Political attitudes towards LGBT-persons in contemporary Swedish family policies

- An analysis around the concepts of freedom and tolerance in the Swedish society
Abstract
The objective of this research was to contribute to the discussion about LGBT-rights in Swedish politics. Some previous findings suggested that one political party in particular, the Swedish Democrats, had an opposing stance towards LGBT-persons. To investigate this, the first research question aimed to find out if there are in fact any notable differences between the different parties in the Swedish parliament in this regard. The second research question was designed in order to examine all related opinions of the parties in the light of positive and negative freedom. The third research question aimed to find out how the attitudes from the political parties could be understood within a perspective of tolerance. The analytical framework is based on the concept of tolerance, and the concepts of positive and negative freedom which were originally developed by Isiah Berlin. The study is a qualitative text-analysis with an abductive approach. Argumentation analysis has been applied when suitable. The study found that the Swedish Democrats was the most restrictive party in this context. Moreover, the studied policies were found to have characteristics of both negative and positive freedom, and they were generally approved upon by the political parties. Lastly, the Swedish Democrats and the Christian Democrats were argued to be tolerant towards these LGBT-policies, even though the policies were mostly disliked due to moral clashes against their core family values.
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Introduction
This chapter will give a brief overview of the chosen subject and the overall study. It will also touch upon previous studies to allow for the reader to understand the subject in a broader context.

Overview and hypothesis
Globally, Sweden is often acknowledged for its “gay-friendly” approach in all levels of society (ILGA, 2015). In the domestic discussion though, there are still suggestions and demands being put forward in order to improve the situation for the LGBT-community. There is especially one political party in Sweden, the Swedish Democrats, which is sometimes criticized for being the least favourable for LGBT-persons in Sweden, and even for having a discriminative and degrading view of people who identify themselves within that group (Brandel, 2014; Regnér, et al., 2015; Voss, 2015; etc.). Such criticism does, however, often emerge from rivaling political parties or other sources of information which could be argued to be heavily subjective. In an attempt to avoid such subjectivity, this study will look at all political parties which currently have seats in the Swedish parliament and map out how they have positioned themselves in regards of LGBT-questions, specifically within the family policies. By doing so, it will be possible to study if certain political parties in Sweden in fact represent different attitudes in these regards, as suggested by these sources.

Previous studies and research problem
In Sweden, most researchers seem to focus on different social aspects of LGBT-persons in the society. For example, Darj, et al., (2011) discuss the difficulties of LGBT-persons within families which follow certain norms of honour as a cultural practice. Another study by Jalali (2015) investigates lesbian mothers in Sweden. By approaching the subject in a sociological manner, she describes in what ways the practise of insemination impacts the woman (in a lesbian partnership) who is not carrying the couple’s child, in terms of developing her identity as a mother. Some studies also investigated how the heteronormativity within religious practices in Sweden had affected LGBT-persons. For example, Enstedt, (2015) discussed how the Church of Sweden changed its approach to homosexuality from being related to “sin” to instead gain acceptance as new ways to intepret the Bible arose. Moreover, Lindström (2005) studied how heterosexuality as an established norm in the church in Sweden had influenced notions about homosexuality as “deviant”.

However, some scholars have investigated matters closely related to LGBT-rights in connection to politics in Sweden. For example, Blåholtz (2012) have looked into how political parties in
Sweden have debated around the removal of the demand for sterilization for transsexuals wanting to undergo a legal change of sex. Among other things, she found an ideological difference between the actors who supported the removal of the law and the actors who opposed it, where the supportive arguments often were liberal and the opposing were conservative. Another study by Liliequist (2008) have looked at state policies in connection to homosexuality in Sweden. The study has an historical perspective and focuses on the time from the 17th century up to the 19th century, although earlier sources are also discussed. It seems, however, to be a general lack of research regarding contemporary politics in relation to LGBT-rights in Sweden.

In order to fill that research gap, this study has investigated how the contemporary political attitudes towards LGBT-persons could be understood in a perspective of freedom and tolerance. Such concepts are common in discussions related to LGBT-rights and are suitable in this context. As such, the study has relied upon an analytical framework based on measurements of different aspects of freedom and tolerance. In doing so, the study has provided insight to the discussion of LGBT-rights in a context of political attitudes regarding family policies in Sweden.

Relevance
The study has great relevance in the contemporary policy discussion in Sweden as the subject of everyday-life questions for LGBT-persons may often be dismissed and forgotten due to other concerns at hand. Although the topic could be argued to be less important in Sweden since the country already have in place very LGBT-friendly policies and laws, it still seem to be diverging national opinions on the matter. Furthermore, the largest “pride-festival” in the Nordic countries, Stockholm Pride, provides a platform for important discussions which are relevant for the LGBT-community every year. The upcoming festival in the summer of 2016 has announced that one of their main topics of the year in fact revolves around the issue of family in a LGBT-context (Stockholm Pride, 2016). This proves the need for the topic to be discussed further and for empirical data to be gathered on the subject.

Moreover, given the overall acknowledgement around the world for Sweden’s liberal approach to LGBT-persons, it becomes of interest to explore the nature of such freedoms and to see if there is a national political consensus around the subject. By conducting a comparative study of all parties it will also be possible to see which parties, if any, have a lesser or more extensive liberal approach towards the LGBT-groups in terms of the family policies. In addition, by studying the attitudes in a tolerance-perspective the study can also contribute to the overall
understanding of the political attitudes in this regard and offer some in-depth understanding of party standpoints.

Objective
The main objective of the research is to contribute to the discussion about LGBT-rights in Swedish politics with valuable empirical data and a relevant analysis based upon concepts of freedom and tolerance.

With the above written in mind, the aim of this research is to thoroughly map out the various attitudes from each of the political parties in the parliament in regards of family policy-solutions for LGBT-persons. The study will explore if there is a national political consensus in the country, or if certain parties deviate from the others. Moreover, the study aims to gain a deeper understanding of the situation for LGBT-persons in contemporary Swedish politics by relying on concepts of freedom and tolerance.

Research questions

- To what extent can potential differences be identified between Swedish political parties in terms of how the situation for LGBT-persons in contemporary family policies is addressed?
- How can the chosen policies be understood in the light of different aspects of positive and negative freedom, and what can be concluded from the political parties’ standpoints?
- How can the different attitudes of the political parties be interpreted in the light of a tolerance-perspective?

Limitations of the study
The study had to adapt to certain limitations in order to fit into the given timeframe.

