



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper published in *Offentlig Förvaltning. Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Bohlin, M., Brandt, D., Elbe, J. (2014)

The Development of Swedish Tourism Public Policy 1930-2010.

Offentlig Förvaltning. Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration, 18(1): 19-39

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:du-13211>

Magnus Bohlin
School of Technology and
Business Studies, Dalarna
University
mbo@du.se

Daniel Brandt
School of Technology and
Business Studies, Dalarna
University
dbr@du.se

Jörgen Elbe
School of Technology and
Business Studies, Dalarna
University
Jel@du.se

Keywords: Tourism policy,
Regulation theory, Competi-
tion laws, Welfare state,
Political economy

Abstract

In this article, the development and changes in Swedish public policy relating to tourism from the 1930s to 2010 is described and interpreted from a political economy perspective. A case study, compiled from mainly secondary sources, is analyzed from a theoretical framework based on regulation theory. The purpose with this study is to increase the understanding of how the macro political economy context has influenced the policy-making in tourism in Sweden, but also to make a contribution to an area which seems to be quite neglected when it comes to research. The changes are analyzed according to the three periods denoted as pre-Fordism (mid-19th century-1930s), Fordism (1930s-1970s) and post-Fordism (1970s to present). It is observed how the general changes between these periods regarding aspects such as regulation and deregulation, and the degree of state involvement, have affected tourism policy making. The tourism policy making has changed from being insignificant, to a high degree of state involvement including planning, control and supervision, to a situation where the market rather than government regulation is considered as state of the art.

Introduction

Tourism is today considered an industry of significance (see e.g. UNWTO: 2004). It affects the environment, cultures, economic, and social conditions. Tourism is of importance to nations and regions and must be taken into account in policies concerning the formation of regulations, investment in infrastructure, facilitative measures, governmental coordination, and in policies on its social, cultural, economic and environmental impact (see e.g. Hall, 1994; 2009). As also noted by Garay & Cànoves (2011), the public policy perspectives are to a large extent neglected in explaining tourism development. We would like to address this gap by presenting a historical case study on the tourism development in Sweden, where we are focusing on the emergence and changing role of tourism public policy.

Tourism public policy has a comparatively short history in Sweden. At an early stage it was indirect and it mainly concerned infrastructure and regulations for travel and transport. From the 1930s there was some minor public involvement in the tourism sector, but more active policy-making was first in place in the mid-1960s. Although the starting point for public policy concerned with tourism may be traced back to that decade, the ideas which initially formed the policy were rooted in the creation, development and structure of the Swedish welfare state. Despite this short time-span, from the 1960s until today, many changes regarding directions, principles, and actions have occurred in Swedish policy in general as well as in policies more directly concerned with tourism due to altered political and economic conditions. The aim of this article

*The authors are all affiliated with Dalarna University and active both as educators and researchers in tourism studies. Tourism research and education has been a main focus of Dalarna University since the late -70s, when tourism became an academic concern in Sweden. Magnus Bohlin is one of the founding fathers of tourism studies in Dalarna. He has been active in TTRA and first president of the European Chapter. Jörgen Elbe's field is business administration with a focus on marketing. Daniel Brandt is a human geographer with a background in political science.

is to contribute to the understanding of the historical development and changes in Swedish tourism public policy and the forces behind it, based on regulatory theory (Boyer & Saillard, 2001; Agglietta, 1979; Jessop, 2002).

We argue that tourism public policy development and changes has to be understood in its wider political context; an area which has not received attention by the scientific literature in this field. This article will shed light on the question why contemporary Swedish policy directed against tourism is designed the way it is, but we also want to inspire the reader to reflect upon possible directions for future policy making in this area.

Studies on public policy and tourism – an overview

Tourism public policy is often considered as a field of its own and it may be defined as: "a progressive course of actions, guidelines, directives, principles, and procedures set in an ethical framework that is issues-focused and best represents the intent of a community (or nation) to effectively meet its planning, development, product, service, marketing, and sustainability goals and objectives for the future growth of tourism" (Edgell, et al., 2008). Defining tourism public policy in this way excludes policymaking in other fields which may have bearing on tourism. We prefer a more holistic approach and therefore we use a general definition of public policy as a natural starting point. A suitable definition for our study is the one proposed by Dredge & Jenkins (2007). They state that policy may be seen: "...as being a position, strategy, action or product adopted by government and arising from contests between different ideas, values and interest" (p. 7).

Dredge and Jenkins definition is more open and stresses the different goals associated with policy formation and makes it possible to understand the changes in policy over time (Edgell, et al. 2008. p. 7). This is also in line with the arguments proposed by Liu & Liu (2009). Consequently, this paper has a broader perspective on tourism related policies than what is suggested in the tourism public policy definition since this paper aims at connecting changes in tourism policy with the shifts in the overall public policy. They are in turn a result of the changes in the political and economic system.

There are few studies with a similar approach to tourism public policy. An early study on tourism policy change in Spain was presented by Fayos-Solá (1996). They discuss the development in the government's response to changes in the demand, from mass-tourism to individualisation and customisation. It is concluded that a change occurred from an emphasis on promotion and product development to the maintenance of competitiveness; and Fayos-Solá argues for the need to develop policies and plans in partnership among public, private and voluntary sectors. Although this is a study of tourism and public policy change, it covers a short period of time and the influence of other contextual factors such as demand is overlooked.

Chambers & Airey (2001) conducted a study on the role of public policy in Jamaica and its link to tourism development. They compared two contrasting

periods, one which they call 'The Socialist Era' and the other 'The Capitalist Era'. In another article Shone and Ali Memon (2008) describe public policy changes and their relation to tourism in New Zealand. They describe a shift to neo-liberal ideology and later yet another shift which emphasises a stronger public involvement on the regional level as well as collaborative planning, in what sometimes is referred to as the new regionalism framework. In these articles the broader context influencing policy changes is to a large extent neglected and the time span is relatively short.

A study of specific relevance is the one by Garay & Cànoves (2011). They have studied tourism development in Catalonia, Spain, in a long term perspective, from the end of the 18th century until today. In order to analyse this development, they used the Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) model, developed by Butler (1980), together with regulation theory. The TALC model was developed for the purpose of analysing evolutionary phases of a tourist area by focusing on changes in demand. In their work the model is used to distinguish between historical phases. Since Garay & Cànoves found the TALC model to be too reductive to derive explanations of how the social and economic structures are transformed in the long run, they combined it with regulation theory. The conclusion drawn in the paper is that the development actually best may be described as having passed through several consecutive life cycles, referred to as paradigms related to modes of regulation.

