

Political Science Research in Sweden 1960-1975: An Overview

OLOF RUIN
University of Stockholm

Swedish research on politics during the fifteen year period 1960–1975 has not been confined to the departments of political science in Sweden. Research of this kind has also occurred in other university departments as well as outside the universities. However, the major portion of the country's political research has taken place within the framework of political science.

1. The Background

The content and focus of an academic discipline is determined by a series of different background factors. In a discussion of the background of Swedish political science it is appropriate to examine five such factors: (a) the intellectual tradition within the discipline, (b) international contacts and influences, (c) the domestic network of contacts, (d) funding and (e) the relations between society and political science research.

The Intellectual Tradition. Swedish political science research, as pointed out by Nils Elvander in his article 'Growth of the Profession 1960–1975', is based on quite a long tradition in comparison with the other Nordic countries. A chair, the Johan Skytte professor of discourse and politics, was established as early as 1622 at the University of Uppsala. The scholars holding this chair did not, however, concentrate on the study of politics until the 1840s. During the first half of the twentieth century a similar study of politics was introduced at the universities of Lund, Gothenburg and Stockholm. These pedigrees in themselves may seem modest. Slightly more than one hundred years, however, is not an insignificant period of time in a rapidly developing scientific discipline characterized by swift changes in focus and methods.

The content of Swedish political science research during the first half of the 1900s was dominated by three main currents. Each of these currents was oriented toward another academic discipline. One current was related to constitutional law. Many political scientists devoted their attention to the study of written law: its background, substance and application. The focal point of this interest was the 1809 Instrument of Government, the second oldest written constitution in the

Political Science Research in Sweden 1960-1975: An Overview

OLOF RUIN
University of Stockholm

Swedish research on politics during the fifteen year period 1960–1975 has not been confined to the departments of political science in Sweden. Research of this kind has also occurred in other university departments as well as outside the universities. However, the major portion of the country's political research has taken place within the framework of political science.

1. The Background

The content and focus of an academic discipline is determined by a series of different background factors. In a discussion of the background of Swedish political science it is appropriate to examine five such factors: (a) the intellectual tradition within the discipline, (b) international contacts and influences, (c) the domestic network of contacts, (d) funding and (e) the relations between society and political science research.

The Intellectual Tradition. Swedish political science research, as pointed out by Nils Elvander in his article 'Growth of the Profession 1960–1975', is based on quite a long tradition in comparison with the other Nordic countries. A chair, the Johan Skytte professor of discourse and politics, was established as early as 1622 at the University of Uppsala. The scholars holding this chair did not, however, concentrate on the study of politics until the 1840s. During the first half of the twentieth century a similar study of politics was introduced at the universities of Lund, Gothenburg and Stockholm. These pedigrees in themselves may seem modest. Slightly more than one hundred years, however, is not an insignificant period of time in a rapidly developing scientific discipline characterized by swift changes in focus and methods.

The content of Swedish political science research during the first half of the 1900s was dominated by three main currents. Each of these currents was oriented toward another academic discipline. One current was related to constitutional law. Many political scientists devoted their attention to the study of written law: its background, substance and application. The focal point of this interest was the 1809 Instrument of Government, the second oldest written constitution in the

world. Special attention was given to the question of the origin and influences shaping this constitutional document. One school of thought stressed the influence of foreign doctrines, another school emphasized the importance of the national tradition.

A second line of analysis in political science was influenced by the discipline of history. Political events of various kinds in the fairly recent past were analyzed. Particular interest was devoted to the study of the development of different political institutions and processes. An analysis restricted to written law was viewed as not providing an adequate picture of the functioning of different institutions and procedures. Much attention centered on the evolution of parliamentarism, primarily in Sweden but also in a number of other countries. Numerous studies, based on vast source material, dealt with the formation, dissolution and inner working procedures of governments. The expressed purpose of these studies was to elucidate the successive shifts in power in the relationships between the head of state, parliament and the government.

A third current in political science finally gravitated toward philosophy and the history of ideas. Classical political thought as well as modern ideologies were regarded as a major line of inquiry in political science. Works were published on various bodies of ideas, their background, historical development, the correctness of their appraisals of reality, etc.

At the end of the Second World War, each of these lines of inquiry in Swedish political science was dominated by an outstanding figure: Fredrik Lagerroth, Axel Brusewitz and Herbert Tingsten. Fredrik Lagerroth at the University of Lund mainly concentrated on a study of written laws and their origin; he passed away in 1974. Axel Brusewitz was at the University of Uppsala. Among his accomplishments was an inspiring leadership of the extensive research on the evolution of parliamentarism. Brusewitz died in 1950 shortly after he had retired. Lastly, at the University of Stockholm there was Herbert Tingsten, the most dynamic of the three. His major area of research was the analysis of ideas. Herbert Tingsten left political science in 1946 when he was appointed editor-in-chief of *Dagens Nyheter*, the largest morning newspaper in the Nordic countries. New editions of his writings in political science were published during subsequent decades; e.g., his major work on the historical development of the political thought of the Swedish Social Democrats was published in English as *The Swedish Social Democrats* as recently as 1973 (B 22, 1973).

Although Swedish political science during the first half of the twentieth century was characterized by three main currents, each dominated by one man, it would be too much to say that the discipline was divided into three independent parts. On the contrary, these three currents were intimately interconnected with each other; Lagerroth, Brusewitz and Tingsten were at home in all of them at the same time as they symbolized one. A noticeable feature of Swedish political science during this period was indeed the ability of political scientists to fuse perspectives and ways of thinking found in law, history, and philosophy into a single study of the institutions and processes of central importance in political systems.

International contacts. The contacts of Swedish political scientists with political

science in other countries can take many different forms: research on political conditions in other countries, teaching at foreign universities, participation in international arrangements of various kinds, reading the literature, and acting as host to foreign researchers visiting Sweden. Instances of all of these forms can be found between the years 1960 and 1975.

The rhythm and substance of these contacts varied in earlier periods. Before the Second World War there was not very much political science to keep in touch with. Sweden was one of the few countries where political science existed at all as an independent and well-established discipline at the universities. On the other hand, it was not uncommon for Swedish political scientists to live abroad and conduct research on political conditions in other countries. A series of studies was also published on political institutions and practices in other countries besides Sweden alone. But since many of these studies were written in Swedish, they have unfortunately remained almost unknown outside the Nordic countries.

During the years immediately following the Second World War, political science became established in several other countries, amongst them Denmark and Norway. At times during these years the contacts between Swedish political science and that in countries outside Scandinavia could have seemed to be less intensive than the contacts of, for example, the expanding young discipline in Norway. Contacts between American and Norwegian research in political science thus appeared to be somewhat closer than between American and Swedish research. Young Swedish political scientists had a strong tradition of their own for support and therefore did not feel as great a need to travel abroad to receive their education. Furthermore, Swedish social scientists did not have the same opportunities to receive scholarships for studies abroad as did, for example, their Norwegian colleagues.

Nevertheless, as was mentioned above, by the 60s and 70s Swedish political science had become well integrated into the international network of contacts within the discipline.

One exceedingly important area of contacts for Sweden, as well as for the other Nordic countries, is American political science. Now it is almost a general rule that young Swedish political scientists study for a period of time at a university in the US. Many have participated in the courses arranged by the Institute of Social Research in Ann Arbor; the department in Gothenburg is a member of the ICPSR. Projects consisting of both American and Swedish political scientists, and based on American and Swedish data, have been started. American political scientists pop up very often in the academic environment in Sweden. Sweden, it seems, has come to be regarded as an example of a small, and consequently easily surveyed, post-industrial society which is valuable to include in comparative research. So far, Sweden has tended to both encounter and attempt to solve at an early point in time the problems which appear to be common to post-industrial societies.

Another important area of contacts now is European political science. Contacts with the rest of Europe have mainly developed during the 1970s. At the beginning of the decade the European Consortium for Political Research was formed. Sweden, like the other Nordic countries, has been very active in this organi-

zation. Every year, for example, roughly twenty Swedish scholars participate in the annual Joint Sessions of Workshops; every year young Swedish political scientists also participate in the courses organized by the ECPR. A sense of community within European political science is gradually beginning to develop.

Domestic Network of Contacts. The pattern of contacts within Swedish political science, as well as between political science and other disciplines, has of course also been of significance for the development of political science research.

The pattern of internal contacts *within* each of the five departments of political science has naturally varied; a fifth department was established at Umeå in the early 60s. Certain common conditions have, however, had an impact on intra-departmental contacts. The explosion in enrollment during the 1960s was dramatic at some departments of political science. The small number of professors, who were supposed to fulfil a large portion of their duties in the form of research, became largely occupied with administrative tasks. University lecturers, an expanding category of university teachers, were almost entirely occupied with teaching undergraduate courses. The substantial amount of research, which was conducted during these years in spite of everything, was mainly done by younger researchers and doctoral candidates.