First, it could be argued that all political areas of concern should have been studied in order for the study to get a comprehensive picture of the parties’ attitudes towards LGBT-persons. However, only nine family policies were selected for investigation. This was primarily decided due to the limited time available for the study, but also due to the relevance of that specific topic.
Moreover, the study was limited to only look at contemporary attitudes rather than, for example, examining how the parties have changed their views over time. But in cases where there is no contemporary statement which can enlighten the current stance of a party, the study will rely upon earlier findings which may indicate the position of the party instead. Additionally, it is more relevant to look at current policies and political attitudes in order to contribute to the ongoing debate about LGBT-rights. It also provides a better opportunity to analyse the Swedish Democrats as they are a fairly new party to enter the parliament compared to the other parties.
Analytical Framework
This study will take an analytical point of departure from three concepts. All the concepts described below are interpretations made by the author from writings by Isaiah Berlin (2011) and the Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought (1991). Andrew Heywood’s (2015) interpretations have also been relied upon in order to deepen the understandings of the concepts. The author’s interpretations were made in order to construct a useful analytical framework which would be suitable for this study’s purposes. The first two concepts are negative- and positive freedom and were originally presented by Berlin. A second concept of toleration, as described in the Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought, will also be relied upon as an analytical tool to measure liberty in Sweden.

According to Danemark et al. (2003, pp. 258-268) there are certain requirements to consider when applying concepts as a theoretical tool for analysis. Most important is that the concepts are clearly defined and used coherently. It was therefore deemed necessary for the practicality of the study to create sub-categories of each concept. These are entirely based on the author’s understanding of different identified keywords which are considered to define each concept. They are being used coherently as well as the same structures based on all keywords are also present in the Analysis-chapter. In addition to this, Danemark et al. (ibid) also warn about using the theoretical concepts in a dogmatic manner since this limits the usefulness of the theoretical frame and may make it predictable. The study has attempted to limit such predictability by allowing for the author to freely interpret the concepts and independently construct an analytical framework based on those interpretations.

Negative freedom
According to Berlin, negative freedom can be defined as the freedom to act without being prevented to do so from others (Berlin, 2011). Heywood also discussed the concept of negative freedom. He refers to negative freedom as the “absence of external constraints” (Heywood, 2015).

Law
Since freedom is seen to be when there is an absence of constraints, the law comes in question in regards of the liberty of people. One way to interpret negative freedom may be to assume that anarchy is needed in order to ensure the highest level of freedom. This is, according to both Berlin and Heywood, not necessarily the case. Laws can be justified as the tool needed to ensure that one person’s freedom does not impose upon someone else’s. In that sense, laws should be limited in the greatest way possible to ensure negative freedom, but they are at the same time
much needed in order to assure liberty for all (Berlin, 2011, pp. 194-199; Heywood, 2015, pp. 242-244).

Choice
Another key point within negative freedom concerns the opportunity to have choice. It is sometimes argued that freedom relies upon having the option to choose the alternatives regarded to be the most desirable for a person. There is, for instance, a liberal idea about the importance of a free market to protect the freedom of choice for people in regards of consumerism and the labour market. When there is access to a free market, it is assumed that the individual is able to make whatever choice he or she may then desire (Berlin, 2011, pp. 199-200; Heywood, 2015, pp. 244-245).

Privacy
The idea of privacy of the individual is closely linked to the core principle of negative freedom; that state-interference should at the greatest length possible be avoided. In terms of negative freedom, the right to privacy within the family-sphere is often emphasised. It is stressed that personal relationships, and the actions and thoughts of individuals on that level, should not be encroached upon by the authorities. To ensure negative freedom, it may be considered more important to protect the privacy of individuals rather than allowing for state interference on that level for whatever reason (Berlin, 2011, pp. 194-198; Heywood, 2015, p. 245).

Rationality
Human rationality is also considered in regards to negative freedom. It is believed that humans have an unquestionable rationality which allows for them to always make the decisions best suited for their own preferences. Even when people are totally free from interference, guidance or coercion, they are perfectly capable to make rational choices. It is believed that no matter how well-meaning the interference may be; it will always encroach on the individuals’ freedom as they are being denied the very responsibility of their lives. Even if they make mistakes in the process of making rational decisions, it is simply considered healthy as it allows for personal growth since people then may learn from their mistakes (Berlin, 2011, pp. 199-200; Heywood, 2015, pp. 245-246).

Positive freedom
The core belief within positive freedom is that people must be able to act in what way they may desire in order to be free. It differs from negative freedom where the core principle revolves around not having any direct prevention to perform an action. For example, defenders of positive freedom could point out that for some people it is not sufficient to only legally allow
for certain actions to take place. If certain individuals completely lack the, for example, economic or social features needed to perform such actions, then they are not free enough to perform them anyhow (Berlin, 2011, pp. 203-262; Heywood, 2015, pp. 246-250).

**Governance**
One aspect of positive freedom is connected to governance. In this view, freedom is considered to have been gained when the people are governed in a manner of their choosing. It differs from views on negative freedom where it is assumed that when there is less involvement of the state, there is more freedom for the citizens (Berlin, 2011, pp. 202-204; Heywood, 2015, p. 246).

**Individuality**
Some critics of capitalism have argued that the social constraints, such as poverty and diseases, put on the working mass was in every way as threatening to their liberty as governmental control-mechanisms. Even if such a system ensures liberty for some, others may not enjoy freedom due to no fault of their own. This chain of thought then started revolving around the concept of individuality. Individuality in this sense refers to a person’s specific traits and the aim is to allow for every human being to reach personal growth. Through personal growth, freedom can be assured. In other words, freedom is gained when any individual can pursue self-development and fulfilment. For positive freedom to be ensured to everyone, state interference is likely required in terms of, for example, social or economic benefits for certain individuals deemed to be in need of such (Berlin, 2011, pp. 206-210; Heywood, 2015, pp. 246-249).

**Restricted self-autonomy**
Restricted self-autonomy may be both a blessing and a curse according to both Berlin and Heywood. In this sense, it refers to the ability to master oneself. If self-development is the goal, then there is a need to repress all things which may hinder individuals from mastering themselves and reaching their full potentials. Therefore, actions aimed at granting every individual positive freedom by reaching their “higher self”, may very well seem tyrannical. By restraining people’s access to negative freedom to act in certain (self-destructive) manners, positive freedom can be gained. The restraint on negative freedom is justified by an assumed better knowledge of the mass or the rulers. This enables the opinions of the many to also rule over the few, for their own good. For example, a man can be prohibited from using drugs, even as he harms no one but himself, since the drugs are actively preventing him to realise his full potential (Berlin, 2011, pp. 18-20, 206-210; Heywood, 2015, p. 250).
Toleration

The concept of toleration will also provide an analytical tool for the study. In order to narrow down the otherwise broader and varying interpretations of the concept, this study will foremost rely upon the description of the concept from the Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought. The interpretations made by Andrew Heywood will also be taken into consideration here in order to deepen the analytical depth of the concept.