When it comes to the Swedish context, there are no long term studies to be found on public policy and tourism. There are two studies where the ideological and normative side of the public involvement in the tourism sector in the 1930s has been analysed (Eskilsson, 2000, Lindström, 2006). These studies focused on the public response to a growing amount of spare time in the population. A main issue has been how the public policies fit into the creation of the Swedish welfare state, the so-called *Folkhemmet*.

Lindström (2006) has also analysed the changing government policies in a related sector, the leisure sector, in Sweden between 1962-2004/05. The main finding in this study was that the private sector has expanded its involvement in the leisure sector since the mid-1990s. The 1970s showed a period of strong public planning, and a collective and publicly controlled leisure sector dominated the policies, but at the end of the decade and in the following decades, a more individualistic view on leisure began to evolve. In the 1990s cooperation between private and public sectors in organising leisure became more common. Another main result from the study was that the leisure sector has been decentralised and that the political influence over the sector has decreased and will probably be even smaller in the future. Lindström (ibid) provides an interesting description of the development in the leisure sector, but there is no analysis of how the political and organisational change is related to the structural changes in the economy.

In this context the study by Pearce (1996) is relevant. He has scrutinised the organisational situation concerning tourism in Sweden in the mid-1990s. Although a useful assessment of the time, his focus is on organisational structure

rather than policy discourse and its manifestations. It is the authors' contention that by taking a longer perspective the ideological underpinnings of tourism policy and its subsequent implementation becomes more evident.

Drawing from this literature review, we argue that there is a need for more studies highlighting the long term development of public policies related to tourism from a political economy perspective. We also believe that our study may be a valuable contribution to the understanding of tourism public policy development and changes in Sweden.

Regulation theory for the study of tourism public policy

Boyer & Saillard (2002) argue that the state must be regarded as a main regulator of the economy and that many sectors which are usually not regarded as economic sectors must be considered important for the economy. There are three central and related concepts in this theory: *the mode of production*, *the mode of consumption*, and *the mode of regulation*.

The mode of production is the way production and transactions are organised in a society and *the mode of consumption* refers to the ways goods and services are consumed (Mavroudeas, S. 2003). Throughout history a number of different modes of production as well as modes of consumption have existed (Zuindeau, 2006). Together the mode of production and mode of consumption constitute specific regimes of accumulation. During such a regime a set of regularities is required in order to make the economic system functional and stable. This is called the mode of regulation. The regulationists argue, like the institutionalists, that the regimes of accumulation are governed not only by formal laws and regulations but also by norms, i.e. informal regulations, which are rooted in cultural values (see also North, 1990). Altogether they constitute a *mode of regulation* which is important for production, consumption and redistribution. The mode of regulation reproduces the social relations in society and underpins the mode of production and consumption.

There are five institutional forms which are emphasised as important for regulating the capitalistic system. The first has to do with the monetary system, which is viewed as a form of social relation. The second deals with the relation between labour and capital, since the way the labour market is organised is important for the regulation of the economic system. The third form deals with how competition is regulated. The fourth institutional form has to do with how the system is suited to the international arena. The fifth and last institutional form of importance is the form of the state which is viewed as a compromise between conflicting groups in the society (Boyer & Saillard, 2002).

As suggested above, the regularities are important to overcome and adjust imbalances and disturbances in the market so the accumulation of capital is not disrupted. The regularities must be arranged in different fields in the society such as the organisation and the relation between workers and the means of production, the distribution of wealth and the formation of classes, a correspondence between production and consumption of goods and services, a balance between

the production of and the reproduction of the workforce, and a stability in the economic sector which makes investments profitable (Boyer & Saillard, 2002).

One particular mode of regulation tends to be obsolete over time and will be replaced by a new mode of regulation. Such changes are always triggered by crisis. There are several different kinds of crisis. Lipliz (1987) states that the magnitude of crises differs: a small crisis can be triggered by the system's inability to adjust to the expectation of the population and imbalance can often be met by small adjustments. However, if the crisis is more profound, the whole system has to be changed.

According to regulation theory, three different regimes have been identified during the 1900s and up to the present day. These regimes are divided into three main periods labelled: *pre-Fordistic period*, *Fordistic period* and *post-Fordistic period*. The shifts between periods have been triggered by different crisis and the shifts have led to major changes in all fields in the society. The Fordistic period started after the economic depression in the beginning of 1930, when changes in economic growth stabilised. The only major interruption was World War II when most countries in the world faced the largest decline in GDP ever. In the 1970s this stable situation changed once again and the changes in annual growth became volatile once more. We then entered an era with a new regime – the post-Fordistic period.

The regimes proposed in regulation theory refer to commonalities in development in the industrialised world, but it must also be emphasised that there are differences between national welfare systems. Esping Andersen distinguishes between three welfare systems. The *liberal* system is characterised by a small welfare sector, a low tax level and a high share of voluntary work and many providers. The *continental* system is based on family-centred welfare service provision. The *social democratic system* is based on a high tax level, public responsibility for delivering the service and a few providers of welfare services (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Even if there is a clear connection between a specific welfare system and the policies pursued, there is also path dependency, related to the general and overall mode of regulation, which shapes the specific national trajectory. The issue show in other words considerable complexity (see e.g. Powell & Barrientos, 2004; Kim & Zurlo, 2009; Hudson & Kühner, 2009; Harris & McDonald, 1994, Warburton & Grassman, 2011).

Method

The case study is based on secondary sources. An extensive review of Swedish national and official reports, inquiries and investigations was initially made (Bohlin & Elbe, 2011) in order to understand how tourism policy in Sweden was introduced and has changed over time. Another review was then made to find material about the economic and political changes in Sweden and the relation of these changes to the international level. There has not been a problem finding relevant sources since there is a strong and, from a researcher's perspective, appreciated bureaucratic tradition in Sweden of investigating and documenting

public matters and actions. Transparency is a hallmark in Swedish government conduct which grants public access to a great many documents (*offentlighetsprincipen*). Government inquiries are published on a regular basis in several series and the SOU (*Statens Offentliga Utredningar*) is the one most frequently used here.