Contacts between the five departments of political science have been frequent and beneficial. Regular consultations have taken place. There have been several research projects consisting of personnel from two or more departments. Since the beginning of the 1970s, the graduate studies programs have been revised and now a similar program exists at all five departments. Some instruction has even been provided on a joint basis; graduate students from the five departments convene during a shorter period for intensive instruction. One reason for this organized cooperation has been quite simply the realization that individually the five departments of political science are relatively small with limited resources, but together they constitute a rather significant research unit. Parallels have been drawn at times with American conditions. The size and the capacity of the five Swedish departments, viewed as one unit, correspond to a department at one of the large U.S. universities with a vital research program. Staff mobility among the Swedish departments, however, has not been achieved; persons who receive their doctoral degree at one department seldom move to another department.

The organized cooperation existing among the country's five departments of political science has been facilitated by a fairly good intellectual climate. Naturally there have been intellectual disputes among individual political scientists. To be sure, there has periodically also been a rather intense and bitter debate within the discipline. But a more permanent division of the discipline into various groupings with divergent approaches, hostile to one another, has not occurred. It is perhaps characteristic that two of the 'new' currents in political science during the postwar period – the behavioral movement and the Marxist influences during the late 1960s and the 1970s – have not generated the intense dissensions which have characterized the social sciences in a number of other countries. Comparatively widespread agreement prevailed, when behavioralism was eventually introduced at all departments, that the new approach was important and essential. Those who

may have felt sceptical were fairly silent. Marxist influence was met with rather widespread indifference. Of course some individuals were firmly committed for or against; a majority remained fairly aloof, however.

Contacts *between* political science and other disciplines have been rather infrequent in Sweden. Here, as in other countries, various circles have advocated more cooperation and an exchange of ideas between traditional academic subjects. There has been much talk of multidisciplinary and problem-oriented research. Although these demands were frequently expressed, there were few research institutes in Sweden in the period 1960–75 that concentrated on a single problem area and consisted of researchers trained in different traditional disciplines. As the period came to a close, several plans for establishing such research institutes were being discussed, and by 1977 some of these plans have come a long way towards implementation.

Funding. In Sweden the resources for political science research, and social science research in general, are simultaneously both remarkably limited and substantial.

The scarcity of resources pertains to permanent research positions. The remarkably small number of professorships in political science is often acknowledged and has been criticized. At present, as shown in Table II in Nils Elvander's article, there are only 9 professors of political science in Sweden. In terms of population, Sweden is larger than its three neighboring countries. But Denmark, Finland and Norway each have a larger number of professorships than Sweden.

Funds for short-term research projects in Sweden are more readily available, however. There are three major sources of funding for such projects: the Swedish Council of Social Science Research, the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Fund, and various bodies involved in sectoral planning. Council research grants have increased even after taking inflation into account. The Tercentenary Fund was established in connection with the 300th anniversary of the Bank of Sweden and the amount of money it allocates annually must be regarded as considerable by Nordic standards. During the first ten years of the Fund's existence, Swedish political science had received a total of 20 million crowns from the Fund. The funding of social science research by bodies involved in sectoral planning has primarily occurred during the 1970s, but this form of funding has expanded rapidly. There has been a steady increase in appropriations to various authorities for research and development, with a large portion of these funds being used to commission research concerning various social problems.

In a study on Swedish social science research commissioned by the Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities, Dick Ramström, a business economist at the University of Uppsala, has attempted to make a rough estimate of the total amount of funds available to social science research in Sweden during one year, 1973–74. The amount was estimated to be approximately 77 million crowns. A little over half of the amount was in the form of revenues received by the universities within the framework of the regular government budget. Roughly 17 million was obtained in the form of grants from various funds, primarily from the Swedish Council of Social Science Research and the Tercentenary Fund. Roughly the same

amount – approximately 16 million – came from bodies involved in sectoral planning. The bulk of this research is financed by funds administered by central and regional public bodies. The ability of different social science disciplines to attract money from funds and sectoral bodies varies. Political science is not among the least successful. The most successful disciplines in this respect are psychology and education.¹

The Relations between Society and Political Science. Swedish society naturally influences the content and focus of the nation's political science research in various ways. This influence can vary both in degree and directness. One influence, even if weak and indirect, consists in the mere fact that the political scientist in selecting research tasks is influenced by problems which happen to be of current interest to the society he or she is living in. In addition, there is a growing tendency on the part of political scientists, as well as other social scientists, to stress explicitly the social relevance of the research they wish to undertake. The emphasis on one's research as being of significance for society is partially a response to a traditional criticism which has been levelled at the universities for being isolated from society. This sort of emphasis, however, appears especially urgent if external funding is desired by a project and if this funding is based, in part, on judgements concerning the project's relevance for society. For example, the Tercentenary Fund applies such criteria of relevance in giving priority to project applications.

A sectoral funding of research naturally enough leads to both a strong and direct influence on the content of a research program. The research which is carried out must be of direct value to politicians, administrators and planners in their area of activity. In the case of political science, this type of research has been initiated by both the authorities funding the projects and university researchers who have inquired if there was an interest in an analysis of certain specific questions. Many examples of this sort of practical research can be mentioned: inquiry commissions concerning constitutional reforms have provided research tasks for the departments of political science; the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation has turned to political scientists to analyse certain aspects of the content of radio programs; local government bodies have sponsored research dealing with planning; the central administrative agency for higher education has financed various projects concerning university administration; immigration authorities have commissioned research concerning the political socialization of immigrants in Sweden.

Another form of direct societal influence on the choice and orientation of research tasks in political science is quite simply the practical experience of the political scientist in politics and administration. Movement back and forth between a university position and employment outside the universities is not common in Sweden. The system of appointing university positions militates against this sort of shuttle traffic. Rather often, however, university-employed political scientists are utilized as experts for limited periods in the administration. Furthermore, many political scientists are politically active; in the elections in September 1976 for example, three university teachers of political science were elected to parliament. Some of the university-employed political scientists who have served as experts or

held political office eventually left the universities for good; others have returned, however, and contributed their practical experiences and observations to the departments' political research.

2. General Features

The general lines of development followed by political science research in Sweden between 1960 and 1975 resemble for the most part trends that can be discerned in the discipline in the Western world. This resemblance can in itself be viewed as an indication that international influence has played an especially important role among all the different factors determining the development of the discipline. Swedish political scientists have largely worked within the same frames of reference as political scientists in other countries; they have tended to be influenced by and refer to the same theoretical works.

During the first part of the 60s, what is usually called the behaviorist wave in political science had swept through the departments at all universities. The group that was mainly responsible for introducing this movement to Sweden was that comprised of Jörgen Westerståhl and his associates, especially Bo Särilvik. Westerståhl had been appointed professor at the University of Gothenburg in 1951. The Department of Political Science there was the first in Sweden to offer thorough training in quantitative techniques; it was also the first to carry out large-scale projects concerning political behavior of the masses. Studies of both voters and the mass media had been begun in the 50s. This behaviorist wave was of course largely influenced by American example. The fact that it did not sweep through the whole of Sweden until fairly late can be taken as an indication of the fact that during the 50s relatively few Swedish researchers had studied at American universities where sociological perspectives and quantitative methods stood at the forefront. At the same time it should be pointed out, however, that Sweden had something of a tradition of its own in this field. As early as 1937 Herbert Tingsten had published *Political Behavior*, a pioneering work on the study of mass behavior.

During the 1960s the general mood in Swedish political science, as in political science in many other countries, was characterized by optimism. Many political scientists entertained fairly high hopes concerning the possibilities of evolving a general theory of politics and political behavior based on empirical findings. These hopes stemmed from a fairly strong belief in the methodological and technical innovations which at this time were being incorporated into Swedish political science. Considerable energy was expended in specifying aims and formulating clear definitions of concepts. There was a wave of enthusiasm for attempts to measure various phenomena by using quantitative methods.

During the 1970s a certain reaction has occurred in Swedish political science, as in other countries. The optimism concerning the possibility to generalize on the basis of common theoretical assumptions and vast amounts of data has diminished. The multiplicity of theoretical perspectives has persisted; the difficulties in comparing data from different political systems still exist. Criticism has also been levelled at

an alleged preoccupation with aspects lending themselves to operationalization and measurement. This emphasis has been felt to lead to a neglect of certain areas of research. A naive attitude is also considered to have been displayed at times towards the role of values in the research process.

This new climate, which naturally is observable in varying degrees in most of the social sciences, has not, however, meant that Swedish political science has discarded the concern for methodology and techniques which emerged during the 1960s. On the contrary, this persistent concern is among other things illustrated by the fact that obligatory instruction in methods and techniques has expanded at all the departments of political science. Now, however, the complexity of the research process is stressed more than during the previous decade. An interest in analyzing the discipline's intellectual structure has also manifested itself in political science: how problems are formulated, how operationalizations are conducted, how conclusions are drawn, etc. Young scholars representing this new form of awareness in Swedish political science are, e.g., Jan Erik Lane in Umeå, Evert Vedung in Uppsala and Björn Wittrock in Stockholm.