Tolerance or intolerance

Tolerance should not be confused by an idea of simply allowing for something to happen. To “tolerate” certain behaviours originates from a stance of acceptance of that behaviour, although the behaviour in itself may be disliked. Tolerance in this sense is when a person may be capable of acting to directly prevent a disliked behaviour, but chooses not to. However, although tolerance indicates a passiveness against the disliked behaviour, it may entail certain actions of persuasion to end the disliked behaviour in a rational manner (Blackwell, 1991, pp. 521-523; Heywood; 2015, pp. 250-257). That is the main difference between the concepts of tolerance or intolerance; tolerance requires a rational dialogue to take place without fear of precautions, whereas intolerance simply decides that the behaviour is unacceptable and must come to an end. Intolerance can, in other words, be understood as the complete refusal to accept certain behaviours and thus trying to impose constraints on them (ibid).

Both tolerance and intolerance are therefore concepts where a person does not really agree with a certain type of behaviour. But what determines whether the person is tolerant or intolerant in a specific scenario depends on how he or she chooses to act upon it.
Methodological Framework
This chapter will describe the chosen methods of the study. It will also present the validation strategies which have been applied to improve the accuracy of the findings. Furthermore, the chapter will also comment on the sources and methods in a critical manner.

Collection of data
In order to gain deeper knowledge from the written sources, this study has been shaped as a qualitative text-analysis. The study will be of an abductive type since the empirical data will be understood within the light of the analytical framework (Danermark, et al., 2003). In other words, this research will only be understood within the concepts of positive and negative freedom as well as tolerance as described in the analytical framework-chapter.

Different types of written sources will be relied upon as the empirical data for this study. Most are primary sources but there are also some secondary sources in those cases when primary sources were insufficient. First, the study will attempt to sample the main arguments from non-state actors in Sweden regarding LGBT family policies in order to see how the civil society views these questions. The study will attempt to find such information from various groups and organizations with different attitudes towards the subject. Second, the official webpages of each party will be examined in order to see how they argue around the chosen subject. Third, voting within the parliament will be another unit of analysis for this study. By knowing how the different parties have positioned themselves in previous legislation-attempts around “non-traditional” family constellations, it will be possible to further analyse how the parties view these matters. Fourth, both government and non-government bills will be analysed as these are attempts to persuade the parliament of a certain direction to take within these matters. Lastly, different newspapers and magazines often conduct brief interviews with political representatives. When appropriate, the study have relied upon such sources.

In addition to the sources connected to the political parties, the study has also gathered empirical material from various civil society’s groups. This was necessary in order for the analytical framework to be properly applied

Argumentation analysis
In order to analyse some of the sources, it is important to have a proper method to aid with the selection of data within a written source. One such method which can help to interpret written sources is an argumentation analysis. A few key aspects from this method have been chosen and will be described and evaluated in this section.
According to Bergström and Boréus (2012, p. 91), argumentation analysis can be suitable when wanting to compare arguments and also to create an opportunity to get an overview of the chosen topic. This is appropriate for this study since the opinions of the different parties in the Swedish parliament will be studied and a method of comparison is therefore deemed necessary.

In an argumentation analysis, the *argument* of the written source is the unit of analysis. There are other similar methods of data-collection. For example, an *analysis of ideas* -method aims to identify and analyse the underlying idea of a source. However, to look at the argumentation rather than other such units of analysis has certain advantages for this study. First, to look at the argumentation of a source is to search for “the point” of what is presented. More specifically, the different parties will attempt to make clear why their point of view is the most appropriate, and that is what is interesting to note in this study since the political standpoints in these questions are what will be analysed. Second, it will be possible to distinguish degrees of commitment to the questions asked if the argumentation is analysed. For example, one party may prove to very often bring up these questions for debates, whereas other parties may not want to discuss the issues.

**Critical analysis of the sources and methods**

This section will aim to point out the weaknesses of the methods and also explain the measures taken in order to lessen the impact of those weaknesses.

**Validation**

In order to ensure validity to the study, certain factors have been taken into consideration. These are explained in this section.

John W. Creswell has attempted to identify and describe the most common eight procedures which can increase validity in qualitative research. He suggests that at least two out of these eight procedures are applied to any qualitative study (Creswell, 2013, pp. 243-253). Two out of his presented strategies has thus been chosen for this study. First, *triangulation* of the sources has been an important tool for this study when collecting data. The main understanding of triangulation is that many types of different sources enhance the credibility of the research results. As mentioned above, there are five distinctive different types of sources for empirical data which will be relied upon for this research. The second chosen strategy aims to *clarify researcher bias*. The purpose of that strategy is to make it clear to the reader where the author stands in terms of potential biases. Therefore, certain issues connected to the author’s position

---

1 In Swedish: "Idéanalys"
in relation to the study are evaluated in the section below which discusses the ethical considerations of the study (Creswell, 2013, pp. 250-253).

Limitations of the methods
As with all methods, also the chosen ones for this study contain certain limitations.

First, since the various arguments of each source is the unit of analysis in the texts, there may be room for misinterpretations. A study which is basing its collection of data on the usage of argumentation analysis is more or less forced to interpret all the sources. In that way this study may have become more biased rather than simply descriptive which could then have influenced the objectivity of the study negatively.

Second, to do an abductive study is positive in the way that it allows for the study to go deeper into the analysis through the guidance of a theory or another type of analytical framework. But it can also be argued to limit the study since the findings here only will be discussed within the concepts of negative and positive freedom as well as tolerance.

Ethical considerations
Some clarifications are needed to make the reader aware of certain ethical concerns which have risen in this study.

As a member of the Swedish society and with an interest in political science, the pre-existing assumptions of the author may be a source for subjectivity in the study. Certain precautions have thus been taken in order to diminish that subjectivity and enhance the study’s reliability. First, the author’s involved position in Swedish politics should not be allowed to influence the reader into approving more of some parties than others. As such, the study will only have a descriptive and analytical approach, rather than attempting to value the opinions of each party in favour of one another. Second, all the different parties were examined on equal terms. The Findings-chapter was constructed in a manner which allowed for equal treatment of all political parties as they were all examined in relation to the chosen nine policies. That some parties have a significantly lesser interest of the chosen policies is not something that this study could have avoided. It should be brought to the reader’s attention nonetheless, however. Lastly, the study may paint a skewed or even false picture of the political parties’ approaches to LGBT-concerns. Since the study focuses on family policies, and have selected nine in particular, all other policies regarding protection of LGBT-persons or enhancements of their rights are left unstudied. A comprehensive picture of the political attitudes in regards to LGBT-persons is therefore not shown. Moreover, the findings are interpreted in aspects connected to freedom and tolerance.
It is positive in the manner of reaching a deeper understanding, but may also limit the ways in which the results are understood.
Background
This chapter will place the reader in a context of LGBT-related politics in Sweden. Focus will be placed on contemporary politics and, more specifically, family policies.