A selection of the sources which have been influential on the development of a tourism public policy in Sweden and therefore found to be relevant to our study was scrutinised and digested into a case study template. These were mainly selected by using the main references in the texts, i.e. that one text of importance led us to the next text. The selection of relevant material was facilitated by the fact that two of the paper's authors have been following tourism public policy changes in Sweden for some 25 and 35 years first as students and then as researchers.

The material was organised into the three regimes based on an analysis of historical economic and political events in accordance with the ideas put forward in regulation theory. Every regime was then analysed using the concepts of mode of production, mode of consumption and mode of regulation, and finally how tourism public policy has been influenced and changed in relation to these larger events.

From Pre-Fordism to Post-Fordism in Swedish tourism public policy

Background

Even though we argue that there are some distinct periods in the economic trajectory of the Swedish economy we realise that each of the periods bears some elements of the preceding era but we argue that important changes have occurred which have bearing on the regime of accumulation. It is also important to note that the macroeconomic shift manifests itself several years later in a specific sector, such as tourism. Thus changes in the political economic context alter the economic conditions for developing tourism with a time lag. The specific form of the accumulation regime is decided by the historical institutional context even if the forces by which they are formed are universal (Harris & McDonald, 2000).

In order to be able to make an appropriate interpretation of the case, it is important to understand that tourism policy in Sweden is rooted in the social democratic way of organising the delivery of welfare services to the population. It is also important to understand that in an international perspective, the Swedish bureaucracy is more separated from the political power compared to other countries. The government sets up goals for the different branches of the state and allocates resources for reaching these goals. The government controls the authorities by laws and regulations but are forbidden to directly intervene in specific cases. The government audits the authorities and make sure that the policies are implemented. Indirectly they also steers the administration by appointing the head of the authorities. (Ehn, et.al, 2003) Another distinct feature of the Swedish political system is that the local level, like in other Nordic countries, has a rela-

tively autonomous position in the administrative system. Moreover the municipalities have been the key administrative level on which the welfare reforms have been distributed (Baldersheim & Ståhlberg, 2010).

The pre-Fordism period, 1850-1930

This period in the Swedish economic history is characterised by rapid industrialisation. Under the British free trade regime, export-driven industrialisation led to fast transformation of the Swedish society. Migration and internal urbanisation was coupled with a transfer of labour from primary to secondary activities which led to restructuring and social change in Swedish society. The labour market became structured with organizations for both employers and workers by the turn of the century (Olsson, 1993).

Even if the labour market was re-shaped at the end of the 19th century, the economic policy did not manage to bridge the downturns in the economy and the social consequences of a recession were often hard. State involvement in the social sector was limited. As capitalism developed, the level of mechanisation and division of labour led to higher output and rising productivity and the imbalance between consumption and production in the economy led to a crisis (Aglietta, 2000). The level of consumption was generally low, and consumption was concentrated to the middle class and to the industry itself. Aglietta (2000) has argued that the reason behind the crisis in the 1930s was that demand from the consumer markets was insufficient to match the advances in industrial production. As the welfare system was not yet implemented, the consumption by the state was also low.

The industrial revolution reinforced the expansion of the rail network which had been initiated a few decades earlier. The road network in the country had a very low standard; the bulk of goods transportation prior to the railways took place in wintertime when roads and lakes were frozen. In the early days travelers were either civil servants or businessmen. Before the industrial revolution wealthy people had travelled for re-creative and leisure purposes and a network of spas had developed. In the late 19th century the bourgeoisie started to build summer villas on the outskirts of large urban centres. The military and academic community founded the Swedish Tourist Association (*Svenska Turistföreningen*, STF) in 1885 inspired by the advent of similar clubs in the rest of Europe including Scandinavia (Sörenson, 1989). Initially elitist but soon reaching wider groups. It became a significant consumer organisation providing cheap lodging for its members. The first youth hostel was established in the town of Gränna in 1933 and was soon followed by new ones. STF played a role in making Sweden known to the public via various publications and later as a tour operator/producer (Svenska Turistföreningen, 1986, 2010).

During the inter-war period Sweden acquired its first legislation regarding a general vacation. Thus, in 1938 all working people were guaranteed two weeks of vacation. The effect was limited as the Second World War upset normal functions in society. However, prior to the war, an organisation called RESO was also formed. The founders were ABF, KF and STF¹. RESO with its connection

to organisations close to mainstream Sweden and the social democratic movement embraced the idea of creating and producing the people's vacation package (*folksemestern*). (Holmberg, 1971) Ideologically it congrued with the idea of the welfare state securing affordable and meaningful leisure pursuits. The Swedish state had been passively involved in promoting incoming tourism through the Swedish Tourism and Travel Association (STTF) which was set up in 1902 as a syndicate for the large travel corporations such as the State Railways (SJ), the main ferry companies, and later on Scandinavian Airlines (SAS). In the early 1930s the parliament decided to specifically direct funding to STTF. Prior to this decision resources had been funnelled via the SJ. At the end of the decade a decision was taken to further support tourism by establishing what was termed the *Fritidsnämnden* (the leisure committee). Its purpose was to establish nature reserves for leisure purposes, holiday facilities and vacation homes for housewives. *Fritidsnämnden* was a result of the government inquires on recreation presented in the report SOU 1940:12. Although the report mainly deals with recreational policies (Hultman, 1999) it shows a growing concern of society as a provider of opportunities whether they are mainly recreational or pursued by tourists. Sandell and Sörlin (1999) point to the fact that several NGO:s contributed to the development of domestic tourism and recreation and as a result influenced the formation of national policies, later implemented on different governmental levels in Sweden.

The development which took place during this period was intensified in its latter part but was disrupted by war time. The overall assessment was that tourism was a minor branch of the economy. It had significance in some regions such as Dalarna County and parts of the West Coast of Sweden but as a whole tourism was dismal. The state involvement, although as yet minute, had two impetuses. Firstly, it attempted to attract visitors to Sweden and secondly, a growing concern about the provision of leisure and vacation possibilities for ordinary people became evident as an ingredient in forming the welfare state (SOU 1940:12).

