<b>Sum of adaptation</b>
Question 1	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Positive & Positive	Adapted all years
Question 2	Positive & Negative	Positive & No mentioning	Positive & Positive	Adapted 2 out of 3
Question 3	Negative & Negative	Negative & No mentioning	Negative & Negative	Adapted all years
Question 4	Positive & Negative	Negative & Vaguely negative	Negative & Negative	Adapted 2 out of 3
Question 5	Positive & Positive	Positive & No mentioning	Positive & Positive	Adapted all years

### **3.7 Theoretical Implications**

The theoretical approach of this study is the fusion perspective (FP) that takes into account the attitudes of the national policy makers (see section 1.4.1.3). The fusion perspective's two indicators performance fusion and political fusion have been utilised to develop the second and third research question for this study. The findings of these questions are discussed in relation to the FP indicators in the below.

#### **3.7.1 Performance Fusion**

The first fusion perspective indicator, performance fusion, stresses an output related attitude to the European integration. The national policy-makers realise that the nation state no longer can provide welfare and necessary service for its citizens alone due to the current interdependence. This makes them acknowledge that EU membership is in the best interest of the nation for the sake of securing the welfare system. They are willing to accept the obligations and take part of European integration

as long as the EU provides them with economical and political results they no longer can provide themselves. The indicator also stresses that domestic support for the EU is important.<sup>104</sup> The second research question of this study, *"Is it believed that participation in the international collaboration provides output benefits the nation state no longer can provide?"*, is inspired by what the indicator stresses but it is has been given a broader definition than just the EU. The data shows that the Social Democratic Party has a positive attitude on this issue in all three years. It believes that there are output benefits from international collaboration and that the nation state cannot provide alone. The Moderate Party stresses a positive attitude on this issue in two out of the three years. When expressing their attitudes both political parties rather explicitly outline which the outputs from participating in international collaboration are, for example security and environmental regards. This might, in accordance with the FP indicator, be their way of promoting the output benefits in an attempt to keep the domestic support for continued participation in international collaboration. Another possible strategy for maintaining the citizens support could be to stress positive attitudes on the EU issues represented by questions one (1), two (2) and five (5) and negative attitudes on the issues represented by questions three (3) and four (4). Officially expressed attitudes like these would be a way to show the public that the parties themselves have embraced the idea of Sweden as an integrated part of the Union. And so is the case. The parties, with some exceptions, do express attitudes according to the above. It seems like the political parties might have traces of performance fusion in their attitudes and it is interesting to think that these traces potentially could be a contributing factor to the parties stressing the kind of attitudes that they in fact do in this study.

### 3.7.2 Political Fusion

The second indicator of the fusion perspective, namely political fusion, is the inspiration source for the third question *"Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?"*. The indicator makes an assumption that national policy-makers want EU to develop into an organisation with mostly supranational elements and intergovernmental elements in some more sensitive areas of collaboration<sup>105</sup>. This probably means that some pooling of sovereignty is not considered problematic by the actors. The data shows that the Social Democratic Party has negative attitudes on this question in two out of the three years. The Moderate Party, on the other hand, stresses negative attitudes in all years whereas they do not find decreased national sovereignty to be problematic. It is interesting that even when the

---

<sup>104</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.7

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8

parties give expression for supranational solutions, they sometimes still imply that intergovernmental aspects are important too. This might indicate what the political fusion mentions, that by not solely promoting supranational solutions the actors keep the door open for discussions with those in the population that are sceptic towards the European Union<sup>106</sup>. In other words we might witness strategic thinking by the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party in line with the political fusion.

---

<sup>106</sup> Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.8

## 4. Conclusions

Before we go in on the conclusions there need to be an additional outlining of the research questions; (1) *Should Sweden take an active part in developing the European integration process?*, (2) *Is it believed that participation in international collaboration provides output benefits that the nation state no longer can provide?*, (3) *Is pooling of sovereignty problematic?*, (4) *Is military non-alignment important for Sweden?* and (5) *Is it important that Sweden participates in a common European security policy?*

This study has shown that there are attitudinal alterations in both political parties. In the five questions representing EU related issues that are all investigated at three different years, the Moderate Party has attitudinal alterations in four questions while the Social Democratic Party has alterations in three of the total five questions. This effectively suggests that the Moderate Party has alterations in one question more than its rival party. As we have seen both political parties show adaptation towards the Union in most of the years investigated. The Moderate Party experience adaptation in thirteen out of the total fifteen years. The Social Democratic Party is adapted in a total of eleven years. Consequently each party has rather consistent attitudes between the years of research in each question. Let us not forget the fact that the Social Democratic Party has totally unanimous attitudes in the fourth (4) question which though indicates that it is not adapted towards the Union, but there is still no attitudinal alterations between the three years. Furthermore when comparing the parties it becomes evident that they express the same type of attitudes making them both adapted in most of the fifteen years researched. This also means that the assumption made in the beginning of this study, that the parties could differ with regards to early internal differences, is proven wrong (see section 1.7.2).