LGBT policies in Sweden
Generally, Sweden is today seen as a progressive country in terms of different LGBT-aspects (see for example; ILGA Europe, 2016; Sundevall & Persson, 2016; World Economic Forum, 2015). Homosexuality was forbidden in Sweden until 1944 when it instead became classified as a mental illness. This remained the case up until 1979 after pressure being put on the government by civil society movements leading to the removal of that classification. A few years after removing the status as mentally ill for homosexuals, Sweden enacted a law which gave homosexual domestic partners the same legal rights as heterosexual married couples or domestic partners (Mänskliga Rättigheter, 2014; Statistics Sweden, 2013; Sundevall & Persson, 2016).

LGBT family-policies
This section will describe a selection of LGBT-related family policies. The section will discuss both policies which are already legal in Sweden, and also non-legal policies which have been debated upon in both political spheres as well as within the civil society. Although most of these options are also available for hetero persons or couples, these sections will present the options from a LGBT-perspective.

Gay marriage
Gay marriages are legal in Sweden. Such marriages have the same legal conditions as heterosexual marriages (Riksdagen, 1987).

Adoption
Homosexual spouses have been legally able to adopt in Sweden since 2003. Today, couples must be married in order to adopt together. It is, however, still very rare for homosexual adoptions to take place as most countries only allow heterosexual married couples to adopt (Adoptionscentrum, 2016; Riksdagen, 1949)

Insemination
Today, single women and homosexual female partners have the right to assisted insemination at Swedish hospitals with the aid of a sperm donor. The condition is that the egg used in the insemination is from the woman who is planning on getting pregnant. As such, sterile single women and homosexual partners were both women are sterile cannot use this method (Riksdagen, 2006). However, the waiting lists are often very long at Swedish hospitals and...
many women choses to instead carry out the insemination in their homes or at hospitals in other countries.

**Embryo-donation**

Embryo-donation refers to the donation of a fertilized egg to be inseminated into a woman. As both the egg and sperm are donated, the child would have no genetic ties to either of its parents. This is currently not a legal method in Sweden since there is a law which prohibits insemination when there are no genetic ties between the child and any of the to-be parents (Riksdagen, 2006; 2016).

**Multiple parents**

Another way for non-hetero persons to become parents is to engage in a modern collaboration of parenthood. For example, a male gay couple may conceive a child together with a lesbian couple. Insemination conducted in the home is often the used method in such instances. A child in Sweden can, however, only have a maximum of two legal guardians or parents. As such, there is no legal recognition of more than two parents for any child, no matter how the families have socially constructed their lives (Riksdagen, 1949; Rikshandboken, 2015).

**Parental insurance**

The parental insurance is an economic benefit aiming at allowing parents to care for their young children instead of working. A maximum of two adults, whom are recognised as parents or legal guardians, can receive the benefit (Försäkringskassan, 2016).

**Parenthood-assumption**

A parenthood-assumption is a family policy which determines the parents for a new-born child. If a woman is married to a man he will usually immediately be recognised as the parent to the new-born child, according to the Swedish fatherhood-assumption. If a woman is instead in a domestic partnership with a man, they will have to officially declare the fatherhood. When a woman has been inseminated in a Swedish hospital, and she and her partner have previously declared the parenthood, the spouse of the mother will also be recognised as a mother. However, in those cases where the woman inseminates herself in the home or outside of Sweden, there is no legal recognition for her partner as a parent. Parenthood for both women has to be established through adoption in those cases (Riksdagen, 1949).

**Surrogacy**

To conceive a child through the use of a surrogate mother, a woman bearing a child which she will not be a mother to, is not allowed in Sweden today. An investigation about the matter was ordered by the government which presented its results in 2016. Altruistic surrogacy where there
is no payment to the surrogate mother is differentiated from commercial surrogacy which involves a payment of some kind. The recommended parliamentary action in regards of surrogacy was that it should not be permitted in Sweden, in any form (Riksdagen, 2016). The parliament has not yet made a decision on the matter.

**Transsexual fertility**
Sweden became the first country in the world to allow transsexual men and women to undergo a legal change of identity in 1972. To be allowed to do so, however, they were also required to undergo steralization. This demand was abolished in 2013 (Riksdagen, 2013; Sundevall & Persson, 2016).
Findings
This chapter will present the research findings from several different sources. It will begin by briefly displaying some of the civil society’s views upon the matter of LGBT-persons and family policies. Following that, the chapter will present the political parties’ positions on matter.

Non parliamentary party-opinions
This section contains information about several civil society movements which have different opinions regarding the LGBT in a family context.

LGBT-supportive actors
The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education\(^2\) (RFSU) has established itself as an important actor for the LGBT-movement in Sweden. In terms of family policies and the LGBT, the RFSU has declared that adoption must be accessible on equal measures for both bisexual and homosexual men and women as it is for heterosexuals. Moreover, the RFSU believes that insemination should be an available option for all women. They also support embryo-donation (RFSU, 2003; 2012). In terms of surrogacy, or “host pregnancy” as it is referred to by RFSU, the organisation is positive to see some type of legalislation which would make it legal. Furthermore, the RFSU have advocated for the rights for families with multiple parents. In their opinion, it should be possible for a child to have more than two legal guardians. Moreover, others than the legally recognised parents of a child should be able to access state benefits for parents such as parental allowance, according to the RFSU (RFSU, 2015).

The Feministic Initiative\(^3\) is a feminist political party with no seats in the Swedish national parliament. They have several opinions regarding the LGBT in a context of family policies. First, they want to see the possibilities for homosexuals to adopt enhanced on an international level. They also want to enable insemination of embryos in Sweden, and ensure the equal treatment of homo- and hetero-couples. They also support notions of families with more than two parents, and the right of transsexuals to keep their fertility after a change of gender identity. They are however, firmly against the use of surrogate mothers (Feministiskt Initiativ, 2015).

Anti-surrogacy groups
There are quite a few groups which have opposed the suggestion for surrogacy to be made legal in Sweden. Two such groups have a feministic approach to that stance, the Swedish Women’s Lobby\(^4\) and the Swedish Women’s Doctor’s Society\(^5\) (KLF). They both agree that surrogacy

---

\(^2\) In Swedish: “Riksförbundet för sexuell upplysning”
\(^3\) In Swedish: “Feministiskt Initiativ”
\(^4\) In Swedish: “Sveriges kvinnolobby”
\(^5\) In Swedish: “Kvinnliga Läkares Förening”
should not be legal as it would then legalize a trade with children and female bodies. They also criticize the very idea of surrogacy as it is perceived to derive from a patriarchal notion of seeing women’s bodies as mere tools to be used. They acknowledge no difference between altruistic surrogacy and commerce surrogacy (Fahlén & Åström, 2013; Kvinnliga Läkares Förening, 2011; Sveriges Kvinnolobby, 2016).