The Fordism period, 1930-1973

The crisis that the pre-Fordistic system created led to an adjustment of the capitalistic system. Institutions and the international trade system was re-arranged. For Sweden, the economic crisis of the 1920s was in an international perspective deeper. The conflicts in the labour market declined after its culmination when demonstrators were shot and killed in the village of Ådalen in 1931. The Swedish system with centralised bargaining between workers and employers and a non-interfering state was put in place via the Saltsjöbaden Treaty in 1938.

Swedish tourism policies became integrated with the welfare policies in the 1930s. As a result of this public involvement tourism was shaped by the welfare system which it was a part of. After World War II Keynesian economic theories were implemented in many Western countries. The Fordistic system was based on production of standardised goods for a mass market. The state under the Fordistic system became pro-active (Breathnach, 2010). The state intervened to a

larger extent than before. The motive for these interventions was to improve the social conditions for the population by reducing the amplitude in cyclical fluctuations in the economy. Keynesian economics were adopted and a set of social reforms were introduced after the war but the foundations dated back to the pre-war period. To improve the Fordistic system the economic theories of Meider and Rehn was pursued. The idea was to create a permanent boom in the economy with low inflation by stimulating structural adjustments (Ryner, 1994).

During the Fordistic period, the importance of the welfare state grew in most Western countries. This had to do with the concept of de-commodification, a term introduced by Polanyi (Polanyi, 1944; Holden, 2003). This process is according to Esping-Anderssen something which: '... occurs when a service is rendered as a matter of right, and when a person can maintain a livelihood without reliance on the market.' (Esping-Andersen 1990: 21-22). More sectors in the economy became de-commodified, e.g. education and health services. This way the welfare state expanded in many societies during the Fordistic era. There were differences between social democratic states and neo-liberal countries, but several states took on new tasks and expanded their domains during the post-war period. The state started to organise the spare time of the labour force. State and capital shared an interest in keeping the labour force strong and healthy (Holmberg, 1971). Many firms created holiday homes for their employees and also set up reserved areas for second homes. The state initiated and gradually expanded the number of vacation weeks through legislation (see eg. Lundahl). Another reflection of this is the marketing of domestic tourism and recreation opportunities during the Fordistic period.

Until the 1970s the Fordistic mode of production produced the intended outcome, but due to several internal and external shocks the Keynesian welfare state became unable to manage its role as director of the economic system and to uphold the existing regime of accumulation. The regulationists argue that each of these regimes of accumulation might run into problems and crisis. Crises are of different magnitudes. Some problems are only cyclical or temporary while others are structural and more severe (Lipliz, 1987). In the 1970s the welfare states were criticised by economists, political leaders, and citizens. A recession led to a shift in public opinion from left to right in many Western countries with a corresponding shift in public policy. Welfare systems were gradually changed or dismantled.

This second time period represents the breakthrough for tourism as a major concern for the public sector in terms of its involvement, the phenomenal growth of tourism in society and its significance in the economy. The driving force behind this was the growth in wealth and a relatively even income distribution. The Swedish economy was thriving during the 1950s and practically exploded in the 1960s. The means for realising the welfare state was in place (see e.g. Blyth, 2001). The municipal reform of 1952 strengthened local government and falls into this context of institutional change.

So far the STTF had marketed Sweden as a destination to a selection of countries which coincided with the geography of major Swedish carriers (air, rail

and ferries). Finland, Denmark, West Germany and the UK were key markets in Europe, reflecting the interests of the STTF board and not the best business opportunities (Mattsson, 2010). However, the state demanded a shift in focus from only trying to attract more visitors to Sweden to also informing a growing domestic market about tourism opportunities. (SOU 1973:52, see also Selander)

In the 1960s charter travel gained momentum. Outbound tourism created a growing deficit in the balance of payments (SOU 1973:52). This period of deficits lasted from 1961 to 2009 and is interesting in the sense that it reflects several changes in society. The fact that it did end showed more than anything that tourism was now recognised as a real business in Sweden. Swedes are still very attracted by holidays to the sun so the regained balance is only an effect of increasing tourism exports from Sweden (Tillväxtverket 2012).

During the 1960s several government inquiries were commissioned. The reports SOU 1964:47, 1965:19, and 1966:33 presented the state of the art for tourism and recreation in Sweden, and just like e.g. the ORRRC (1962) studies in the US initiated a few years earlier, government policies grew out of these studies. The SOU reports mentioned above had among other things established the extent and magnitude of tourism and recreation. It was obvious to the government, from their ideological viewpoint, that steps had to be taken in order to increase the supply of recreational and tourism opportunities and facilities, not least accommodation. This led to a major change in the legal system (SOU 1967:50) which made it possible for municipalities to cater to the needs of non-residents.

The 1960s was also a decade when new government agencies were set up. Thus *Statens Planverk*² and *Naturvårdsverket* (NV) were established. The latter administered grants and financial support to different facilities of significance for tourism and recreation. *Statens Planverk* had a more direct involvement in the establishment of a national physical plan. This project was initiated during Olof Palme's time as minister of the department of communications. Its scope was present and future use of all Swedishland and water resources (SOU 1971:75). Part of this work dealt with tourism and recreation (see e.g. Genrup & Nordin) which culminated in designating 25 areas for tourism development (*Primära Rekreationsområden, Pri R*). It created a Klondike-like atmosphere in the municipalities concerned. When parliament took the decision party lines were suppressed in favour of geographic commonalities. Thus instead of the suggested 22 the final vote identified 25 Pri R. The winners expected that large scale government funds should be devoted to new facilities in the designated areas, visions congruent with the heydays of the 1960s. However, the 1970's economy looked bleak when the decade ended. Of course, many of the policies put forward in the 1970s bore the imprint of the 1960s. The government inquiries of the 1970s and early 1980s conveyed the sense that policy making and economic realities were out of step with each other (SOU 1973:52, SOU 1981:28, SOU 1983:43).

In 1976 STTF was replaced by the new Swedish Tourist board (ST). This was the outcome of the inquiry which was presented in 1973 (SOU 1973:52). Instead of creating a new ministry and appointing a tourism minister ST evolved

out of STTF. It remained a corporatist organisation legally set up as a foundation with key organisations representing the founders. However, the new board had a stronger connection to social movements and thus also close ties to the ruling social democratic party. This was also reflected in the fact that ST was given two major tasks. It should promote social tourism as well as sound development of businesses. The lack of statistics on tourism, which the inquiries from the 1960s had made painfully clear, was one task given to ST to remedy. Among Western countries, Sweden as a forerunner on vital statistics, became one of the last to document this new and growing business (SOU 1973:52).