There have also occurred certain shifts in the selection of research subjects during the 1970s in Swedish political science which correspond to a well-known international trend; naturally there are areas which have continued to be perennial objects of research and concern. One shift of this kind is the current focus on policy studies. To be sure, research centering on specific policy areas was conducted prior to the 1970s. In the 1960s a number of such studies were published, e.g., Bo Jonsson on the policy toward the Swedish ore fields around the turn of the century (C 521, 1969), Sven-Ola Lindeberg on Swedish unemployment policy during the 1920s (C 51, 1968), and Hans Wieslander on Swedish defense policy in the 1920s (D 17, 1966). A new feature in the 1970s was an analysis of contemporary policy in various areas. Lennart J. Lundquist began to publish books and articles dealing with environmental policy (C 61, 1971, 1973). In the middle of the decade a very large policy-oriented project, known as the Politics as Rational Action Project, was started at the University of Uppsala. In principle, it is to comprise all the active researchers at the department, and its objective is to elucidate and explain, on the basis of a rational theory, a series of different policy decision in Sweden. At about the same time a number of political scientists at the University of Stockholm embarked on a study of the education and research policy of a number of countries. In Gothenburg, finally, a project has been launched on nuclear power and energy policies in Sweden.

An additional shift in the selection of research subjects is a revived interest in the major institutions and procedures of the political process. Of course, this interest also existed to some degree during the 1960s, but the input side of politics was strongly accentuated during the decade: electoral behavior, the formation of opinion, parties and organizations. Now in the mid-1970s Bo Bjurulf at the University of Lund is in charge of a study of the Swedish remiss procedure of consultation; at the University of Gothenburg a study of the Swedish system of inquiry commissions is in progress; at the University of Stockholm studies concerning the working procedures of the government and parliament have been started.

In subsequent parts of this essay a more detailed account of the subjects researched in Swedish political science during the period 1960–75 will be given. To do so it is of course necessary that the material be organized in some suitable way. Unfortunately, no one principle of classification is completely adequate, while any combination of principles is difficult to apply consistently because of overlapping. In an essay on the development of Swedish political science in the post-war period in SPS, Vol. 4, Olof Ruin divided up his subject according to five different dimensions: nature, level, region (i.e., area), point of time, and sector.

Of these five dimensions, one – level – seems to be especially suitable to a more detailed presentation of research in Swedish political science during this particular period, 1960–75. The largest research project undertaken by Swedish political scientists during this period took the dimension of level as one of its points of departure: the project involved a study of local government in Sweden from a number of different perspectives. Interest in international politics, which had earlier been documented in Swedish political science, was intensified, as witnessed by a series of new studies. To these two levels can of course be added a continued – and still dominant – interest in politics at the ‘national’ level, particularly Swedish politics, but to some extent also non-Swedish. This primary stress on level does not mean, however, that such dimensions as area, time, and sector have been totally ignored.

The fact that a great deal of Swedish work in political science can be arranged according to level reveals one of the weaknesses of this scientific effort, for there is not very much written on the interaction between levels, or on such processes as steering and decentralization.² One scholar who has been active in this field however, is Lennart Lundquist, originally associated with the University of Lund but now professor at the University of Copenhagen. His most important work is *Means and Goals of Political Decentralization*. It is often quoted, even outside of Sweden; the model of decentralization developed in this study has aroused a remarkable amount of attention.

Before the review of Swedish political science under the headings ‘local politics’, ‘national politics’, and ‘international politics’ is embarked upon, a presentation will first be made of what has been accomplished within the field of political theory. Naturally, the boundaries of this sub-discipline cut across boundaries based on the level of politics dealt with in this essay.

3. Political Theory

This field of political science encompasses a broad sphere. Principles of classification and distinctions in it often vary. One distinction has been upheld with remarkable tenacity in Swedish political science: the distinction between normative and empirical theories. Normative theories refer to theories concerning what the nature of politics ought to be, whereas empirical theories refer to theories constructed for application in empirically oriented research. The desire to maintain this sharp distinction is related to a tradition which has been very strong in Swe-

dish intellectual life. It has been repeatedly emphasized, although less during the 1970s than in previous decades, that a distinction must be maintained between propositions containing an evaluation and propositions containing a statement about reality. The truth of the latter can be verified but not that of the former.

Normative Theory. Few Swedish political scientists have themselves produced theories on what the nature of politics ought to be. On the other hand, there are many Swedish political scientists who have devoted themselves to the study of normative theories formulated by others. The analysis of political thought and ideologies, as already emphasized, has a fairly long tradition in Swedish political science. The emphases in this type of analysis have varied. Among others, Leif Lewin and Evert Vedung have sought to systematize various conceivable approaches to the analysis of political ideas and ideologies (Lewin B 20, 1972 and Vedung B 20, 1974, 1975).

One branch of the analysis of political thought and ideologies is historically oriented. The development of ideas and ideologies has been studied. Examples of works of this kind from the years 1960–1975 are Nils Elvander's study on Swedish conservative thought 1865–1922 (B 27, 1961), Reidar Larsson's examination of theories of revolution in Russia (B 23, 1970), and Daniel Tarschys' analysis of the concept of the state in both classical and Soviet Marxism (B 23, 1972). Two scholars who have manifested a continuous interest in this type of analysis of political thought are Elias Berg at the University of Stockholm and Stefan Björklund at the University of Uppsala (Björklund B 20, 1970).

An analysis of ideas and ideologies can also have many other focal points. In addition to the delineation of the historical development of ideas, the degree of truth in appraisals of reality can be verified and the logic of arguments can be tested. Herbert Tingsten, as mentioned, is the outstanding figure in Swedish political science representing this broad analysis of political thought and ideologies. He did not write any new works in this area during the 1960s but he did eagerly interject his views into the contemporary debate on the role of ideologies in politics. With great persistence he argued the thesis of the end of ideologies (B 21, 1966). This occurred before the radicalism of the 1960s had gained momentum and Marxism had experienced a renaissance. Moreover, this thesis had been formulated by Tingsten long before Daniel Bell published his famous book *The End of Ideology*. Tingsten's thesis was challenged in Sweden by other political scientists. One of them was Leif Lewin who published a study of the debate on a planned economy which had been carried on during four decades (B 22, 1967).

As a rule, ideological writings with their built-in values and descriptions of reality have not been utilized in the construction of empirically oriented theories in Swedish political science. This is largely a consequence of the sharp distinction maintained in political theory between normative thought on what the nature of politics ought to be and the construction of instruments for the analysis of reality. In at least one area, however, the gap between normative and empirical theories has been bridged. This concerns the study of the problems of democracy: ideological writings on democracy have been analyzed at the same time as models for empirically oriented research on democracy have been constructed.

In Swedish political science there is a tradition of analyzing the problems of democracy. Again Herbert Tingsten is a forerunner in this area. In 1946 he wrote a book entitled *The Problem of Democracy*, which appeared in English translation in 1965 (B 21, 1965). Elias Berg published a work entitled *Democracy and the Majority Principle* (B 21, 1965). The problematic dimension of democracy, which has received particular attention during the late 1960s and early 1970s, concerned the implications of democracy in the sense of congruence between the will of the majority and the policies of the government vis-à-vis democracy in the sense of citizen participation in political decisions. Within the framework of the earlier mentioned research project on local government, which will be presented in more detail below, a model emphasizing the first aspect was constructed (Westerståhl C 71, 1970 and B 21, 1971). Another model was presented by Leif Lewin in a book that contained a systematic survey of American academic literature during the post-war period relating to the problems of democracy (D 32, 1970). These diverse American writings were classified into two groups: the 'functionalists' and the 'normativists'. The latter group included those writers who considered democracy to be implemented to the extent that the people participate in the political decision making process. In an article in *SPS*, Vol. IX, Olof Ruin stressed that the demands for participation by individuals in the decision-making processes in various spheres of society easily pave the way for more corporatism, i.e., an intensified incorporation of interest organizations into the machinery of government (B 21, 1974). The interest in the participation dimension of democratic theory during the late 1960s and the early 1970s was a natural reflection of political conditions in Swedish society; more than before, people voiced demands to participate in decisions which directly affected them.

Empirical Theory. The interest in the second dimension of political theory – the construction of theoretical tools for use in empirically oriented research – increased greatly during the 1960s. One of the leading Swedish political scientists with this type of theoretical orientation was Gunnar Sjöblom, now professor at the University of Copenhagen. This orientation was clearly a result of the general interest in methodology and techniques which now began to gain prominence. Consequently Swedish political scientists, like political scientists in many other countries, were strongly influenced by a number of American theorists. Most of these theorists were subsequently cited in Swedish works. There were, however, two theorists whose ideas were particularly influential in Swedish political science. Moreover these two theorists appear to some degree as opposite poles: David Easton emphasizing a systems perspective and Anthony Downs emphasizing actors who behave rationally.

The influences of David Easton's ideas arrived first. His book *The Political System* appeared in 1953 and was read quite early, i.e., by a group of young scholars at the University of Lund. Most members of this group, in a way uncommon for Swedish political science, subsequently moved to different universities around the country. Easton's first book served as a general plea for greater systematization, categorization and classification of political data than had been common in the highly descriptive Swedish political science during the early post-war

period. It was Easton's books from the 1960s, however, which were most frequently cited. Many Swedish works presented the major features of his system in considerable detail. In contrast it was less usual to allow his framework of analysis to permeate entirely a study or to attempt to refine various features of Easton's theory.³ Easton's role in Swedish political science, although large, was chiefly restricted to providing a common framework of reference for many scholars.