There are also some concerns from religious actors around the Swedish society regarding surrogate motherhood. The Christian Values Party⁶ and the Christian Council of Sweden⁷ (SKR) have both involved themselves on the topic of surrogacy. The SKR listed a number of concerns they had for the well-being of the surrogate mother and the child and sent it to the Swedish Ministry of Justice as an appeal. The Christian Values Party, on the other hand, clearly marked a rejection of the idea by stating in their principle program that it should not be allowed (Kristna Värdepartiet, 2014; Sveriges Kristna råd, 2013).

Supporters of the nuclear family-model
Some groups also find other means of allowing non-hetero people to become parents to be wrong. The Christian Values Party declares that the right of the child to have both a mother and a father to be of upmost importance. Therefore, they cannot condone same-sex adoptions or actions where a child is taken away from its “biological origin” by various fertility techniques (Kristna Värdepartiet, 2014). Other common defenders of the nuclear family-model are far right groups. One extreme-right group in Sweden called the Nordic Youth⁸ have also opposed to what they refer to as the “normalization of homosexuality” in the society. They position themselves as complete opposites to what the RFSU stands for and accuse them (and other organizations) of braking down the “natural” identities in the society in order to create new ones (Nordisk Ungdom, 2016; Svensson, 2014).

Political parties in the Swedish parliament
The political parties are presented in an alphabetical order. The findings are concentrated upon each party’s attitudes towards the different types of LGBT-policies described in the Background-chapter.

The Centre Party
The Centre Party⁹ support the idea of gay marriage. In regards of adoption, the party believes that it does not matter if there are same-sex parents or hetero-parents who adopt, or if it is a

---

⁶ In Swedish: "Kristna värdepartiet"
⁷ In Swedish: "Sveriges Kristna råd"
⁸ In Swedish: "Nordisk ungdom"
⁹ In Swedish: "Centerpartiet"
single-parent. They believe that all potential parents should be evaluated on equal premises regarding their appropriateness as parents, not their sexual preferences or marital status. They also believe that the state grant given in connection to an adoption should be evaluated for a raise. In terms of insemination, they believe that insemination should be an accessible option for both lesbian couples and single women. They are also positive towards a change in Swedish law which would allow for embryo-donations. Moreover, the party declared a supportive attitude regarding a multiple parents-policy by stating that the law should allow for a maximum of two extra adults to benefit from the parental insurance, not only the legal guardians. However, they have not made a clear statement in terms of allowing for some children to have more than two parents by law. Moreover, the Centre Party is supporting the idea of surrogate motherhood, but only on altruistic terms. They also declared that a gender-neutral parenthood presumption should replace the fatherhood presumption. Lastly, during the Centre Party’s time in the government-coalition referred to as the Alliance\textsuperscript{10}, a governmental bill was presented which urged the removal of sterilization for transsexuals when changing their legal gender (Centerpartiet, 2015a, 2015b; 2015c; Federley & Qarlsson, 2013; Federley, et al., 2014; Riksdagen, 2012).

The Christian Democrats
The Christian Democrats\textsuperscript{11} supports homosexual marriages and adoptions. However, the party also support the UN convention about the rights of a child, where a child as the right to know his or her genetic background and, as far as it is possible, be raised by the biological parents. As such, they have a more conservative approach to insemination and embryo-donation and have, more often than not, voted against new policies aiming to broaden the possibilities for the LGBT to have children. One of their core beliefs is that a child has the right to both a mother and a father. Therefore, they do not condone single women to have the right to state assisted insemination. In connection to this, it can be assumed that they have no intention of promoting a change in the parental insurance or fatherhood assumption in favour of LGBT-persons, or to enable more than two legal guardians. In addition, the Christian Democrats oppose the idea of surrogate motherhood. They were also against the removal of the force-sterilization of transsexuals in connection to their legal change of identity (Dawod, 2014; Digréus, 2015; Kristdemokraterna, 2014; 2015; Lauffs, 2015; Oscarsson, 2013; Riksdagen, 2008a; Sveriges Radio, 2011)

\textsuperscript{10} In Swedish: “Alliansen”
\textsuperscript{11} In Swedish: “Kristdemokraterna”
The Green Party

The Green Party\textsuperscript{12} have long supported the idea of gay marriages and the possibility for homosexuals to adopt. They also fully support the idea of state funded right to insemination for homosexual women. Moreover, they would like to see an update of the family policies in general to allow for gender neutral expressions to be the norm rather than the currently mostly heteronormative expressions. As such, they are also promoting a change in law on several points. First, they are suggesting the parental insurance to be divided in three parts to immediately allow for some families to include an extra adult. Second, they believe that it should be possible for a child to have multiple parents by law in support of families where children have more than two parents in their everyday life. Thirdly, they are also positive towards making altruistic surrogate motherhood legal in Sweden. In addition, they would like to see embryo-donation legal in Sweden. In terms of transsexual persons’ abilities to conceive, they supported the abolition of the force-sterilization. Moreover, they also believe that there is a need for a gender neutral version of the father assumption in order to protect the legal rights of some lesbian parents (Hirvonen Falk & Persson, 2015; Miljöpartiet, 2012; 2009; 2013; 2015; Regeringskansliet, 2016; Riksdagen, 2015).

The Left Party

The Left Party\textsuperscript{13} have long supported homosexual marriage and the possibility for homosexual persons to adopt. They also condone insemination for both homosexual couples as well as singles. In terms of embryo-donations, they would like to see the law removed which demands a genetic bond between at least one parent and the child when inseminating an egg into a woman. They believe this would provide equal rights also, for instance, to sterile women in terms of carrying children. They are also positive towards investigating the legal technicalities around more than two legal guardians for a child in order to support all types of parent-constellations. In terms of parental insurance and fatherhood assumption, they would like to see it becoming more gender-neutral. Specifically for the fatherhood presumption, they urge the law to be modified in order to allow, for example, also lesbian couples to both immediately becoming the registred parents for their child. Moreover, they supported the abolished of force-sterilization for transsexuals. However, they are heavily against surrogacy as they believe that would be to use women’s bodies as a commodity (Vänsterpartiet, 2005a; 2005b; 2007; 2010; 2011; 2013; 2014; 2015).