If ST had been set up as a ministry, it would have been easier to centralise all government activities concerning tourism and recreation to such an agency. Instead NV and other central agencies continued to deal with matters concerning tourism. When it came to the 25 Pri R a special planning body was set up (*Rekreationsberedningen*). Just a few years later it was amalgamated with ST, but by then the entire project had collapsed. This failure reflected the slowdown in the Swedish economy. There was no government money to finance anything beyond extravagant physical planning documents. Developing social tourism under the auspices of ST was consequently abolished. The government rhetoric (SOU 1981:28) became clear when *implementation* was replaced by wording such as *coordination*. With no fresh resources any changes had to take place within the existing budget. Politically the social democrats managed to sell the message that a healthy and competitive tourism business community will deliver any products in demand – there was in fact no need for a social tourism policy. Had social tourism been taken further it would have become a service turned into a right, i.e. a process of de-commodification (see SOU 1983:45; Billing and Rångård made reservations against de-commodification suggested by the majority of this inquiry). ST conducted a few surveys of handicapped people's access to facilities, but apart from this, the social aspect was abandoned (Pearce, 1996). The change was also evident with regard to the location of tourism matters in the central administration. There was a shift from the department of agriculture via foreign affairs/commerce and trade, finally ending up in the department of industry. The corresponding move in government was from the committee of culture to the committee of industry and trade.

On the local and regional level there was a gradual shift towards a firmer structure of public involvement. However, the emerging structure was sometimes fragile and there has sometimes been competition regarding tasks between local and regional tourism organisations (see e.g. Pearce 1996). From the 1950s and onwards many municipalities had built campsites, summer villages and let public buildings as hostels often with substantial support from central government. This involvement continued as tourism became one of the recognised means in regional development policy during the late 1970s and thereafter. As this time period drew to a close the strong public sector involvement in the provision of tourism opportunities also came to an end. This trend toward market based solutions is not only an international trend, put forward by OECD and other organizations, it is also a set of reforms which is implemented both under

socialist and conservative governments. In Sweden, for example, the new public management ideas were implemented and de-regulation of monopolies were introduced under socialist governments during the 1980's (Sundström 2003, Pavolini & Ranci 2008).

The post-Fordism period. 1973-

In the beginning of the 1970s a recession ended a period of stable economic growth in the Western world. The Fordistic growth engine did not produce the intended result anymore. Unemployment, state budget deficits, an oil crisis and the collapse of the global monetary system changed the regime of accumulation. In order to overcome the imbalances in the capitalistic system, the regime of accumulation changed. This new system has been termed *post-Fordism*, or *post-industrial* (Bell, 1974). The new arrangement can be seen as a new regime of accumulation, or a new mode of regulation. New ways of doing business emerged and at the same time social practices and formal rules were being modified in response to these changes.

Many of the policy areas where the state had increased its importance up to that time were privatised, and deregulated. New ways of organising tasks in the public sector were introduced. The philosophy behind this was taken from the private sector. This development has been referred to as 'New Public Management' (Hood, 1995). Since the 1980s many have argued that there has been a considerable 'hollowing out' of the state. Several of the functions that states earlier were in control of were either turned over to the market or taken over by other public actors.

The transition to a new post-Fordistic state which focused on competition also changed the relation between the regions (Breathnach, 2010). The space for local and regional initiatives had expanded immensely. Re-distribution between regions had been reduced or even abolished and the local ability to produce economic growth was emphasised.

What is evident from our research is that the state was trying to shape regional and local business in order to make it more successful in the global competition, but under certain circumstances the legislation for securing free competition worked against the specific needs of the local economy. The result was that some local and regional economies were more adaptable to the new situation while others faced a relative disadvantage. The 'one size fits all' approach was based on the notion of the market economy as a neutral, effective and fair institution.

Jessop (1993) has suggested that the new state can be characterised as a Schumpeterian post national competition state which is a new kind of state primarily concerned with developing new ways of competing in the global arena. This leads to new ways of defining the role of the state. The Schumpeterian workfare state is more concerned with improving the supply side of the economy, by stimulating learning and by being more involved in creating a dynamic environment for business and entrepreneurship than the state was before. During the Fordistic period, the demand side was stimulated in times of recession to

keep the economy on track. Another change is the way the cost of labour is perceived. In the Fordistic days the labour force was considered a source of demand, but now it is seen as a factor cost. This is one of the inherent contradictions within capitalism, when return on capital is gained by reducing labour costs demand is challenged and business will peril. As a result economic restructuring has been profound in most Western countries, with a shift from de-commodification to re-commodification. The provision of social benefits as a matter of social rights has been replaced by a system of welfare services in the market (Dingeldey, 2007).

The new system has been created by deregulation of old monopolies and a separation between public and private sector. An interesting paradox which may be noticed is that the joint ventures between private and public actors have become more common than before and is, in the post-Fordist state, a common way of organising local and regional development schemes. This has in turn led to a question of political legitimacy and transparency (Pike, 2002).

Policy transfer has been a distinct feature of this period in time. The neo-liberal policy fix which has been dominating state policy in the USA and in the UK for example has been influencing political systems in many countries regardless of historic background. Often this trend has been interpreted as a sign of decreasing state power. However, without states this policy transfer would not be possible. One of the most important actors behind globalisation is in fact states (Peck, 2001; Gramsci, 1971). Free trade agreements, supra national organisations are all dependent on state support in order to function. In fact states are the only actors which are strong enough to drive such politics and decide the rules of the game.

The gradual withdrawal of government involvement in tourism in favour of private interests is reflected in a stronger involvement from various trade organisation such as VISITA (the former hotel and restaurant association) and the Swedish Travel and Tourist Industry Federation (*Rese- och Turistnåingen i Sverige*, RTS), established in 1992, as well as Swedish Campsite Owners Association (*Sveriges Camping- och Stugföretagares Riksförbund*, SCR), just to mention the main ones.

