

Social Blocs, Political Cleavages and Institutional Change in Switzerland

A Neorealist Approach

Celâl Güney

Table of contents

Abstract	5
1 Introduction	6
References	9

List of Figures

List of Tables

Abstract

What are the relationships between political cleavages, the formation of social blocs and socio-economic characteristics such as income and education? The present master thesis analyzes the links between socio-economic factors, the formation of socio-political groups and social blocs in Switzerland. After assessing the country's political stability in the last decades, a long-run analysis of the socio-economic determinants of voting outcomes for the main Swiss social blocs are conducted. Finally, two latent class analysis are conducted to identify socio-political groups and to what extent the latter conflate with socio-economic groups. This master thesis is the first work to conduct such an analysis for Switzerland, and the aim of this work is to provide a first step into a overall analysis of the political economy of institutional change in Switzerland, from a neorealist perspective.

1 Introduction

Switzerland represents an interesting case study for the analysis of institutional change. Despite some widespread *clichés*, such as the supposed slowness and rigidity of the Swiss political system, the country experienced important institutional, economic, as well as political change in the last decades. The Swiss model of capitalism is also difficult to classify in the varieties of capitalism (VoC) framework. Hall and Soskice (2001) typically ranked Switzerland among the coordinated market economies (CMEs). Despite the structural weakness of the Swiss federal state, the low density of labor union and the predominance of business interests, Switzerland’s economy developed various non-market and non-competitive coordination mechanisms throughout the 20th century. One can think of, for instance, the cartelization of major Swiss industries which was actively supported by the state through public subsidies in the interwar period (see Boillat 2011 for the case of the Swiss watch industry) or the creation and expansion of the Swiss welfare state after the Second World war, even though the latter remains small compared to other welfare state regimes (Obinger 1998). Swiss corporate governance also displayed strong differences from a market-based, shareholder-oriented system which typically prevails in Anglo-Saxon countries. Until the mid-1980s, Swiss corporate governance was characterized by self-regulation by private actors with minimal legal framework, protection and “selective protectionism” (*Vinkulierung*) in favor of Swiss shareholders and blockholders and strong cooperation between business actors, associations and networks (Mach et al. 2007).

According to Katzenstein (1985), small European states like Switzerland were likely to develop such coordinated and corporatist institutions. In fact, small domestic markets, international competitive pressure and the structural weakness of small states make the latter likely to develop some forms of “democratic corporatism”. But among democratic corporatism systems, Katzenstein still stressed that Switzerland could be classified as a “liberal variant” due to weak labor unions and the dominance of employer’s associations.

Therefore, Swiss capitalism represents a peculiar case with both liberal and non-liberal institutions: weak labor union density and strong business side; labor market flexibility and weak state intervention are all features that could sort the Swiss case into the “liberal market economy” type of capitalism (LMEs). The uniqueness of the Swiss model, which combined both strong liberal and coordinated elements, led Trampusch and Mach (2011) to talk about the “Swiss hybrid model” (SHM).

However, since the global neoliberal turn of the late 20th, the SHM is under pressure and is gradually mutating into a neoliberal type of capitalism (Trampusch and Mach 2011). The so-called “structural reforms” advocated by international organizations such as the OECD,

but also promoted internally by various Swiss actors, led to subsequent waves of neoliberal reforms in almost all institutional areas. The reforms went from competitive policies such as the *Swiss Cartel Act* (“Carta”) of 1995, which aimed at limiting or even suppressing cartels and to strengthen competition, to privatizations like the partial privatization of the PTT (*Poste, téléphone et télégraphe*) in the late 1980s. Regarding corporate governance, the *Stock Corporation law* of 1991 and the *Federal Act on Stock Exchange and Securities Trading* (SESTA) of 1995, among other reforms, marked the beginning of the convergence of the so-called traditional “*Forteresse des Alpes*” (“Alps Fortress”) Swiss financial and corporate governance system towards the liberal Anglo-Saxon model (David, Mach, and Schnyder 2015).

The neoliberal transformation of the Swiss socio-economic model is nonetheless far from complete and has met some resistance, according to some observers. For instance, the waves of privatization encountered some resistance in the energy sector since the *law on the electricity market* was rejected through popular vote in 2002. The future of the Swiss energy sector, which remains largely public, is subject to heated debates given the deterioration of international context since the Covid crisis and the war in Ukraine¹.

On the one hand, the Swiss advocates of neoliberalism are still unsatisfied with the progress of the reforms and are keen on underlying the remaining rigidities of the Swiss Hybrid Model. In that respect, Gerhard Schwarz, director of the neoliberal think tank *Avenir Suisse* between 2011 and 2015, and co-author of the so-called “white books”, which were the first manifesto promoting a neoliberal transformation of the Swiss model in the 1990s (Leutwiler et al. 1991; Hauser et al. 1996), declared in 2015:

“It is absurd to believe that we live in a liberal society. The Swiss politico-economic system is mixed, as evidenced by the share of the state, compulsory levy, of 40%. The production of norms and regulations grows exponentially. I am always surprised by the amount of people who still believe that we are in a neoliberal world. This is a *fake news*. The size of the state grows and the autonomy of the individual declines.” (“Gerhard Schwarz: «Une Suisse néolibérale? C’est une «fake news» - Le Temps” 2019, my translation)

On the other hand, the OECD still underlines the “barriers to free trade and competition in the domestic market” and the overdue of the pension reforms (OECD 2022, 12).