Anthony Downs with his book, *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, has directly shaped research in Swedish political science to a greater extent than Easton. His theory of parties as a team of individuals desiring to gain political office through maximizing votes was developed in various directions. The goals assumed to explain the behavior of parties were differentiated in a variety of ways; several secondary goals were included; the conceptual apparatus was refined, etc. It is correct to say that utilization of rational models in explaining political behavior has formed a special school in Swedish political science.

The pioneer in Swedish political science of this actor-oriented research is Björn Molin. In 1965 he published a study of the political conflict in Sweden during the late 1950s over supplementary pensions (D 21, 1965). The book constituted both an independent elaboration of Downs' reasoning and an application of a scheme of analysis, formulated by Molin, to this important issue in Swedish politics. Additional empirical studies in Sweden applying a goals-means approach have been mainly conducted in the area of party research. The major Swedish theoretical work of this genre is Gunnar Sjöblom's book published in 1968, *Party Strategies in a Multiparty System*; the book is often quoted in the Nordic political science literature but is surprisingly not utilized much outside the Nordic countries (D 20, 1968 cf. also Sjöblom D 20, 1967). The book builds upon the approaches of Downs and Easton and can be viewed as an attempt to bridge the gap between actor-oriented and systems-oriented theories.⁴

Earlier it was stated that a Marxist inspired critique of the main current in Swedish political science has been rather limited within the discipline. It is characteristic that two of the existing criticisms are levelled at systems-oriented theory and actor-oriented theory respectively. In 1971 Maj Palmberg, who is a member of a research group on problems of the developing countries at the University of Uppsala, published an article containing a critical discussion, of the kind which is now fairly common, challenging Easton's theory and especially the theories of Almond, Apter and Pye (A 2, 1971). Lennart Berntsson criticized Downs and the Swedish elaborations of his theory (D 20, 1974). Both Palmberg and Berntsson were critical of these American political scientists and their followers in Sweden for having neglected the significance of actual economic structures and, consequently, according to Palmberg and Berntsson, also condemned themselves to conducting research of a superficial nature.⁵

It should be finally noted that the growing interest among Swedish political scientists during the 1960s in constructing theoretical tools for empirical analysis has primarily focused on the formation of schemes of analysis and definitions of concepts. The construction of formal models has been comparatively rare. Two examples of the construction of such models however are Bo Bjurulf's model for

studying legislative voting behavior (C 321, 1972) and Leif Lewin's model for aggregate analysis presented in the book, *The Swedish Electorate 1887-1968* (D 342, 1972). Two useful textbooks, written by Ingemar Lindblad and Björn Söderfelt for teaching methodology and research techniques in political science have been published during these years (Lindblad A 2, 1972 and Söderfelt A 2, 1972).

Analysis of Arguments. One contemporary line of inquiry in Swedish political science – simultaneously related to both the traditional interest in the analysis of ideas and ideology and to the growing interest of the 1960s in the construction of tools to be used in empirically oriented research – is the analysis of arguments. There are a remarkable number of studies of political debates and the arguments presented in these debates.

These analyses of arguments have had a variety of purposes and varying focal points; at times several purposes have been combined in one study. However, three different purposes stand out as central. One aim has been simply to interpret and present the nuances in the content of a debate; the subject matter of the debate is thus regarded as of essential importance. A second aim has been to attempt to dissect the logical structure of a debate and examine the inter-relationships between arguments; here the manner of conducting a debate on a political problem appears as crucial. A third aim finally has been, through an analysis of arguments, to attempt to explain other facets of the actors' behavior; in this case the actors in the debate are of prime interest, not the content or the structure of the debate. This third type of analysis of arguments is directly related to the interest in actor-oriented theories which has characterized Swedish political science.

Arguments can be analyzed with the use of quantitative techniques. To date, this type of analysis of arguments has been mainly conducted at the departments at Gothenburg, Lund and Stockholm; the technique developed at the University of Stockholm was presented in an article in *SPS*, Vol. 7, written by Magnus Isberg, Anders Wettergren and Björn Wittrock (A 2, 1972). The major purpose of the research conducted at the University of Gothenburg has been to analyse the attributes and content of large amounts of text in quantitative terms; a good presentation of the technique used is given by Jörgen Westerståhl in a book on objectivity in the reporting of news (D 332, 1972). At Lund and Stockholm there has also been a concern with using quantitative content analysis to attempt to comment on the behavior of the 'debaters'.

Many analyses of arguments which are not based on quantitative methods can also be mentioned: the debate on religious instruction in Swedish schools by Karl-Göran Algotsson (D 18, 1975), the Swedish debate on the EEC by Mats Bergquist (D 23, 1970), the international debate on research and society by Sverker Gustavsson (A 2, 1971), the Swedish debate on the state church by Carl Arvid Hessler (D 18, 1964), the Swedish foreign policy debate in connection with the Korean War by Barry Holmström (D 24, 1972), the Swedish debate concerning the formation of governments by Olof Ruin (C 311, 1968), and the debate on the Norwegian-Swedish Union at the turn of the century by Evert Vedung (B 20, 1971).

The large interest of Swedish political science in the analysis of arguments is unusual. International forerunners or parallels are few; an often quoted American work, however, is R. A. Levine's *The Arms Debate*. In fact, this focus on the analysis of arguments can be identified as a distinctive Swedish tradition.

4. Local and Regional Politics

Politics at the local level was the most neglected level of politics in Swedish political science for a long time. Thus, at the beginning of the 1960s there was hardly any research dealing with local government politics in Sweden or in other countries. Most of the Swedish studies that did exist were influenced by administrative law. The situation was radically changed when a large project on local government politics was started in 1965.

The decision to select local government politics as the object of a huge research endeavor is indicative of the trends of the 1960s. Swedish local government politics was in the midst of a tremendous transition. As a result of steady migration, three-fourths of the population were already living in built-up areas; parallel with this, local government services had rapidly expanded and had become more diversified; local government units had successively been merged into larger units. In the early 1950s, the number of local government units (the communes) was reduced from 2,500 to 1,000, and during the 1960s the number was expected to decline to less than 300. The future form of government at the local level was a topic of public discussion. Within the discipline, research on local politics also appeared tempting; the field was totally unresearched. Furthermore, comparisons aiming at generalizations would be easy to do; there were a large number of units to analyze and they had a similar organization and similar functions.

The organization and funding of the local government research projects is also illustrative of the spirit of expansion during the 1960's. The project included all five departments of political science and was led by a board of directors consisting of one person from each department. The chairman of the board was Jörgen Westerståhl. The project was financed by the newly established Tercentenary Fund. The grants from the Fund eventually came to a total of approximately 5 million crowns. The major portion of these grants was paid out in the form of salaries for younger researchers. The actual research was largely done in the form of dissertations. Nearly 40 dissertations have been published within the framework of the project.

The major topic of inquiry of the local government project may be formulated as a study of the relationship between different types of communes and two sets of values: democratic values and efficiency values. By democratic values was meant values related to local government activities viewed as popular government; efficiency values referred to conditions relating to local governments as producers of public services. The data which formed the bases for the various studies of the project were chiefly collected from a sample of 36 communes, selected according to criteria of size and density of population. The project was divided into

a number of subprojects dealing not only with the communes at the local level, but also devoting significant attention to the activities of county councils (landsting). Each subproject, based on joint data, consisted in general of researchers from more than one department.

The results of the local government project, as mentioned, are presented in a large number of dissertations. It is not possible to list them all and their authors. In addition, a series of five volumes have been published. The series contains a presentation of the research program (Westerståhl, C 71, 1970), the forms of citizen information (Birgersson, Forsell, Odmark, Strömberg, C 71, 1971), the nominating process of the parties (Barkefeldt, Brändström, Simm, Zanderin, C 71, 1971), parties and organizations at the local level (Bergquist, Gunnmo, Klason, C 71, 1975) and the activities of the county councils (Johansson, Nilsson, Petersson, C 71, 1975). A final presentation summarizing all the results is still not complete. It is evident now, however, that activities vary with the size of the commune: this is true of the frequency of political discussion, the number of elected officials and full-time employees, the voters' opportunities to meet politicians, the nature and intensity of election campaigns, participation in the nominating process, membership in parties and organizations, the degree of agreement between voters and elected officials, and so on. One circumstance has been emphasized rather strongly. At the same time as the large cities have the best provision of services, they also contain the largest proportion of persons dissatisfied with services. On the other hand, in the small rural communes where the standard of service is lowest, fairly widespread satisfaction with services prevails. This paradoxical condition has been labelled by the local government research project as the 'service paradox'.