\textsuperscript{12} In Swedish: "Miljöpartiet"
\textsuperscript{13} In Swedish: "Vänsterpartiet"
The Liberals

The Liberals\(^{14}\) state on their official website that they supported the laws which enabled homosexual couples to marry and to adopt. They also support the laws concerning insemination for homosexual partners and singles. In terms of embryo-donation, they have argued that it should be made legal since it may be a vital component for some people in the society, such as an infertile woman, as a method to become pregnant. Regarding the issue of multiple parents, the Liberals have not made any clear statement. Neither have they taken an official stand in terms of a more flexible parental insurance which would open up new possibilities for families with more than two parents. They do, however, want to modernise the fatherhood assumption in order to, for example, also allow a female partner to the woman given birth to immediately be recognised as a parent. The Liberals further argued that surrogate motherhood should be allowed in Sweden if it can be regulated so that it takes place on altruistic terms rather than commercial ones. Moreover, they were also against the sterilization of transsexual persons wanting to change their legal gender (Liberalerna, 2014; 2015; 2016a; 2016b).

The Moderate Party

The Moderate Party\(^{15}\) believe that homosexual spouses should be able to get married, and homosexual partners or singles should also have the opportunity to adopt. They also support the laws which enabled lesbian couples or single women to get inseminated. In regards to embryo-donation however, they have not made an official statement on the matter yet other than a request to have the matter investigated and presented before the parliament. Moreover, the Moderate Party believes that Sweden is in need of new family policies which are adapted for family constellations in the “modern day”. This includes more rights for parents in non-nuclear families. They suggest a review of the parental insurance in Sweden which currently can only be accessed by a maximum of two legal guardians. The Moderate Party finds this to be sometimes inadequate for modern family constellations, and point out that a review could benefit families with more than two parents. They further argued that parenthood should be established before children are born as they could see some legal complications for same-sex parents in that regard. They are supportive of regulated altruistic surrogacy. Moreover, the Moderate Party supported the removal of the force-sterilization of transsexuals in connection to their legal change of gender. They have made no official statement about a change in law, in order to legalize more than two parents, but some parliament members from the party have

\(^{14}\) In Swedish: “Liberalerna” (f.d. Folkpartiet)

\(^{15}\) In Swedish: “Moderaterna”
suggested the reform (Bengtzboe & Drougge, 2015; Moderaterna, 2015a; 2015b; 2015c; Riksdagen, 2012; SVT Nyheter, 2016).

The Social Democratic Party
The Social Democratic Party\(^{16}\) support gay marriages. In terms of adoption, they do not only support the Swedish law which enables homosexual men and women to apply for adoption, they also want Sweden as a country to actively work to influence other countries to allow and promote same-sex adoptions. Regarding insemination, it is agreed within the party that it should be legal for lesbian couples and single women. But apart from a few bills presented from Social Democratic members of parliament, the party have made no official statement regarding the donation of embryos in that regard. They have, however, taken a stance in the question regarding family constellation which differ from the traditional nuclear families. First, a gender-neutral parenthood law is suggested as that would erase legal difficulties for same-sex couples in connection to becoming parents in certain manners. Their second statement urges for a legal overview of the possibilities of having more than two legal guardians since they see the societal need for this. Lastly, they see that the parental insurance, which enables economic support for families, is not adapted for non-hetero families. They would like to see it becoming more tailored to fit every family’s needs. They supported the removal of force-sterilization in connection to gender change, and have also initiated a policy while in government in order to enable economic retribution for those affected by the sterilization. Regarding surrogate motherhood, however, the opinions within the party is divided and no formal stance from the entire party may yet be found. Those who agree mainly refer to the altruistic version of surrogacy (Ekström & Vestlund, 2012; Larsson, 2014; Olsson, 2015; Regeringskansliet, 2016; Riksdagen, 2008b; 2015; Socialdemokraterna, 2014; 2015)

The Swedish Democrats
According to the Swedish Democrats\(^{17}\), the nuclear family-model is the most appropriate family constellation, although they realize that some families do not appear in that way. They do, however, stand firm in their belief that men and women are born differently and in many ways complement each other as a result of that. That is the main reason as to why children are entitled to both a mother and a father, according to the party. Children who do not grow up with their genetic parents should be able to still spend time with them, or at the very least, know their genetic origin. With these ideas as a point of departure, they have taken a stance against

\(^{16}\) In Swedish: "Socialdemokraterna"

\(^{17}\) In Swedish: "Sverigedemokraterna"
adoptions from homosexual couples and single parents. In terms of marriages for gay couples, they oppose the law as it is forcing religious groups to adapt to it even if goes against their convictions. They are also against the idea of families with more than two parents, and insemination for non-hetero couples. Although there are no formal statements from the party regarding embryo-donations, it is likely that they would reject that idea since they believe children to be cared for by their genetic parents as far as possible. On the same note, there is no initiative from the party regarding changing the fatherhood assumption or the parental insurance since these are policies which would go against their family values. The party have also positioned themselves as against surrogacy. In terms of transsexuals and forced sterilization, the party voted against the abolition of the former law in 2013, and have made no new official comments on the matter since then (Digréus, 2015; Riksdagen, 2013; Sverigedemokraterna, n.d.; Teglund, 2015; Voss, 2015)
Analysis
This chapter will present the research findings. The first section portrays the findings in a
descriptive manner in order to give the reader an easy overview. The chapter also contain two
sections with discussions of the findings in relation to the analytical framework.

LGBT-policies and political party standpoints
The following figure has been created in order to allow for the reader to get an easy overview
of the results as presented in the previous chapter.

Figure 1 - Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centre Party</th>
<th>Christian Democrats</th>
<th>Green Party</th>
<th>Left Party</th>
<th>Liberal Party</th>
<th>Moderate Party</th>
<th>Social Democrats</th>
<th>Swedish Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Insemination</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embryo-donation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Parents</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrogacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood assumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish trans-sterilization</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

Supportive 🟢  No official statement 🟠  Opposing ❌

When the results are presented in this manner, certain conclusions can be drawn instantly. First,
most political parties in the Swedish parliament show a progressive attitude towards adapting
family policies to also include LGBT-options. Second, two parties stand out among the rest
with a more conservative approach to family policies and LGBT-persons, and one of them in
particular has an opposing stance towards almost all LGBT-policies mentioned in this study.
As such, it can be concluded that there are in fact some differences in how some parties in the
Swedish parliament regard LGBT-persons in a family policy perspective. The Christian
Democrats approve of same-sex marriages and adoptions, but are hesitant or opposing the other
policies. The Swedish Democrats is the most restrictive party in this regard; they officially
approve of none of the above described policies, and openly object to most of them. Only one political party, the Green party, have officially supported all policies.

**LGBT-policies from a negative/positive freedom-perspective**
This section has divided each policy into two categories, either negative or positive freedom.

**Policies within negative freedom**
The negative freedom-policies have traits which consist of removal of laws as obstacles for an action, availability of choices, protecting the privacy of individuals by limited state-intervention, or defending human rationality.