Since the break-up of the post-war keynesian “historical compromise” between the Swiss Socialist Party (SSP) and the traditional right parties during the so-called “decade of all dangers” of the 90s (Boschetti 2007), the neoliberal transformation of the HSM was also followed by important political change. The Swiss political scene is still marked by the rise of the Swiss People Party (SVP), one of the most successful far-right populist parties in Europe. The electoral success of the SVP is associated with the destabilization of the traditional right bloc,

¹See for example the “seven good reasons” to privatize the electricity sector by *Avenir Suisse* (Grünenfelder 2022).

which entered a phase of “cacophonic” crisis ([Meuwly 2008](#)) which still persists in the early 2020s.

The extent to which the Swiss model will complete its mutation towards a neoliberal model represents thus a fundamental economic, political and institutional issue for the years to come. A thorough and non-normative analysis of the path taken by the Swiss model since the crisis of the 1990s is thus duly needed and is behind the motivation of the present paper. What kind of social base made this neoliberal transformation of the Swiss socio-economic model possible in the last decades? Is this social base stable enough to complete this transformation? The aim of this essay is to conduct an analysis which would constitute a first step into a broader and comprehensive investigation of the political economy of institutional change in Switzerland. Far from the normative approach of mainstream economics, for which structural reforms simply constitute the sole and evident path towards its ideal model of perfect competition purged from rigidities, the methods and theory employed here are extensively based on the political economy approach of institutional change developed by Amable and Palombarini ([2005](#); [2008](#)).

After assessing the political and economic stability of the Swiss socio-economic model in the last decades, an empirical analysis of the structure and evolution of the Swiss social blocs since the 90s will be conducted in two parts. On the one hand, a long-run analysis of voting outcomes depending on socio-economic characteristics is conducted. The objective is to identify the social structure of the support for each main Swiss party and how the latter evolved from the 1980s to the 2020s. This part offers the opportunity to test findings of the literature about the links between socio-demographic characteristics, voting outcomes and political cleavages.

References

- Amable, B., and S. Palombarini. 2008. "A Neorealist Approach to Institutional Change and the Diversity of Capitalism." *Socio-Economic Review* 7 (1): 123–43. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwn018>.
- Amable, Bruno, and Stefano Palombarini. 2005. *L'économie Politique n'est Pas Une Science Morale*. Raisons d'Agir. Paris.
- Boillat, Johann. 2011. "Contrôler La Dissidence : Naissance Et Évolution Du Cartel Horloger Suisse (1931-1941)." In *Schweizerische Gesellschaft Für Wirtschafts- Und Sozialgeschichte*, 26:261–74. <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-515017>.
- Boschetti, Pietro. 2007. *La Conquête Du Pouvoir: Essai Sur La Montée de l'UDC*. Carouge-Genève: Éditions Zoé.
- David, Thomas, André Mach, and Gerhard Schnyder. 2015. *De La "Forteresse Des Alpes" à La Valeur Actionnariale. Histoire de La Gouvernance d'entreprise Suisse (1880-2010)*. Zürich et Genève: Seismo.
- "Gerhard Schwarz: «Une Suisse néolibérale? C'est une «fake news» - Le Temps." 2019, November. <https://www.letemps.ch/economie/gerhard-schwarz-une-suisse-neoliberale-cest-une-fake-news>.
- Grünenfelder, Patrick Dümmler, Peter. 2022. "7 bonnes raisons de privatiser l'énergie. Avenir Suisse." October 18, 2022. <https://www.avenir-suisse.ch/fr/7-bonnes-raisons-de-privatiser-lenergie/>.
- Hall, Peter A., and David Soskice. 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press.
- Hauser, Heinz, Beat Schmid, Josef Ackermann, and David De Pury. 1996. *Ayons Le Courage d'un Nouveau Départ : Un Programme Pour La Relance de La Politique Économique de La Suisse*. Zurich: Orell Füssli.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. 1985. *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.
- Leutwiler, Fritz, David De Pury, Gerhard Schwarz, and Josef Ackermann. 1991. *La Politique Économique de La Suisse Face à La Concurrence Internationale. Programme Pour Un Ordre Plus Libéral*. Zürich: Orell Füssli.
- Mach, Andre, Gerhard Schnyder, Thomas David, and Martin Lupold. 2007. "Transformations of Self-Regulation and New Public Regulations in the Field of Swiss Corporate Governance (1985-2002)." *World Political Science* 3 (2). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-6226.1022>.
- Meuwly, Olivier. 2008. *La Liberté Cacophonique: Essai Sur La Crise Des Droites Suisses*. Genève: Éditions Slatkine.
- Obinger, Herbert. 1998. "Federalism, Direct Democracy, and Welfare State De-

- velopment in Switzerland.” *Journal of Public Policy* 18 (3): 241–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X98000129>.
- OECD. 2022. *OECD Economic Surveys: Switzerland 2022*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation; Development. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/oecd-economic-surveys-switzerland-2022_1fde6924-en.
- Trampusch, Christine, and André Mach. 2011. *Switzerland in Europe: Continuity and Change in the Swiss Political Economy*. Taylor & Francis.