The local government research project has entirely dominated Swedish research dealing with politics at the local level. It must be noted, however, that research on local politics has occurred on a limited scale in addition to the project. Two examples are: (a) Bengt Owe Birgersson, Sören Häggroth and Gunnar Wallin at the University of Stockholm who have analyzed the extent of political and social activities in a newly built suburb of Stockholm (C 71, 1973), and (b) Gunnel Gustafsson and Harry Forsell at the University of Umeå, who have studied the relationship between political decision-making and structural change in communes which are expanding or are depressed (Forsell C 71, 1972, and Gustafsson, D 31, 1972).

The strong concentration on research dealing with local politics which characterized Swedish political science for several years is now past. Few scholars are currently active in this area. Most of the doctoral candidates who did their research within the framework of the local government project have left the universities; persons remaining have changed their focus of interest. This de-emphasis is *per se* illustrative of Swedish research policy. It is often possible to obtain quite substantial resources for research for periods of a few years in a specific area, but it is difficult to secure more permanent resources which would make possible a continuous concentration in a specific area.

An interest in research concerning conditions at the next level above the local level – the regional level – has arisen in recent years. No extensive studies in

this area had been presented by 1975. This interest is centered in the departments at Lund and Umeå. At Lund the emphasis is on an analysis of the Swedish counties (*län*), their decision-making structures, planning activities and relations with local government units; earlier many researchers at Lund had been involved in studying the county councils within the framework of the local government research project.⁶ At Umeå prime weight has been attached to a study of the organization of regional planning and the relation of the region to the national political system. Inasmuch as Umeå is located in Norrland, which geographically is the largest region of Sweden, it is natural that the department should adopt an interest in regional problem in a comparative perspective. Contacts have been developed with other university disciplines focusing on regional questions, government agencies responsible for regional policy, and finally with regional research conducted in other countries.

5. National Politics

In terms of volume, there is still a predominance of research dealing with political conditions at an intermediate level: the 'national' level. Above all, this research has focused on Sweden. To some extent, other political systems have also attracted attention. The research on non-Swedish conditions, with one exception, has been of a disparate nature. A series of contributions to this research can be enumerated: Göran Lindahl has written about Uruguay (F 2, 1962), Olle Nyman about West German federalism (C 11, 1960), Thomas Hart about China (D 16, 1971), Tom Bryder about industrial relations in Great Britain (C 51, 1975), Harald Hamrin about the Italian Communist Party (B 23, 1975), etc. During this period a number of scholars, independent of one another, have also exhibited an interest in the Soviet Union: Jury Borys (B 23, 1960), Åke Dellenbrandt (C 521, 1972), Reidar Larsson and Daniel Tarschys.

The only area outside Sweden which has been the focal point of political science research and which is not of a more sporadic nature is Africa. The interest of Swedish political science in Africa commened when Göran Hydén presented a study of the dominant party in Tanzania (D 13, 1968), and Lars Rudebeck (D 21, 1967) wrote a work on the dominant party in Tunisia. Hydén and Rudebeck have been involved in a general discussion of different approaches to the study of politics in the developing countries (E 155, 1969; A 2, 1971). Göran Hydén later received a position in Africa; he has additionally published a number of works on African politics (C 610, 1973; F 1, 1969, 1971, 1972). Lars Rudebeck remained in Sweden. He has written, e.g., a study on Guinea-Bissau (F 1, 1974) and articles concerning theories of development (A 0, 1970; E 155, 1970). Around him have gathered several doctoral students, all of whom are working in the area of African politics. Dissertations have been published or are forthcoming, e.g., concerning conditions in Ethiopia, Ghana, Lesoto and Nigeria.⁷ This greater interest of Swedish political science in Africa compared with conditions in Asia or Latin America is not exactly easy to explain.⁸ Accidental circumstances have contributed to this

development. It must be underscored, however, that Swedish public opinion has long been committed to the black liberation struggle in Africa, that Africa is a major recipient of Swedish development aid, and that the Scandinavian Institute of African Studies is located in Uppsala.

The bulk of the literature written in Swedish political science about politics at a national level, as noted, deals with Sweden. Earlier in the article some examples of debates conducted at a national level or concerning national policies were mentioned. Other works can be grouped in terms of a number of phases into which political decision-making processes can be divided: voters, mass media, interest organizations, parties, parliament and the cabinet and their internal bodies, and finally the government administration.

There is a disinclination to center attention on dimensions of a political process other than these 'phases'. Few studies employ theoretically based concepts as a point of departure. Studies which in a single sweep cover this entire process are also rare. In general, Swedish political scientists have not produced any studies which attempt to analyze and describe the Swedish political system *in toto*. There is an unwillingness in Swedish political science to adopt broad perspectives. The discipline is still more micro-oriented than macro-oriented. Some Anglo-Saxon political scientists, in contrast, have written books that adopt a macro-perspective: Joseph Board, Donald Hancock, and Dankwart Rustow.⁹ Furthermore, there are a few Swedish works which elucidate the decision-making process at the national level in terms of a single concrete issue. Terry Carlbom has analyzed the processes preceding the decision in parliament to establish a number of new institutions of higher learning, (D 10, 1971), Olof Ruin the process leading to a new system of financing university studies, and Lars F. Tobisson the evolution of the decision to grant public employees the right to collective bargaining (D 11, 1973). This type of analysis of decision-making processes can be expected to increase as a result of the growing interest during the 1970s in policies: the origin of a policy is one dimension of policy analysis.¹⁰

Voters. The emergence of an interest among Swedish political scientists in political behavior and the use of quantitative techniques was intimately related to the start of research on voters and electoral behavior, led by Bo Särilvik at the University of Gothenburg. A long series of general elections have been examined: all regular parliamentary elections starting with the 1956 election up to the present. This is a fairly unique series. Several different aspects of electoral behavior and the party system in Sweden have been analyzed on the basis of data from these elections: the significance of socio-economic status and origin, the saliency of the left-right continuum, the degree of stability and change in voting behavior, etc. The results of these studies have been published in a series of articles; several have appeared in *SPS* (D 20, 1968; D 21, 1967; D 31, 1964; D 340, 1965, 1969, 1970). Since Bo Särilvik has taken a position as professor at the University of Essex, the leadership of electoral research in Sweden has been assumed by one of his colleagues, Olof Petersson at the University of Uppsala (D 30, 1975; D 342, 1974). Lars Ricknell at Umeå has attempted to analyze voting behavior in a number of constituencies in northern Sweden employing partially new techniques.¹¹

The electoral studies at the Gothenburg department, in turn, have generated a series of additional projects. One of these is the project on representative democracy. For one of the studies within this project, a set of data on voters has been compared with a set of similar data on members of parliament. The results have been published in the book *Riksdagen representerar svenska folket (The Riksdag represent the Swedish people)* by Sören Holmberg (C 21, 1974). One of the most surprising results of Holmberg's study was a tendency, if a left-right scale was applied, for members of parliament to be farther to the left on various issues than their voters.

It should be added that during the 1970s a growing interest developed in research on political socialization by Swedish political scientists, particularly in Stockholm and Umeå. At the Stockholm department there is a project examining the political socialization of immigrants in Swedish society; immigrants recently received the right to vote in local and regional elections. The project is led by Thomas Hammar and Ko-Chih Tung (D 31, 1974, 1975); Hammar in the 1960s published a study of Swedish immigration policy (D 19, 1964). Gunnel Gustafsson at the University of Umeå has written works in this area (D 31, 1972, 1974).

Mass Media. Mass media research of significant proportions has occurred in Swedish political science. Most of this research, but not all of it, has been done at the Gothenburg department under the direction of Jörgen Westerståhl. It is not surprising that one and the same department has concentrated on both electoral research and mass media research. Various dimensions can be applied to mass media research. Three frequently mentioned dimensions of this kind are *content*, *use* and *structure*. All three of these dimensions are represented in the media research at Gothenburg. Some examples of research focusing on *content* are the earlier mentioned studies commissioned by the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation. The purpose was to attempt, with the use of quantitative content analysis, to ascertain the objectivity of news reporting of certain events (Westerståhl D 332, 1971, 1972); the criteria used to determine objectivity have been criticized, resulting in a lively discussion on methods in this area (Andrén, Ericsson, Ohlson, Tänn-sjö, D 332, 1972). One example of research concerned with the effects of using mass media is a project started during the 1950s on the political significance of the press; this research has led to other projects with a similar focus. Presently a project on the functions of the press in society is under way under the leadership of Lennart Weibull. Finally, one example of a study more oriented toward analyzing the structure of the media is a work by Stig Hadenius, Jan-Olof Sveveborg and Lennart Weibull on the growth of the Social Democratic press (D 332, 1970); part of their research results have been presented in *SPS*, Vol. 3 (D332, 1968). Stig Hadenius has also published several studies, including one dealing with the major news agency in Sweden (D 332, 1971). Structure-oriented studies on mass media have also been published by scholars at other departments. Ingemar Lindblad at the University of Stockholm has written a work on the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation (D 332, 1970), and Torbjörn Vallinder at Lund has examined the daily press and politics in Sweden (D 332, 1968).