**Gay marriage**
Gay marriage falls into the category of negative freedom as it refers to the legal right to perform an action. It is not diminishing the freedom of others to permit two consenting adults to marry, and hence it should be allowed in order for negative freedom to be provided. It also enhances choices for homosexual couples. In terms of privacy, marriage can be argued to fit in that category as well due to its connection to state-involvement in family affairs. Since it is believed that the state should respect family privacy by not encroaching on personal relationships, negative freedom is provided when the state respects the privacy of families and does not prevent non-harmful actions.

**Adoption**
A legalization of the practice enables homosexual couples to adopt on same terms as heterosexuals. Since it is usually considered to not be harmful for children to be adopted by same-sex parents, a legalization of the practise should therefore be considered as an enhancement of negative freedom. Rationality is also connected to this policy in terms of negative freedom. It is not up to the state to interfere and forbid some people from becoming parents; rather it is their own rationality which should guide them in deciding to take on the responsibility of parenthood or not, just as it is for heterosexuals or singles. In terms of choice, adoption can be seen as an enhancement of the options available for homosexuals to have children.

**Multiple parents**
The policy which could legally recognise multiple parents is negative in the sense of law as an obstacle, because currently it is preventing some people from being legally recognised as parents. It can also refer to the enhancement of choice for LGBT-persons since a legalization of the practise would offer more possibilities for non-hetero people to have children in ways which are recognised by Swedish law. Privacy and rationality are also deeply connected to
freedom in this regard, individuals should be allowed to be governed by their own rationality and with minimal state-interference on household levels.

**Parenthood assumptions**

Parenthood assumption also represents a situation where more options in family policies for LGBT-persons have legal obstacles. Currently, the only legally protected option for homosexual women who want to inseminate is to conduct the insemination at a Swedish hospital. This limits the choice for homosexual females, and also questions their rationality to choose where to conduct the insemination.

**Abolishment of force-sterilization**

The abolishment of sterilization for transsexuals as they go through a legal change of gender is another policy which can be argued to enhance negative freedom. Other than increasing choice in a reproductive manner and also protecting the individual from unnecessary state-interference on a private level, the policy can also be argued to place trust in the rationality of the individual trans-person. That is to say that, it is not up to the state to decide if transsexuals make adequate parents or not. Rather, the transsexual persons should be trusted to be rational enough to make such decisions for themselves, on equal terms as other adults wanting to conceive children.

**Policies within positive freedom**

The positive freedom-policies are those which seek to enhance freedom by enabling individuals to master themselves through restricted *self-autonomy*, to embrace their *individuality*, or by being *governed* in a manner of their choosing.

**Insemination**

Involuntary-childlessness is a state of being in Sweden which entitles a woman or a couple accesses to assisted insemination at Swedish hospitals. As such, the cost for the practise is subsidized by the Swedish state. The practice should therefore be considered to enhance positive freedom since it allows for individuals to “develop” as parents and families. One way to regard insemination and restricted self-autonomy could be in the manner that the law states that insemination should take place. Since it is considered to be safer and regulated within Swedish hospitals, other types of inseminations are not legally supported. Their loss of negative freedom in the sense of choice may be defended by an assumed better knowledge that women are much “better off” at Swedish hospitals. In terms of governance and the few societal findings presented in this study, a careful predication can be made in that regard. Since most sources, both societal and political, have been positive towards insemination, the policy in itself can be regarded as an enhancement of positive freedom in regards to the aspect of governance. Only a
few organised groups have been identified in this study which openly objects to insemination for lesbians and singles, often in defence of the nuclear family. They can be argued to not have access to positive freedom in terms of governance.

*Parental insurance*
Since the parental insurance is an economic benefit given to support families, it qualifies as an enhancement of positive freedom as they are given tools to develop themselves. If made legal, the policy would likely be debatable in the aspect of governance since there could be many nuclear-family supporters whom may object to the policy. On the other hand, many actors are supportive of the policy which enhances positive freedom in regards of governance.

*Surrogate motherhood*
By assuming that people who may want to use a surrogate mother would be entitled to subsidized hospital costs in the same manner as insemination, the practice could be characterized as an approach to reach positive freedom. In that sense, it could be seen as the duty of the state to provide surrogacy in order to allow for some families to reach their higher selves and gain self-development in this way. However, the topic of surrogacy has brought forward passionate arguments from both supportive as well as opposing actors. The opinions seem to be equally divided among the civil society as well as the political parties, which would complicate a legalization of the practice. Should the parliament legalize surrogacy, it could both enhance positive freedom in terms of self-development for all individuals, but also diminish it in terms of governance since many people are not being governed in a manner of their choosing. Moreover, should a conflict arise shortly after the birth regarding who should get to keep the baby, the state would be the one to determine the optimal solution. It is therefore a policy which would require a restrictive self-autonomy for the surrogate as well as the parents.

*Embryo-donation*
Embryo-donation would require the state to determine that the best-interest of the child is to be born to any adults who desire a child, rather than focusing on keeping a genetic tie between children and their parents. The practice could therefore be argued to affect the child with a restrictive self-autonomy for its “own good”. It could also enhance the self-development of individuals who may need to conceive a child in this manner.
Final remarks
A division of the policies into either negative or positive freedom can be observed in Figure 2 and Figure 3. Some assumptions can be made based on these figures.

Figure 2 - Policies within negative freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centre Party</th>
<th>Christian Democrats</th>
<th>Green Party</th>
<th>Left Party</th>
<th>Liberal Party</th>
<th>Moderate Party</th>
<th>Social Democrats</th>
<th>Swedish Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Parents</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood assumption</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish trans-sterilization</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive ✔ No official statement ✗ Opposing ✗

Figure 3 - Policies within positive freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centre Party</th>
<th>Christian Democrats</th>
<th>Green Party</th>
<th>Left Party</th>
<th>Liberal Party</th>
<th>Moderate Party</th>
<th>Social Democrats</th>
<th>Swedish Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insemination</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental insurance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrogacy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embryo-donation</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive ✔ No official statement ✗ Opposing ✗

There is slightly more approval from the political parties in regards of the policies which enhances negative freedom. The policy with the least direct support concerned a legalization of multiple parents and was characterized by an enhancement of negative freedom. Two policies with characteristics of positive freedom received the most opposition; Surrogacy and embryo-donation 18.

---

18 Two other policies (abolishment of force-sterilization and insemination) received the same amount of opposition, but also received more direct support.
Political party attitudes to LGBT-policies in a tolerance-perspective
This section will evaluate the findings in relation to the concepts of tolerance and intolerance as described in the Analytical framework-chapter. Tolerance refers to the act of permitting actions which one does not generally agree with or conduct oneself, although rational dialogue may be attempted to end the behaviour. Intolerance is the complete refusal to accept such behaviours, and actively attempting to prevent them from taking place.