Attitudinal alterations combined with the fact that the political parties show adaptation towards the EU in many years, implies that the alterations probably are of such kind as not leading to changed political stance. This is correct. Most of the attitudinal changes are of the sort that the parties omit expressing any opinions, and therefore any attitudes, in the parliamentary protocol from one year to another. This makes the level of adaptation to become somewhat stronger or weaker in comparison with the previous or coming year, in that specific question. Some of the attitudinal alterations thus lead to changed political stance and therefore to a more manifestable change in the level of adaptation between the researched years. So is the case for the Social Democratic Party in the third

(3) question where it goes from indicating that pooling of sovereignty is problematic to indicating that it most likely is not. The Moderate Party demonstrate similar development, even if not as evidently, in two questions. In the second (2) question it goes from partly suggesting that the nation state itself can provide the same results as international collaboration to suggesting that there are output benefits from international collaboration that the nation cannot provide. Furthermore in the fourth (4) question the party goes from partly indicating that the principle of military non-alignment is important for Sweden to indicating that it is not. These alterations are most evident between the first year of investigation (1995) and the second (2006) which might have something to do with external influences. Maybe the Madrid- and London bombings contributed to the parties reassessing their stance. Attitudinal alterations leading to changed political stance only occur in these three cases. This might have to do with the fact that all the investigated issues represent rather "important" aspects of Sweden's relation to the European Union, whereas the parties are not likely to change their political stance easily.

As this study has shown the Moderate Party experience attitudinal alterations in one question more than its rival party. The Moderate Party is also adapted in more years, thirteen out of the fifteen years meanwhile the Social Democratic Party is adapted in eleven years. Is there a connection between experiencing attitudinal alterations in more questions and being adapted in more years? I do not believe so to be the case. If positive attitudes in the fourth (4) question would indicate adaptation, instead of as now indicating no adaptation, the Social Democrats would actually be adapted in more years than the Moderate Party. The point is that it is this very question making the party not being as adapted towards the Union as the Moderate Party, not the number of questions the party has attitudinal alterations in per se. Thus the sum of years a party is adapted has no connection with how many questions they show alteration in.

Earlier it was mentioned that I have an ambition to generalise the results from the empirical study (see section 1.7.1). As the observation is conducted and the analysis done I do believe that a generalisation is possible. Since the results (with one exception, see below) show that the parties indicate adaptation in high politics areas (the last two research questions) as well as in low politics areas (first three questions), it is assumed that there might be a connection between being adapted in high politics and low politics. Furthermore it might be possible that the parties also are adapted in low politic areas that are not investigated in this study. The exception referred to above is the Social Democratic Party in the fourth (4) question. The party is not adapted in any of the years regarding

this question but as we now it shows adaptation in almost all years in the other questions. This most likely implies that the party holds the principle of military non-alignment very important, but this does not seem to effect a possible connection between being adapted in high and low politics for the party.

The many years of adaptation towards the European Union by both the political parties might also be connected to the fusion perspective and its first indicator, the performance fusion. The indicator stresses the importance of a continued domestic support for the Union<sup>107</sup> and this might, as outlined in the analysis chapter, suggest that the parties would act in ways leading to continued support amongst the Swedish citizens. A good strategy for this would be to stress positive attitudes on questions one (1), two (2) and five (5) and negative attitudes on questions three (3) and four (4), since it would show the public that the parties themselves have embraced the idea of Sweden as an integrated part of the Union. As we know a consequence of the attitudes above is that the parties are adapted towards the Union. Consequently the many years of adaptation (thirteen respectively eleven years out of the total fifteen years) might have something to do with both being adapted in high politics as well as a strive, or maybe even a strategy, to keep the domestic support for the Union amongst the citizens.

Let us finally provide an answer to the overall question *”Has the political parties level of adaptation towards the European Union changed as it is expressed by their attitudes on issues related to the EU and possible alterations in these attitudes?”*. The answer is affirmative. As this study has shown both parties experience attitudinal alterations in almost all the questions investigated, which causes some changes in their level of adaption (to the EU) between the researched years for each of the questions. Most of the attitudinal alterations do not lead to changed political stance, they lead to nuance changes in the level of adaptation (that is stronger or weaker adaptation). Furthermore this study has shown that both the Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party are adapted towards the Union in most of the years researched. This means that the political parties have adjusted to the idea of Sweden being an integrated part with the European Union. In their party programmes and by their parliamentary statements they show attitudes that implies that Sweden should be a natural part of the Union and a willingness to continue and extend the collaboration. *These insights of the patterns of attitudes and adaptation in the two largest*

---

<sup>107</sup> Miles, L., ”National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States”, *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference*, Berlin, 2007, p.7