The new liberal government which took office in 1991 was inspired by Reaganomics and decided to do away with ST. Thus in 1992, instead of running the show the government decided to buy marketing services for Sweden from the Swedish Travel and Tourism Council, a tourism industry created organisation. The cost for the Swedish state was initially lower but the ideological gain was greater as this change was more in tune with the liberal economic ideals of the time. In 1995, the social democrats regained power and the Swedish Tourist Authority was set up. It led to a more direct involvement in tourism by the state. After another 10 years these organisations were once again replaced. Thus in the time span of about 30 years four different organisations had come and gone. The present one remains a two-tier set up with marketing concentrated to *Visit Sweden* and other tourism matters handled by the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (*Tillväxtverket*). Interesting to note is that the marketing focus

is back to where it was in the late 1960s, i.e. on exports only (Bohlin & Elbe, 2011).

Although, this last period is often described as a period of recurring reorganisation and restructuring which may blur the picture as to what was going on, in retrospect the direction of change is clear. Tourism is seen purely as business and government should only concern itself with actions which could enhance this aspect of tourism if it should be involved at all. The collaborative set-up of business and government was reinforced as Sweden joined the EU. Their model of partnership financing and enforcement is in line with this corporative form of organisation. More or less everything is organised as projects based on temporary partnerships.

The new strategy for Swedish tourism presented in 2010 is in tune with the new tourism policy presented by the EU (COM[2010]352:6) Competitiveness is the main way to achieve continued expansion in tourism and tourism is considered the most promising vehicle to address unemployment. The EU tourism policy also recognize a healthy tourism business environment for sustainable approaches and benefits will accrue in the areas of ‘...social matters, territorial cohesion and the protection of and capitalisation on natural and cultural heritage’ (Com[2010]352:6).

On local and regional levels there is a similar development, i.e. that private sector solutions are the ideal. Reorganisation involves getting private partnership for tourist organisations – now more commonly referred to as destination management organisations (DMOs), are often based on the public sector contributing the lion’s share of the financing but having often only a minority vote on the board. Private is superior to public. Thus many of these DMOs during the post-Fordistic era changed from public agencies into share holding companies. If the local level may be described as changing in form, it has been fairly stable in its geographic representation. The regional level has been in much more upheaval. An explanatory factor could be that the administrative regions of Sweden, largely dating to the 17th century do not coincide with what is perceived as natural tourism regions today. As it has been difficult to depart from this government structure diverging interests were incorporated in the regional DMOs from the very start. By and large most of these conflicts have been sorted out by now and the change in regional policy reinforcing the significance of the regional level has probably contributed to this development. This change is part of an increased devolution of power to the regional level and a decrease of the presence of central government on the county level. Central to the new regional policy also affecting tourism is growth and innovation. The buzzwords of the time are clusters, networks, partnerships, innovation systems and projects. Considerable time is spent on grant applications for relative short period of times. This project economy creates a lot of bureaucracy and a project timetable which does not allow thinking beyond a three year project time span.

In order to sum up the analysis, we present the main characteristics in each period on the general as well as on the tourism level in table 1.

Table 1. Relationship between production, consumption and regulation in general and with specific reference to tourism during the three time periods of pre-Fordism, Fordism and post-Fordism.

Time period	Mode of Production		Mode of Consumption		Regulation	
	General	Tourism	General	Tourism	General	Tourism
Pre-Fordism - 1930	Small firms	Resorts Spas,	Low demand	Upper classes at spas	International free trade system	Limited concern as tourism is insignificant
	Craft based production	Mountain, Small companies	Class based consumption	Second homes for the bourgeoisie	Laissez-fair economy	
	Export of raw material		Low public spending		Unregulated labour markets	
Fordism 1930-1980	Mass markets	Summer villages,	Mass consumption	Mass tourism new classes entering the market	Regulated international trade	Vacation laws
	Centralised bargain	Campsites	Standardised goods	Self-catering	Greater state involvement in economy	Tourism becomes part of regional policymaking
	Large firms	Self-Catering	Public consumption higher- Welfare state	Social tourism		
	Nationally based markets		Consumer goods produced			New state agencies
Post-Fordism 1980-	Niche markets	Some larger companies	Re-commodification	Conspicuous consumption	New global institutions	Deregulation of transports
	Flexible production	International capital	Public Spending less and different	High tech high touch	Free trade regime	Market solutions rather than government regulation
	Small batch production,	Niche products		Experience type products	De-regulation	
	Out-sourcing				Neo-liberal policies	

Discussion and conclusion

It is the authors' opinion that tourism policy can best be understood in relation to the overall economic and political development of the country. Like Garay and Cànoves (2011), we have found it useful to use regulation theory as a theoretical framework in examining how tourism policy has changed over time. We have thus used the three main periods in relation to the dominant modes of production for each epoch proposed in regulation theory, named pre-Fordism, Fordism and post-Fordism. Our analysis clearly shows that there exist a strong connection between development of tourism policy and the stages in the regime of accumulation.

During the pre-Fordism period, policies directed against tourism was quite limited in extent, mainly affecting infrastructure which was also used for other purposes in society. With increasing wealth and concern for the well-being of the labour force, policy making regarding leisure and tourism became a main concern in the Fordistic period. There was a clear ambition to extend the welfare state to the realm of tourism by decommoifying a set of facilities and amenities provided through the public purse. It is also evident from changes in legislation.

When this second period ended the relation between the public and private sphere was re-adjusted. This was a reflection of the major shifts in the Swedish economy which started in the 1970s and led to the social democratic vision of a Third Way of economic policy during the 1980s (Ryner,1994). Eventually this economic policy led to a deep economic crisis which was important for the changes in tourism policy during the third period. This period could best be described as a change of focus for the public sector from welfare provision to competition. All of these changes within the tourism industry reflect the general trends in society as a whole.

Stimulating development of sound business ventures in the tourism field gained the upper hand and as we move into the post-Fordistic period. Instead of tourism consumption as part of a welfare scheme tourism policy shifted towards market solutions. This was achieved by successive deregulation. This becomes manifest by re-commodification of goods and services with new and old entrepreneurs acting as providers in the market place.