Interest Organizations. It has been repeatedly emphasized – not the least by

foreign observers – that organizations are very strong in Sweden. Most conceivable interests are organized, the rate of organization among potential members is very high, and interest organizations play an exceedingly important role in the political system. Against this background it is not surprising that the interest in the study of these organizations has been considerable in Swedish political science. This interest began during the 1940s with books by Jörgen Westerståhl and Gunnar Heckscher and has been sustained through subsequent decades. During the 1960s many monographs on national interest organizations and affiliate associations were published: on the Metal Workers' Union and the Agricultural Workers' Union by Pär-Erik Back (D 12, 1961, 1963), the Municipal Workers' Union by Ingemar Lindblad (D 12, 1960), the Typographers' Union by Bertil Björklund (D 11, 1965), the farmers' organizations by Gunnar Hellström (D 13, 1964),¹² the consumer cooperative movement by Olof Ruin (D 11, 1960), on the associations by Olle Söderberg (D 11, 1966), and on the 'peoples' high-school' teacher association by Bengt Bögärde (D 11, 1974). During the same decade associations by Olle Söderberg (D 11, 1966), and the 'peoples' high-school' teacher association by Bengt Bögärde (D 11, 1974). During the same decade two books dealing with Swedish organizations in a total perspective were published. One by Pär-Erik Back on the role of interest organizations in politics in 1870–1910; his thesis was that this role was significant already at this early time (D 11, 1967). The other one by Nils Elvander covered the situation today (D 11, 1969).

During the first half of the 1970s somewhat fewer studies in this area of research were published than previously. Simultaneously, however, the public debate on interest organizations became more intense. The discussion concerned democracy inside the organizations and the growing tendency to incorporate interest organizations into the public administration. The first aspect is dealt with in a research project on democracy in trade unions, which was started at the University of Uppsala under the direction of Leif Lewin. Publications from this project have already begun to appear.¹³ The second aspect has been commented on by political scientists in the public debate but has not yet been a subject of serious research.

It is common amongst political scientists, perhaps under the influence of Gabriel Almond's ideas about the functions of articulation and aggregation, to express themselves in normative terms concerning a division of roles in a political system between interest groups and political parties. Nils Elvander has taken up and elucidated this general problem in connection with a study of a central area of policy: Swedish tax policy during the postwar period (D 10, 1972). He concluded that the differences in 'style of articulation' both among the parties themselves and among different types of interest organizations are so great that it is not at all possible to speak of any general differences between parties and organizations in this respect.

Political Parties. The interest in the study of political parties does not have quite as strong a tradition in Swedish political science as the study of interest organizations. A marked increase in this interest has occurred, however, during the period 1960–1975. For example, there has been a research project concerning

the structure and functioning of the political parties; similar to the local government research project, this was a joint project involving the five departments. Several different dimensions of the activities of the political parties have been examined within the framework of the project as well as outside it.

One dimension of the party research has concerned the internal organization and activities of the parties. Sten Berglund has published a theoretically oriented work on the interaction between members and leaders within a party (D 20, 1972). He is now directing a project on support and discontent in political parties. Agne Gustafsson has dealt in an article with the party congress (Back B 21, 1967), an institution which has successively increased in importance. Carl Gunnar Peterson has written a book on the youth organization of the Social Democratic party (D 21, 1975). A second dimension involves the activities of the parties in the electoral arena. Much light has been shed on this dimension, with no less than six consecutive elections having been examined. Magnus Isberg, Anders Wettergren, Jan Wibble and Björn Wittrock have analyzed party behavior in the electoral arena on the basis of interviews with party politicians and the earlier mentioned quantitative analysis of election propaganda (D 331, 1974) from the 1960, 1962, 1964 and 1966 elections. Several researchers – e.g. Paula Uddman and Jan Åse Wickleus – have concentrated on the parties' behavior during a single election campaign, the 1968 election to the lower chamber of the bicameral *Riksdag*, which still existed then. Kai Kronvall, with a somewhat different focus, has analyzed the parties during the 1970 election – the first election to the unicameral *Riksdag* (D 332, 1975). Dan Brändström has examined the nomination process in the parties for this election (D 20, 1972). A third dimension of party research, finally, concerns party activities in the parliamentary arena. Bo Bjurulf, by himself (C 321, 1972, 1973) and together with Nils Stjernquist (D 20, 1970, D 21, 1968) has analyzed the voting behavior of the parties. Hans G. Andersson has written a book dealing with the activities of the parties in the *Riksdag* (D 21, 1969). Lastly, an overall description of the Swedish party system is provided in a book by Pär-Erik Back (D 21, 1967).

The feature of the Swedish party system which attracted most attention internationally during these years was the stability in the distribution of party strength and thus the roles of the parties. To be sure, the electoral support of the parties has varied; even pronounced shifts have occurred in some elections. But during this entire period the three non-Socialist parties remained in opposition; the Social Democratic party, on the other hand, continued to be in government as the party had been since the autumn of 1932, with the exception of one hundred days in 1936.¹⁴ In an often quoted article in the book *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*, Nils Stjernquist has analyzed the dilemma of the non-Socialist parties as opposition parties, on the one hand, and participants in a political system where compromises are common, on the other hand (D 21, 1968).

Parliament and Government. A new constitution came into force in Sweden on 1 January 1975, although a major overhaul of the former constitution had already been undertaken a few years earlier. This reform resulted in a unicameral parliament, changes in the period of office and a new electoral system. The constitutional

changes were preceded by a lengthy period of investigation and inquiry. Two political scientists – Nils Stjernquist and Jörgen Westerståhl – have been especially active participants in this work; other political scientists have been active in the public debate concerning these issues. No extensive research concerning these major institutions of government and their internal bodies had been conducted on a parallel basis with the work of the inquiry commissions. Attention, as emphasized and outlined earlier, was centered primarily on the input side of politics.

In connection with the one hundredth jubilee of the bicameral *Riksdag*, however, several analyses concerning parliament were published by political scientists. These works dealt with, e.g. the evolution of the bicameral system by Olle Nyman, the social composition of parliament by Lars Sköld and Arne Halvarson, the work and the procedures of the *Riksdag* by Nils Stjernquist, the control function of the parliamentary committee on the constitution and simple questions by Nils Andrén and finally the popular referenda by Gunnar Wallin (C 321, 1966). No studies on the working procedures of the cabinet, on the other hand, were published. Hans Meijer, who had earlier published a work on the system of inquiry commissions, presented in an article in *SPS*, Vol. 4 a follow-up analysis of certain aspects of this important instrument for preparing legislation at the disposal of a government (C 611, 1965, 1969); in the same volume of *SPS* Lars Foyer offered a survey of social science research presented in the reports of the inquiry commissions (A 1, 1969). However, the problem of the formation of governments – a classical subject in Swedish political science – also now attracted a certain amount of interest. In a book Olof Ruin discussed the party negotiations concerning the formation of governments in Sweden during the postwar period (C 311, 1968, 1969); Henrik Hermerén published a more general work on the formation of governments in multiparty systems (C 20, 1975).

Administration. The final stage in a roughly sketched decision-making process – i.e., the administration – began to receive somewhat greater attention during the period 1960–1975. This occurred against the background of the rapidly expanding importance of the administration in the political system in Sweden as elsewhere. Already in 1950 Gunnar Heckscher in an article in *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift* (The journal of political science) had urged political scientists to undertake research concerning the structure and functioning of public administration in Sweden; shortly thereafter he published a study of the functioning of the Swedish administration, which remained the major publication in this area for many years.¹⁵ A very useful description of the contemporary organization of Swedish government administration, authored by Björn Molin, Lennart Månsson and Lars Strömberg, was first published in 1969 (C 611, 1971). A more theoretical analysis of the role of the administration in the political system was made in a book by Lennart Lundquist (C 610, 1971). Two large-scale interview studies of bureaucrats in the ministries and central administrative agencies were done independently of each other at the departments at Gothenburg and Stockholm. Results from the study done at Gothenburg have been presented in a book by Ulf Christofferson, Björn Molin, Lennart Månsson and Lars Strömberg (C 611, 1972); so far only the preliminary results of the second study have been published in an article in

Canadian Public Administration written by Tom Anton, Claes Linde and Anders Mellbourn.¹⁶ Another area of administrative research is the study of public enterprises. This part of governmental activity increased in importance in the late 60's. In 1974 Roger Henning published a book dealing with the attitudes of the political parties toward state enterprise but primarily focusing on the organization of the largest state concern, AB Statsföretag (C 521, 1974).