*political parties in Sweden is my contribution to the academic field.* I believe the insights to be important with regards to the societal role the parties possess. Since these two political parties are adapted towards the Union at an ideational level does it also mean that the national policy's are adjusted to the European Union as they are a part of creating these? Does it indicate that the public opinion have positive attitudes regarding the EU since parties are closely related to the public opinion? Furthermore, if the parties are adapted at an ideational level, how come other aspects of their politics, like institutional organisation, have not changed? The aspects just mentioned (see section 1.3), especially the connection between attitudes and institutional adaptation, would be interesting to investigate. I leave this up to the next researcher and conclude with stressing that the Swedish Social Democratic Party and the Moderate Party in their ideas have adjusted to Sweden as an integrated part of the European Union.

## Bibliography

Bäck, M & Möller, T., *Partier och Organisationer*, Second Edition, Gothenburg, Publica, 1992

Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H. & Wängnerud L., *Metodpraktikan - Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Third Edition, Stockholm, Nordstedts Juridik, 2007

*Handlingsprogram 1993*, Available at URL Address; [http://www.moderat.se/web/1993\\_ars\\_handlingsprogram.aspx](http://www.moderat.se/web/1993_ars_handlingsprogram.aspx) 3 of June 2010

*Idéprogram*, 2001 Available at URL Address; [http://www.moderat.se/web/Vart\\_handlingsprogram.aspx](http://www.moderat.se/web/Vart_handlingsprogram.aspx), 3 of June 2010

Johansson, K. M., "Sweden: another awkward partner?", Chapter in Wessels, W., Maurer, A., Mittag, J. (Editors), *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2003

Ladrech, R., *Europeanization and National Politics*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010

Ladrech, R., "Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis", *Party Politics*, 2002:8

Leth, G & Thurén, T., *Källkritik för internet*, Styrelsen för psykologiskt försvar, Rapport 177, Stockholm, 2000

Löden H., *Konflikt och konsensus i svensk utrikespolitik: Fallet Afghanistan*, Licentiate dissertation, Gothenburg, University of Gothenburg, 1994

Löden, H., & Miles, L., *The Swedish Left and European Integration: Linking Laval and Lisbon*, Unpublished ms.

Miles, L., "National Adaptation and Fusion in the Nordic States", Published in *Northern Europe and the Future of the European Union Nordeuropa Institut Conference, Humboldt University of Berlin*, Berlin, 15 of October 2007

Miljöpartiet (2010), *Mp ska inte förorda att Sverige ska lämna EU*, URL Address; [http://www.mp.se/templates/Mct\\_78.aspx?avdnr=5&number=156616](http://www.mp.se/templates/Mct_78.aspx?avdnr=5&number=156616), 3 of June 2010

Misgeld, K., (Editor), *Socialdemokratins program 1897 till 1990*, Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek, Stockholm, 2001, Available at URL Address; <http://www.socialdemokraterna.se/Var-politik/Partiprogram-och-riktlinjer/>, 3 of June 2010

Mittag, J., Wessels, W., "The 'One' and 'Fifteen'? The Member States between procedural adaptation and structural revolution", Chapter in Wessels, W., Maurer, A., Mittag, J. (Editors), *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2003

Möller, T., *Svensk politisk historia 1809-1975*, Second Edition, Lund, Studentlitteratur, 2005

*Partiprogram för Socialdemokraterna*, 2001, Available at URL Address; <http://www.socialdemokraterna.se/Var-politik/Partiprogram-och-riktlinjer/>, 3 of June 2010

Riksdagen (2010), *Kammarens protokoll*, URL Address: <http://www.riksdagen.se/Webbnav/index.aspx?nid=101&bet=2009/10:76#{E2CFB5EA-EFB1-4DD7-84B0-FD2415E37C2D}>, 8 of May 2010

Riksdagens Protokoll 1994/95. Nr. 64, Stockholm, 1995

Riksdagens Protokoll 2005/06. Nr. 72, Stockholm, 2006

Sjöberg, G., *Det här vill Moderaterna*, Stockholm, 2005

Tallberg, J., Aylott, N., Bergström, C F., Casula Vifell Å. & Palme, J., *Europiseringen av Sverige*, Demokratirådets rapport 2010, Stockholm, SNS, 2010

*Vår tids arbetarparti - Handlingsprogram för nya moderaterna*, 2007, Available at URL Adress; [http://www.moderat.se/web/Vart\\_handlingsprogram.aspx](http://www.moderat.se/web/Vart_handlingsprogram.aspx), 3 of June 2010

Wessels, W., Maurer, A., Mittag, J., "The European Union and Member States: analysing two arenas over time", Chapter in Wessels, W., Maurer, A., Mittag, J. (Editors), *Fifteen into One? : The European Union and Its Member States*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2003