From a theoretical point of view it is our contention that current analysis of changes in tourism policy falls short when it comes to account for the driving forces behind development and change. We have tried to fill this theoretical gap by combining regulation theory with elements derived from the concept of political economy and we have put tourism policy in a wider political and economic context. Although tourism policy in Sweden is rooted in what Esping-Anderssen (1990) refer to as the social democratic welfare system, it is still obvious that the tourism policy in Sweden is highly influenced by the more general regimes. The three major epochs recognized within regulation theory, namely pre-Fordism, Fordism and post-Fordism, can be identified in the development of the Swedish economy starting in the second half of the 19th century and on wards till the present time. It is the contention of the authors that the development and changes in tourism policy can be sorted and understood along these time-periods as well.

If there will be a reassessment of present state remains to be seen, but it is striking how tourism policy so far has moved like a pendulum over time. It is the authors' view, as shown in this paper, that regulation theory put in a framework of political economy substantially contributes to an understanding of the mechanisms behind changes in tourism policy. In relation to the international literature Sweden possibly is an extreme case as the social democratic welfare model had such a profound impact on its tourism policy.

References

- Aglietta, M. (2000) *A theory of capitalist regulation: the US experience*. Verso, London.
- Baldersheim H. & Ståhlberg K. (2002) From Guided Democracy to Multi-Level Governance: Trends in Central-Local Relations in the Nordic Countries. *Local Government Studies*, 28(3), p.74-90.
- Bell, D. (1974) The coming of a post-industrial society. *A Venture in Social Forecasting*, Heinemann, London.
- Bianchi, R.,W. (2009) The 'critical turn' in tourism studies: A radical critique. *Tourism geographies*, 11(4): 484 -504.
- Blyth, M. (2001) The Transformation of the Swedish Model - Economic Ideas, Distributional Conflict, and Institutional Change. *World Politics*, 54(1):1-26.
- Bohlin, M. & Elbe, J., 2011. *Samhällets roll i besöksnäringens utveckling*. Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting.
http://www.skl.se/vi_arbetar_med/tillvaxt_och_samhallsbyggnad/foretagsklimat/rapporter#Samhällets_roll_för_besöksnäringen
- Boyer, R. & Saillard Y. (2002) *Regulation theory-State of the art*. Routledge, London.
- Bramwell, B. (2011) Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 19(4-5): 459 -477.
- Breathnach, P. (2010) From Spatial Keynesianism to Post-Fordist Neoliberalism: Emerging Contradictions in the Spatiality of the Irish State. *Antipode*, 42(5): 1180 -1199.
- Butler, R. (1980) The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 35: 287-295.
- Chambers, D. & Airey, D. (2001) Tourism Policy in Jamaica: A Tale of Two Governments. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2-4), 94-120.
- (COM[2010]352. European commission. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination – a new political framework for tourism in Europe
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/files/communications/communication2010_en.pdf 2011-08-15.
- Dingeldey I. (2007) Welfare-state change between 'compulsion to work' and 'ability'. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 17(2): 189.
- Dredge D. & Jenkins J. (2007) *Tourism Planning and Policy*. Wiley. Chichester.
- Edgell, D.L., Allen M.D., Smith G. & Swanson J.R.(2008) *Tourism Policy and Planning-Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. Routledge. London.
- Ehn P., Isberg M., Linde C. & Wallin G. (2003) Swedish bureaucracy in an era of change. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 16(3), pp. 429–458.
- Eskilsson, L. (2000) Fritid som idé, struktur och praktik: rätten till lättja eller friluftsliv i folkhemmet. *Historisk tidskrift*, (120): 29-53.

- Esping-Anderssen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fayos-Solá, E. Tourism Policy: A Midsummer Night's Dream? *Tourism Management*, 17(6), pp. 407-412.
- Garay, L. & Cánoves, G. (2010) Life Cycles, Stages and Tourism History. The Catalonia (Spain) Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 651-671.
- Genrup, K & Nordin, U. 1977, Fritidsboendevanor - kunskapsöversikt rörande vissa sociala och kulturhistoriska aspekter. *Fysisk riksplanering, underlagsmaterial nr 10.77*. Bostadsdepartementet. Departementets offsetcentral. Stockholm.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks*, International Publishers Co, New York.
- Hall, C. M. (2009) The Public Policy Context of Tourism Entrepreneurship. In: Page, S. & Ateljevic, J (Eds.), *Tourism and Entrepreneurship: International Perspective*. Butterworth Heinemann, London.
- Harris, J. & McDonald, C. (2000) Changing Modes of Regulation: Production and Consumption Relations in the British Local State. *British Association of Social Workers*. (30): 51-70.
- [Http://www.Historicalstatistics.org](http://www.Historicalstatistics.org) accessed 2011-08-15.
- Holden, C. (2003) 'Decommodification and the Workfare State', *Political Studies review*, 1:304.
- Hood, C. (1995) The 'New Public Management' In the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 20(2/3):93-109.
- Hood, C. (1991) A Public Management for all seasons. *Public Administration*, 69(1): 3-19.
- Holmberg, G. (1971) Plats för folksemester. I: *Blekinge - STF:s årskrift 1971*, sid 257-270, Stockholm.
- Hudson, J. & Kühner, S. (2011) Analysing the Productive and Protective Dimensions of Welfare: Looking Beyond the OECD. *COMPASSS Working Paper 2011-63* www.compass.org
- Hultman, S-G. 1999, Myndigheternas engagemang. In: Sandell, K. & Sörlin, S., *Friluftshistoria – Från "hårdande friluftslif" till ekoturism och miljöpedagogik: Teman i det svenska friluftslivets historia*. 185-201. Carlsson Bokförlag, Stockholm.
- Jessop, B. (1993) Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare State? Preliminary Remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy. *Studies in Political Economy*, (40): 7-39.
- Kim, T.K. & Zurlo, K. (2009) How does economic globalisation affect the welfare state? Focusing on the mediating effect of welfare regimes. *International Journal of Social Welfare* Volume 18, Issue 2, pages 130–141, April.
- Jessop, B. (2002) *The future of the Capitalist State*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Lake, R.,W. (2002) Bring Back Big Government. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(4): 815-822.