The Christian Democrats and the Swedish Democrats
Since there are mainly two parties which stand out among the rest in terms of LGBT-persons in contemporary family policies, these are the ones which should be evaluated in a tolerance-perspective. The other parties cannot be argued to be tolerant in this context since the “behaviours” of LGBT-persons are not disliked, therefore they have no need to tolerate them. Instead they may be considered to approve of them, or at least support them. The Christian Democrats and the Swedish Democrats on the other hand, can be considered to disapprove of the LGBT-persons’ position within these policies.

Intolerance is considered to be the absolute refusal to accept certain behaviours and to directly seek to end those behaviours. Tolerance may also seek to see certain behaviours end, but chooses to permit them while engaging in a rational dialogue where persuasion is the tool used rather than coercion. With this in mind, it becomes apparent that both parties should be considered to be tolerant towards LGBT-persons within the family policies. Both parties namely attempt to argue in defence of their core family values; namely the superiority of the nuclear family.

However, since the arguments are placed in a political context with no direct assault or termination of the already enacted policies, the parties can be argued to follow a rational dialogue of persuasion. It can therefore be concluded that the Christian Democrats and the Swedish Democrats disapprove of the mentioned LGBT-policies, but they still have a stance of tolerance towards them.
**Conclusion and recommendations**

This final chapter will evaluate the analysis and findings in a concluding manner in order to clearly answer the research questions as presented in the Introduction-chapter.

**Party comparison**

The first question regarded a hypothesis about the Swedish Democrats being the least favourable option for LGBT-persons. Assuming that a generalization can be justifiably made in regards of LGBT-persons desire to have all above mentioned policies enacted, the hypothesis was proven to be correct. There was however, also another party, the Christian Democrats, which could be argued to have similar standpoints as the Swedish Democrats. What mainly differentiate the two parties is their stance towards homosexual marriage and adoption, which the Swedish Democrats does not wish to support by law for different reasons.

**Parties and policies in a freedom-perspective**

The second research question aimed to find out how the policies could be understood within the light of negative and positive freedom, and also how the parties’ standpoints could be interpreted in that regard.

The analysis of the findings found that the selected policies had characteristics of both positive and negative freedom. The policies with characteristics of negative freedom was slightly more approved upon. The policy with the less direct support concerned enhancing negative freedom by a legal recognition of multiple parents. Only one party directly opposed it, but many had no clear statement. The policies which received the most opposition concerned enhancements of positive freedom by legalizing surrogacy and embryo-donation. Three out of the eight parties directly opposed surrogacy and one party had internal debates about the matter. All in all, most policies are supported by a majority of the political parties.

Generally, most political parties in Sweden could be argued to favour policies which enhances both negative and positive freedom for LGBT-persons in family policies. There is however a gap between the general views of the political parties and the currently active laws which limits both negative and positive freedom for LGBT-persons in contemporary Swedish family policies.
Political parties in a tolerance-perspective

The third research question concerned how the political parties’ attitudes could be understood within the light of a tolerance-perspective.

The study found that the only two political parties which could be evaluated in this sense was the Christian Democrats and the Swedish Democrats since they were the only parties which generally disapproved of the LGBT-policies. The dislike they had of the policies is believed to originate from a clash of values between their conviction of the superiority of the nuclear family-model, and the alternatives ways of parenthood as introduced by the LGBT-policies. They can however, not be considered intolerant as there is no evidence of attempted coercion to be found within this study. Instead, they should be considered to be tolerant in this context since they allow for a rational discussion to take place where they attempt to use persuasion to solidify their stance amongst others.

Critical review of the analytical framework

This section will attempt to describe the limitations and benefits of the analytical framework in more detail to allow the reader to clearly see the limits of the framework.

As pointed out by Danermark et al. (2003, pp. 265-266), it is important to allow for a critical review of the chosen analytical framework. They warn about using theories with a strictly dogmatic approach as this leaves the study too predictable. The study should also be very clear about the limited room for analysis which is established by the framework (ibid). As mentioned above, this study has attempted to construct an analytical framework based on different theoretical concepts rather than a theory. The concepts have also been interpreted freely by the author in order to shape them into a framework. As such, this framework may indeed be unique in its adaption which brings forth both advantages and disadvantages.

The advantage of this type of framework is that the study can freely select particular concepts which are deemed to allow for interesting analysis. The concepts of positive and negative freedom, as well as tolerance, were in this case specifically chosen and transformed into an analytical framework as an attempt to measure the type of liberty which may exist for the LGBT groups within Sweden’s contemporary family policies.

A disadvantage of the framework may be that it is very limited. The study will only be able to measure liberty within the specific measurements of the framework, and can therefore not claim to measure a “general freedom” such as is done by, for example, Freedom House (Freedom House, 2016). There is also a risk of misperception around the concepts as they are the author’s
own understanding of the original texts. The sub-categories of each concept are also entirely constructed by the author as an interpretation of Berlin, Heywood and the Blackwell Encyclopaedia. Interpretations as such can be argued to be neither right nor wrong, but it is still imperative that the interpretations made by the author still hold on to the core of the original sources, even when the concepts are bent to fit into an analytical framework.

Another issue connected to the theory and this study is that it forced the study in some manner to be relied upon both qualitative and quantitative data. Most data are qualitative, but in terms of governance within positive freedom, the study would have benefitted from a comparison between a nationwide survey attempting to discover if societal attitudes towards these policies and political party attitudes are the same. For this study, the capacity to measure positive freedom is limited in regards of governance. There is no way to know if there is a statistical similarity between the different attitudes from the party, and the society as a whole. Other studies may look further into this and contribute to the discussion about positive freedom within this or similar contexts.

Although the framework ended up having difficulties to identify policies in the aspects of governance, overall it was not difficult to rely upon the concept of positive freedom. Since all parties have stated that they support the idea of ensuring equal opportunities and freedom by allowing for state-funded support, such as parental insurance, it can still be concluded that the framework of positive freedom was useful in this context and could be identified on several occasions in the study.

Alternative theory
One alternative theory is presented here as a suggestion for further studies within this field. It could enable other interesting angles to target related research with different analytical contexts.

Other scholars wanting to do research related to this study could benefit from other theoretical point of departures. For a study with a sociological or gendered approach, it could be useful to apply Connell and Messerschmidt’s (2005) theory about hegemonic masculinities. The theory focuses on male behaviour and explains that there is a social ranking of status (a hegemony) of male behaviours. In other words, the hegemony is a socially constructed idea about which masculine traits or behaviours are admirable, and which ones are looked down upon. By using the theory as a guide, it becomes possible to map out what the idealistic man, woman or family looks like to men in a certain social setting. It could be interesting to perform such a study by,
for example, interviewing politicians of each party in order to identify underlying assumptions about ideal (male) behaviour.
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