

Summaries

The civil servant as a capitalist – an unknown story from the nineteenth century *Torbjörn Nilsson*

The classic bureaucrats are often associated with such concepts as traditionalism, long-winded decisions, judicial carefulness and preference for interventions by the state. The entrepreneurs, on the other hand, are associated with profitmaking, desire for freedom and skepticism of the state. Marx, and many after him, has seen them as a group developed by industrialization, with weak connections to the traditional elite. Researchers in the economic field, when discussing entrepreneurs, seldom mention the civil servants.

However, an analysis of the founders of joint stock companies in Sweden shows a rather different picture. The source material consists of 383 applications for the establishing of joint-stock companies 1830–1875. The joint-stock banks with their special legislation are examined from 1830, other companies from 1848 when the new law concerning joint-stock companies was introduced. Nearly one of three entrepreneurs was a civil servant (in broad meaning, including priests and the military). How can this be explained? Why were these bureaucrats useful for the market-oriented companies?

At least the higher civil servants belonged to the well-to-do part of the population, with high salaries and therefore *money to invest*. As civil servants they also had useful connections in the whole society, connections which were necessary in *recruiting* other investors (the share market was not yet established). A more interesting factor is however their *political and social prestige*. This was especially important for the banking, the insurance business and the railway companies. These branches needed a high degree of social reliance. A county governor in the board surely facilitated not only governmental approval of the application for a joint stock company, but also the making of the public trust. A civil servant represented the common good, an important asset for joint stock companies which were seen with deep suspicion in the still predominantly agrarian Swedish society.

One must not forget that the civil servants also possessed different forms of special knowledge. Especially useful for economic activity were law, mathematics (banking and insurance business), natural science (mining and chemical industry) and administration. One important group here is the military with their technical education, still more advanced than the civil equivalent.

The political influence of the civil servants was striking during the 19th century. They dominated the four-estate parliament (the priests, the majority of the nobles and many of the burghers) and withheld a strong position in the two chamber parliament (from 1867). The early liberal movement consisted to a high degree of

SUMMARIES

civil servants belonging to the nobility. Therefore the civil servants can be seen as a more progressive and modernizing factor than often is acknowledged.

In the international debate of the German "Sonderweg" the concept "Bildungsbürgertum" (civil servants and academics) is crucial. They dominated the bourgeoisie ("Bürgertum") while the entrepreneurs ("Wirtschaftsbürgertum") had a minor role. That the civil servants often were sons of civil servants is used as evidence of the gulf that separated the two sections of the bourgeoisie. However, it is interesting to note that in Sweden this self-recruiting was combined with a remarkable activity in the business sphere, in close collaboration with the entrepreneurs. These contacts between the bureaucracy and the businessmen should not automatically be interpreted as a weakness of the capitalist bourgeoisie, maybe instead as an asset which contributed to the successful co-operation between the state and the private sector in the 20th century.

Lenin, Branting and Höglund

What did the Swedish socialist left know about the Bolsheviks before Lenin's last visit to Stockholm?

Aleksander Kan

The paper is a part of a larger study on relations between the Nordic socialist Left and the Bolsheviks before and after the revolutions of 1917, roughly until the end of the Russian civil war. So long managed the author to cover in print just the years of civil war. Now prerevolutionary years and the first year of the Sovjets, i.e. 1917 and 1918, are investigated as regards mutual help, knowledge, and influence. The topics in question have a rich historiography in several languages to begin with Englishman Michael Futrell and Swede Hans Björkegren. Recently a new approach has been tried by younger Swedish scholars Werner Schmidt and Lars Björlin. Their point, especially that of Schmidt, is to stress the differences, a large political distance, aloofness between Bolsheviks, mostly Lenin himself, interpreted as a lonely fruit of Russian soil, and the young Swedish socialists of the Left. Military revolutionary Lenin's influence on these antimilitarists and pacifists was minimal according to the named scholars, especially before the foundation of Komintern. Without undertaking comprehensive polemics (for instance the evaluation of exiled Lenin's development towards an "internationalized Bolshevism" of the war years), the article examines the Swedish-Russian party relations before Lenin's personal acquaintance with a large group of the Swedish radical socialists (in Stockholm, April 1917) and even before the Russian February revolution (in the middle of March 1917 according to Gregorian calendar).

The results support my Swedish colleagues as regards the differences of opinion between the Swedes and the Bolsheviks both until the February revolution and immediately thereafter. However, the differences did not mean neither aloofness nor ignorance on the part of the Scandinavians. The collaboration of the war years embraced not only the practical, technical preparation for a revolution in Russia (sending literature, letters, people) but also a certain indoctrination of younger Scandinavians through such conspicuous exiles as Kollontay, Shlyapnikov, Bukharin, Uritzky, Pyatakov, Radek a.o. The journals of the Left (Swedish *Stormklockan* and still more Norwegian *Klassekampen*) published more and more often, especially after the first Zimmerwald conference (September 1915), the articles and even series of them by the Bolsheviks on the crucial topics of the war, revolution and socialism. The leaders of the Swedish left, though virtually Centrists, in Russian terms at best Mensheviks of the left, thus got to sympathise more and more with the Bolsheviks even before the February revolution. Three factors explain this development: 1/ both sides were consequent internationalists not only in word but in deed too, 2/ both sides held the similar positions inside the workers' movement of respective countries, 3/ the outlooks of a peaceful revolutionary

SUMMARIES

upheaval in Sweden depended on the growth of a European revolution. After March 1917 it became obvious that the main driving force behind the latter were the Bolsheviks.

The daily collaboration gave to the Swedes a better insight in the Russian party affairs, mostly those of the Bolsheviks, than to any other foreign socialists. Besides, Sweden happened to be the first foreign state to experience a direct influence of the new Russian revolution. The fall of the Russian monarchy coincided with a definite split inside the Swedish social-democracy. All these circumstances made the socialist Left in Sweden (as a matter of fact in the rest of Scandinavia too) a fervent ally of the Bolsheviks and made the socialist Right voluntary protectors of the Mensheviks. The further development of these affiliations deserve a special study.