- Lindström, L. (2006) Fritidssektorn en statlig utmaning, Luleå tekniska universitet. Luleå.
- Liu, A. & Liu J.H.H. (2009) Government approaches to tourism: an international inquiry. *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 2(3).
- Lundahl, A. 1978. *Livsformer i omvandling: om arbetstid och fritid i Sverige förr och nu*. Riksförbundet Sveriges fritids- och hemgårdar (RSFH), Täby.
- Mavroudeas, S. (2003) The French Regulation Approach and its Theory of Consumption. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. <http://mpa.ub.uniuenchen.de/19730/> MPRA Paper- No.19730. January 2010/14:17. 2011-08-17.
- Mattsson, I. 2010. Mail and personal communication with Ingvar Mattsson who was marketing director of STTF when it was replaced by the new Swedish Touristboard. 2010-11-22.
- North, D (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Olsson, U. (1993) Industrilandet, In: Beckman, M. (Eds), *Äventyret Sverige: en ekonomisk och social historia*, Utbildningsradion, Bra Böcker, Stockholm.
- ORRRC, (1962) Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. *Study reports 1-27*, Washington.
- Pavolini, E. & Ranci, C. (2008) Restructuring the welfare state: reforms in long-term care in Western European Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2008:18.
- Pearce, D. G. (1996) Tourist Organizations in Sweden. *Tourist Management*, 17(6): 413-424.
- Peck, J. (2001) Neoliberalizing states: thin policies/hard outcomes. *Progress in Human Geography* (25): 445-55.
- Pierre, J. & Peters, G. B. (2000) *Governance, Politics and the State*. Palgrave MacMillan Press, London.
- Pike, A. (2002) Task forces and the organisation of economic development: The case of the North East region of England. *Environment and planning. C, Government & policy*, 20(5):717 -739.
- Powell M, & Barrientos A. (2004) Welfare Regimes and Welfare mix. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43(1) 83-105.
- Ryner, M. (1994) 'Assessing SAP's Economic Policy in the 1980s: The 'Third Way', the Swedish Model and the Transition from Fordism to Post-Fordism.' *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 15(3):385-428
- Sandell, K. & Sörlin, S., 1999. Upptäckten av friluftslandskapet. In: Sandell, K. & Sörlin, S., *Friluftshistoria – Från "hårdande friluftslif" till ekoturism och miljöpedagogik: Teman i det svenska friluftslivets historia*. 27-46.. Carlsson Bokförlag, Stockholm.
- Selander, T. 1968. Sverige-Informationens kalla krig. *Svenska Dagbladet*, 4 maj 1968, Under strecket. Stockholm.

- Shone, M.C. & Ali Memon, P. (2008) Tourism, Public Policy and Regional Development: A Turn from Neo-Liberalism to the New Regionalism. *Local Economy*. 23(4), 290-304.
- SOU 1940:12. *Inrättande av fritidsreservat för städernas och de tätbebyggda samhällenas befolkning*. Stockholm. SOU 1964:47. *Friluftslivet i Sverige, Del I – Utgångsläge och utvecklingstendenser*. Stockholm.
- SOU 1966:19. *Friluftslivet i Sverige, Del II – Friluftslivet i samhällsplaneringen*. Stockholm.
- SOU 1966:33. *Friluftslivet i Sverige, Del III – Anläggningar för det rörliga friluftslivet*. Stockholm.
- SOU 1967:50. *Kommunala befogenheter inom turismväsendet*. Stockholm.
- SOU 1971:75. Hushållning med mark och vatten – Inventeringar, Planövertaganden om vissa naturresurser, former för fortlöpande fysisk riksplanering, lagstiftning. Civildepartementet. Gleerups, Lund 1974.
- SOU 1973:52. *Turism och rekreation i Sverige*. Betänkande av kommittén för planering av turistanläggningar och friluftsområden mm. Stockholm.
- SOU 1981:28. *Turism och friluftsliv- Det centrala myndighetsansvaret*. Betänkande av turist- och rekreationspolitiska utredningen. Jordbruksdepartementet, Liber, Allmänna förlaget, Stockholm.
- SOU 1983:43. *Områden för turism och rekreation*. Betänkande från rekreationsberedningen om utvecklingen av våra rekreationsområden, Liber, Allmänna förlaget, Stockholm.
- SOU 1983:45 *Turism och Friluftsliv 2 – Om förutsättningar och hinder*. Betänkande av turist- och rekreationspolitiska utredningen.
- Stolt, R. & Winblad, U. (2009) Mechanisms behind privatization: A case study of private growth in Swedish elderly care Document, *Social science & medicine*, 68(5):903 -911.
- Sundström, G. (2003) Management by measurement – Its origins and development in the case of the Swedish state. Stockholm Center for Organizational Research Stockholm.
- Sörenson, U. 1989. *Resan till sevärdheten*. Svenska Turistföreningen, Riksantikvarieämbetet och Sveriges Turistråd. STF:s publ nr 2741. Borås.
- Svenska Turistföreningen, 1985. *Svenska turistföreningen 100 år, Årsskrift 1986*. Uppsala. ISSN 0349-229X.
- Svenska Turistföreningens hemsida:
<http://www.svenskaturistforeningen.se/sv/Kampanjsidor/STF-firar-125-ar/20010-03-17>.
- Tillväxtverket 2012. *Fakta om svensk turism 2011*. Stockholm.
- UNWTO, 2004. *World Overview and Tourism Topics*. Madrid, ISBN: 92-844-0803-2.
- Warburton, J. & Grassman, E.J. (2011) Variations in older people's social and productive ageing activities across different social welfare regimes. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 20(2), April, pp.180-191.

Zuindeau, B. (2007) Régulation School and environment: Theoretical proposals and avenues of research. *Ecological Economics*, 62(2):281-290.

Notes

¹ *ABF* (Arbetarnas bildningsförbund) is an acronym for the Workers' Educational Association and *KF* (Kooperativa förbundet) is the Swedish Cooperative Union. In addition to these founding members there were other participants in the background, namely the State Railways (Statens järnvägar, *SJ*), The Federation of Swedish Farmers (Lantbrukarnas riksförbund, *LRF*) and *HSB* (Hyresgärsternas sparkasse- och byggnadsförening - a cooperative housing organisation in Sweden), and *LO* (Landsorganisationen) The umbrella union for blue collar workers.

² *Statens Planverk* was reorganised in 1988 and later became *Boverket* (Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning). *Naturvårdsverket* (Swedish Environmental Protection Agency) is still in existence.