After this phase by phase survey of published research concerning politics at a national level, two reflections remain to be made. The first pertains to the dimension of time. Most of the research presented here deals with contemporary phenomena or those of the immediate past. Now a certain distance in time to the subject of one's research is no longer maintained, as was still the rule a couple of decades ago; the reason for this distance was mainly a desire to obtain some perspective. But, of course, parallel with this emphasis on politics as contemporary phenomena, occasional works focusing on periods in the comparatively remote past have also continued to be published. Works having a common feature of concentrating on some period of the nineteenth century can be enumerated. Elmar Nyman has written a book about the power to confiscate printed matter and freedom of the press in the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century (C 341, 1963), Bo Westerhult about the evolution of the offices of bailiwick officials during the 1800s and early 1900s (C 621, 1965), Stefan Björklund about the opposition in the 1823 *Riksdag* (C 321, 1964), Gunnar Wallin about election campaigns and their outcomes during the period 1860–1884 (D 342, 1965), Per Sundberg about ministerial crises during the 1880s and 1890s (C 311, 1961), Torbjörn Vallinder about the suffrage movement in Sweden at the end of the nineteenth century (D 11, 1962), and Olof Wennås about aspects of Swedish elementary education policy during the 1800s (D 10, 1966). A study dealing with the first decade of this century is Yngve Myrman's analysis of the power struggle in industrial relations during 1905–1907 (D 15, 1973). Some of these works can be classified as constitutional history but others cannot. While the field of constitutional history, which once dominated Swedish political science, was not especially prominent during the period 1960–1975, the outstanding Swedish scholar in this field during this century, Fredrik Lagerroth, continued to publish works in this area up until his death in 1974. In a book published in 1970 he compared the work to revise the constitution and the resulting reforms during the postwar period with the 1809 Instrument of Government (C 11, 1970; C 311, 1972).

Studies employing a long-term historical perspective seem to have become fairly common once again in political science in many countries. There is a renewed concern with analyses of long-term trends in various areas at the same time as advances in computer techniques facilitate studies of this kind. So far there are not many studies of this kind in Swedish political science. In 1972, however, Leif Lewin published a work on trends in the Swedish electorate during the period 1887–1968 (D 342, 1972); he was able to utilize both data on changes in the occupational structure of the electorate and election statistics. Daniel Tarschys has in his research also displayed a proclivity to adopt a long-term perspective. This

is evidenced by an analysis of the budgetary argumentation of central administrative agencies, which he and Maud Eduards have done (C 21, 1975), and by an initial presentation of his ongoing research on the expansion of the public sector, i.a., in *SPS*, Vol. 10 (C 610, 1975).

The second reflection concerns the lack of comparisons which characterize Swedish research on politics at the national level. The bulk of the published research is centered on Sweden, a modest portion deals with other countries; comparisons of similar phenomena in several different countries, in contrast, are quite rare. The comparative studies which do exist deal chiefly with the Scandinavian countries. For instance, Ingemar Glans has published a study on the left-wing socialist parties in Denmark and Norway (D 20, 1965), Claes Olof Olsson and Lennart Weibull in an article in *SPS*, Vol. 8 have compared the selection of foreign news by news agencies in the Nordic countries (D 332, 1973), and Nils Elvander has analyzed the role of the state in the settlement of labour disputes in the Nordic countries (D 10, 1974). A textbook comparing various dimensions of politics in the Nordic countries has been written by Ingemar Lindblad, Claes Wiklund and Krister Wahlbäck (C 22, 1972). Nevertheless it is surprising that there are not more comparisons of various aspects of the political systems of the Scandinavian countries. This deficiency is often noted and regretted. The similar social, economic and political structure of the Nordic countries ought to have stimulated comparative research long ago. A reversal seems to be in progress now – viewed from a Swedish vantage point. A theoretical interest in the problems of comparison, irrespective of the countries involved, is reflected in a research project being carried out by Sverker Gustavsson and Evert Vedung in Uppsala. Furthermore, several concrete comparative research projects focusing on the Nordic countries are in progress. This greater desire to compare phenomena in the Nordic countries is also manifested in the formation of research groups, comprising representatives from all the Nordic countries, within the framework of the recently founded Nordic Political Science Association.

6. International Politics

Debates concerning the academic discipline to which the study of international politics properly belongs are not uncommon. Such discussions have also occurred in Sweden, even if they have not generated much heat. There have been two main lines of argument. According to the first, international politics is not essentially different from politics in general. By and large the same theoretical traditions have made their mark on both the study of international politics and the study of politics at other lower levels of analysis. The foreign policy decision-making processes of the various states – processes of primary importance for politics at the international level – are also closely connected to other decision-making processes at the national level. One consequence of this view of the closeness between the study of politics at different levels has been to maintain that international politics constitutes an obvious part of political science. The second line of argument is

just the opposite of the first. It maintains that international politics is essentially different from other forms of politics. The international system lacks political agents of the type that regulate the activities of national political systems. Moreover, the study of international politics lies in greater proximity to general conflict theory. International politics should therefore not be regarded as a sub-discipline of political science. It would be more natural to create instead a separate academic subject which could comprise not only the study of international politics but also a general study of international problems and patterns of behavior.

The study of international politics constitutes at present an integral part of political science in Sweden. At the same time institutes for peace and conflict research, independent of the political science departments, have been established at the Universities of Gothenburg, Lund and Uppsala. At the political science departments, international politics has been incorporated into all levels of instruction; several positions in political science are held by persons who have done their research largely or entirely in the area of international politics; many doctoral candidates have chosen to specialize in international politics; through the years *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, the journal of the profession, has contained a sizable number of articles on international politics.

At the same time as international politics appears as a crucial and self-evident part of political science in Sweden, there are variations as in other fields of political science in the amount of research at the departments. At the departments at Umeå and Uppsala the research in this area has been sporadic. The largest amount of research activity has developed at the departments at Lund and Stockholm. At the University of Lund one of the two professors at the department, Hans F. Petersson, has specialized exclusively in international politics. At the University of Stockholm intimate contacts exist between the department and the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, which has a research section; several teachers and researchers at the Department of Political Science thus are simultaneously employed at this institute.

Research on international politics, strictly speaking, can boast of a fairly long tradition in Swedish political science. It is sufficient to recall the internationally well-known writings of Rudolf Kjellén on geo-politics published during the first decades of this century. At the same time it is correct to say that the contributions to research on international politics had been rather meager before 1960. In fact, it is not until the period 1960–1975 that activity in this area came into full swing. As is common practice concerning research on international politics, the Swedish research published during these years can be divided into studies employing a systems-oriented approach and an actor-oriented approach. These two approaches have been employed in roughly equal proportions.

Among the systems-oriented studies, three works form a separate group on the basis of their common interest in analyzing global patterns related to war and peace. The first of these works is Hans F. Petersson's study *Power and International Order* from 1964 (E 12, 1964). His study analyzes a dimension of politics which has generally been given much attention in Swedish political science: normative statements. The 'debate' which is analyzed was an international discussion of

power, peace, and international order at the end of the First World War. The second work is Kjell Goldmann's *International Norms and War between States* (E 0, 1971). This work also reflects an interest in the analysis of arguments. He analyzes the official justifications by governments for going to war: What are the causes and effects of these justifications, what conventions and norms are referred to in these justifications, and what are the differences in the choice of justifications by various types of states? A concern with the problem of war finally also pervades Peter Wallensteen's study, *Structure and War. On International Relations 1920–1968*, (E 22, 1973). The origins of international conflicts and war are examined during a fifty year period with reference to different patterns of relations between states.

A separate systems-oriented project has been carried out at the Institute for International Affairs under the leadership of the Institute's research director, Kjell Goldmann, who has simultaneously held a position at the Department of Political Science. The main aim of the project has been to study and measure fluctuations between tension and détente in European politics during the postwar period (Goldmann E 22, 1973, 1974). Roger Wall has analyzed bipolarization as a general phenomenon in the international system (E 21, 1975).

During the entire postwar period in Sweden there has been a marked interest in organized international cooperation. Initially this interest was associated with the United Nations. In Swedish political science, however, no major work on the world organization has been produced; some articles – published and unpublished – have nevertheless been written about various aspects of the UN's activities. A similar interest, which also has not got resulted in any major works in political science, has focused on regional organizations like the European Community and the Nordic Council (Stålvant E 24, 1973; Wiklund E 16, 1970). However, research projects on various dimensions of integration in these regions have been started, e.g., a study on European integration being written by Gunnar Sjöstedt. Finally, there are works published on specialized international organizations, as reflected for instance, in Torsten Landelius's work on the ILO (E 14, 1965) and Gunnar Sjöstedt's study of the OECD (E 16, 1973).

Actor-oriented research in international politics has had nation-states as its focal point during the period 1960–1975. However, research now in progress includes other actors on the international scene, e.g. multinational corporations.¹⁷ Gunnar E. Jervas has in a book on the processes of international conflict presented a general model for the study of the development of conflicts between states with reference to motives and alternative courses of action of the major actors in these conflicts (E 21, 1973). Actor-oriented research can be divided into three groups: (a) patterns of behavior, (b) doctrines and (c) policy formation.

One type of behavior is negotiating. Lars-G. Stenelo has written a work entitled *Mediation in International Negotiations* (E 21, 1972), a type of study rarely found in Swedish political science. It is concerned with a problem which is important not only at the international level but also at other levels, and it also focuses attention on two key political mechanisms in a decision process – i.e., negotiations and mediation – and not, as often is the case, on a 'phase' of a decision process.

A colleague of Stenelo at Lund, Christer Jönsson, has written a case study on the negotiating behavior of one state, the Soviet Union (E 23, 1972). The conclusions in this book are based on both an analysis of the literature and the concrete negotiations which led to the nuclear test ban treaty. The actual area of international politics dealt with in Jönsson's book, i.e., security and armaments policy, has of course also received attention in Swedish research. Two scholars who are active in this area are, e.g., Ingemar Dörfer and Gunnar E. Jervas (Dörfer E 22, 1974; Jervas E 151, 1972; E 23, 1975).

Criticism as a means of conducting foreign policy is the theme of a new research project that has been begun in Lund under Lars-S. Stenelo. The main focus is on Sweden and the criticism the Swedish government has levelled at the USA and the USSR with regard to both the dominant influence of these countries within world politics in general and the substance of their actual policies. The principal thrust of the project is to ascertain and appraise the effects of this criticism.

Doctrines are an aspect of foreign policy. In official statements a country formulates the goals and means for its foreign policy conduct.¹⁸ Krister Wahlbäck is working on a comparative study of neutrality doctrines in Europe; it is only natural for a Swedish political scientist in this case to pay special attention to Swedish neutrality policy. Wahlbäck's study is also concerned with Finland. A work which deals entirely with Finland's foreign policy doctrine has been written by Katarina Brodin (E 23, 1969). Another country with a special position between the blocs is Yugoslavia. Lars Nord has published a work entitled *Nonalignment and Socialism*, dealing with Yugoslav foreign policy in theory and practice (E 23, 1974). Even this study is an analysis of a doctrine – the doctrine of nonalignment – and its application in a series of conflicts affecting Yugoslavia. Naturally several books on foreign policy with a broader focus than merely doctrines have also been published. Nils Andrén, for example, has written a survey of Swedish foreign policy since 1945 (E 23, 1965); the English version of this book is entitled *Power-Balance and Non-Alignment* (E 23, 1967).

Finally, an interest in studying foreign policy decisions also exists in Swedish political science. This interest, however, has not been great, just as there has been little concern for the origin of other types of policy decisions. Krister Wahlbäck has published a work on Swedish foreign policy vis-à-vis Finland during 1935–1940, including the formation of this policy (E 22, 1964); he has also studied the Scandinavian defense negotiations preceding the adoption of foreign policy positions by Denmark, Norway and Sweden in 1949 (E 22, 1974). Thomas Hart has been engaged in research concerning the foreign policy perceptions of elites.¹⁹ Ingemar Dörfer, in his book *System 37 Viggen, Arms, Technology and the Domestication of Glory*, (C 611, 1973) has analyzed the process leading to the decision to build the Viggen. Naturally one could debate whether an analysis of a defense policy decision – which this was – should be mentioned at all in a survey of research on international politics. A reference to this very point in this article can be viewed as a practical illustration of the fact that it often is difficult and unproductive to draw clear lines between research on international politics and research concerning other aspects of politics.

7. Effects on Society

In the introduction it was emphasized that Swedish society naturally influences in various ways the content and focus of the country's political science research. To some extent the reverse is also true. It is not easy to determine the degree of influence which the results of political science research have had on the workings of society. Seldom have these results made the major headlines; nor is there one single work in political science, published during the period 1960-1975, which has profoundly changed opinion-makers' and decision-makers' view of society. The effects of political science research have been of a more specific nature. The local government research project, e.g., provides an excellent illustration of the possibilities open to political science research to influence a process of reform within a limited sector. During the past ten years, the national government has been relatively concerned with various aspects of local democracy. In 1969 there was a decision on public subsidies for local party organizations; a system of substitute representatives in local government councils was introduced the same year; in 1970 an inquiry commission on local democracy was appointed; five years later the commission published a report on local government organization and information, etc. These various measures were accompanied by frequent references to the results published by the local government research project.

The propensity of opinion-makers and decision-makers to heed and utilize the results of a discipline's research is naturally dependent upon the reputation which the particular discipline's research and its scholars may happen to have in a society. Judgements concerning political science research and political scientists vary, of course. There are many groups outside the universities which generally feel that studies oriented towards political science are uninteresting; problems which are perceived as urgent are not included in the area of political science research. There may be other groups which are not necessarily negative toward political science research in general, but they find Swedish political science research uninteresting due to its cautious approach and lack of broader perspectives. While negative attitudes of this kind certainly exist, I still believe it is correct to say that Swedish political science has a good reputation in society. The honesty and reliability of the discipline create respect.

There is a paradoxical aspect of the relations between political science research and society. On the one hand, the very subject matter of political science research is potentially of an anti-establishment nature: the study of relationships of power in society. Persons holding positions of power have reason to feel sceptical and uneasy in relation to researchers whose field of inquiry involves an analysis of these positions. On the other hand, political scientists have revealed a tendency to merge with the establishment, or at least to maintain close contacts of a friendly nature with individuals in positions of power. Many persons who have received a doctor's degree in political science have been absorbed into the public administration and interest organizations; many scholars who remain at the universities, as mentioned earlier, are utilized as experts in various connections. Swedish political science simultaneously contains a potential for criticism of society and is well-integrated in society. This delicate balance constitutes both a dilemma and an asset.

NOTES

1. See Dick Ramström, *Social Science Research in Sweden. Today and Tomorrow*, Department of Business Administration, University of Uppsala.
2. A recent work with such a steering perspective is Benny Hjern, *Statsbidrag som styrmetod*, Göteborg Studies in Politics 6, 1976.
3. An attempt at such a refinement is made in a study by Harry Forsell (C71, 1972). See also an interesting critique of Easton by Jan-Erik Lanc, *On Eastons Theory: There must be some limits to confusion*, Center for Administrative Studies, Umeå University, 1977.
4. A rather intensive debate on the theoretical problems of analysis of party behavior was pursued in *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift* (Hadenius, D21, 1965; Sjöblom, D21, 1965; Moberg, D20, 1968, 1969; Sjöblom, D20, 1965).
5. After 1975 a lively discussion took place in *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift* on the critique expressed by Berntsson. See *ibid.*, 1976, Gunnar Sjöblom, pp. 256-264 and Göran Hermeren, pp. 265-268, Lennart Berntsson, pp. 347-351; and *ibid.*, 1977, Gunnar Sjöblom, pp. 30-35.
6. The first major report was published in 1977. See Björn Beckman, *Regional förvaltning och regional planering. En undersökning av planeringsprocess, planinnehåll och plan-effekter i länsprogram 70*, University of Lund (C70, 1971).
7. See Michael Ståhl, *Ethiopia: Political Contradictions in Agricultural Development*, Stockholm, 1974 (F1, 1974). Björn Beckman, *Organizing the Farmers: Cocoa politics and national development in Ghana*, Uppsala, 1976; Onesimo Silveira, *Africa South of the Sahara: Party Systems and Ideologies of Socialism*, Uppsala, 1976.
8. In 1976, however, a study was published on India. See James Walch, *Faction and Front. Party Systems in South India*, New Delhi (Stockholm).
9. See Joseph Board, *The Government and Politics of Sweden* (Boston, 1970); Donald Hancock, *Sweden: The Politics of Postindustrial Change* (Hinsdale, 1972), and Dankwart A. Rustow, *The Politics of Compromise. A Study of Parties and Cabinet Government in Sweden* (Princeton, 1955).
10. There are remarkably few biographies of Swedish politicians. However, during the 1960-75 period three publicists with a background in political science published biographies of Conservative and Liberal politicians respectively. See Ivar Anderson on Otto Järte (D32, 1965), Knut Petersson on Alfred Petersson i Påboda (D22, 1965), and Leif Kihlberg on Adolf Hedin (D32, 1972) and on Karl Staaf (D32, 1972, 1975). Clarence Nilsson has written a book on the Liberal Sam Stadener's role in shaping church policy (D18, 1964).
11. See Lars Ricknell, *Politiska Regioner. Studier i regionindelningsproblematik*, University of Umeå, 1976.
12. See also Gunnar Hellström, *Jordbrukspolitik i industrisamhället med tyngdpunkt på 1920 - och 30-talen*, Stockholm, 1976.
13. See Axel Hadenius, *Facklig organisationsutveckling. En studie av Landsorganisationen i Sverige*, Uppsala, 1976; and Leif Lewin, *Hur styrs facket? Om demokratin inom fackföreningsrörelsen*, Uppsala, 1977.
14. In the general elections of 1976 the three non-socialist parties received a majority, however, and the Social Democrats were ousted from government.
15. See *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift*, Vol. 1, 1950, pp. 75-52 and Gunnar Herkscher, *Svensk statsförvaltning i arbete*, Stockholm, 1952.
16. Tom Anton, Claes Linde and Anders Mellbourn, *Canadian Public Administration*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1973, pp. 627-651.
17. See Lars Thunell, *Political Risk and International Business. A Study of Multinational Corporations' Investment Behavior*, University of Stockholm, 1977.
18. A book on the study of doctrines was published in 1977 by Katarina Brodin, *Studiet av utrikespolitiska doktriner. Teori och två empiriska tillämpningar*, Stockholm, 1977.
19. A study was published in 1976. See Thomas Hart, *The Cognitive World of Swedish Security Elites*.