

Summaries

On the origin of the Swedish jarl post

Vadim Kazanskij

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ARTICLE is to present a survey of the Early Medieval Scandinavian written sources about jarls in Sweden until the middle of the 12th century.

According to the Classical historians Procopius of Caesarea and Jordanes, the German tribe Eruli, or Heruli settled in Scandinavia around 6th century. Many researchers believe that the stem *erla- can be connected with *(h)eruli*, runic *eri-laR* and the later title *jarl*. The Eruli were intermediaries in the spread of runic writing. It may be supposed that people belonging to the tribe of Eruli were closely associated with kings and had a special status in Scandinavian society.

In the Middle Ages, from the middle of the 12th century, the jarl was commander of the *leding* – militia, according to Swedish historians. Information in the written sources and interpretations of this information makes it possible to state that up to the beginning of the 11th century there were several jarls in the historical regions of Sweden, and from the middle of the 12th century there was only one jarl in the kingdom, the so-called *riksjarl*. Therefore, the process of formation of the status of the jarl in Sweden can be referred to the 11th century.

Ragnvald, jarl of Västergötland, was one of the brightest figures in the history of the first quarter of the 11th century. The information of some sources allows us to consider him as the first *riksjarl* in Sweden. The Swedish *riksjarl* of that time had his own retinue, he was highest in rank after the king, he controlled internal and external safety and the observance of royal edicts in his particular territory, the jarldom, which was one of the most important regions in the kingdom – politically, economically and culturally.

SUMMARIES

Sixty-four and eight instead of ten**Karl XII, Swedenborg and the art of counting***David Dunér*

IN THE YEARS 1716–1718, Karl XII and Emanuel Swedenborg discussed the possibility of creating a new numerical system with 64 as a base instead of 10. Swedenborg tells of these conversations in a letter which is included in Jöran Nordberg's biography of Karl XII. This letter has become the main source for the traditional view that Karl XII was a mathematical genius. In actual fact, there are no convincing or objective arguments for this. Instead the letter to Nordberg should be interpreted as being part of a rhetorical genre. Swedenborg's aim was not primarily to write a historical document, but to glorify the memory of the fallen warrior king. A rhetorical reading means that the letter cannot be taken as a wholly reliable source.

In addition, there are a number of sources which have not been considered in the discussions about numerical systems, measurement systems, and coin divisions during the years when Caroline absolutism was collapsing, sources which can provide new angles on the critical mood concerning despotism, the lack of political freedom, and the economic situation. An important source for this essay is Swedenborg's manuscript *A New Arithmetic* from 1718, which is also the only extant source describing how a new numerical system could be shaped in detail and adapted to the prevailing system of weights and measures. He was commissioned by the king to devise an octal system, yet there is a great deal to suggest that Swedenborg himself did not believe in such a system; instead, following Stiernhielm, he advocated a decimal division of coins, measure, and weights, which he described in print a year after the death of Karl XII. A political interpretation could therefore show that abstract scientific ideas, which may seem to be a long way from the ideological battlefield, can in some cases be dependent on political situations. While the king was alive, Swedenborg was highly dependent on him. It was only much later, in his *Spiritual Diary*, that Swedenborg expressed his critical views of Karl XII and absolutism. Swedenborg found him at the very lowest level of hell.

State and municipalities, collective and private

The 1930s' debate about reformatory homes and welfare policy

Anne-Li Lindgren

IN THE MID-1930S THERE WAS a two-year debate in the Swedish press about how to organize reformatory homes for the roughly 1,500 children and young people who were taken into care pursuant to the 1924 Child Care Act. The chief debater in the press was the journalist Else Kleen. She had made a journey of inspection to a number of reformatory homes, with a letter of introduction written by the head of the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, the social democrat Gustav Möller. Kleen had also interviewed certain children and published some of their statements – for which she was heavily criticized. At the same time, Möller set up a government commission to inquire into the work of the reformatory homes. One of the three members was the social democrat Josef Weijne, who had become known, among other things, for his efforts to achieve a comprehensive school (*bottenskola*). Gustav Möller tabled the subsequent bill and implemented the change in the legislation. All this was known as the reformatory school debate.

The debate was about how the part of the social sector responsible for the care of children and young people was to be organized. A social liberal welfare policy was challenged by a social democratic perspective. The social democrats wanted to bring the reformatory home system under state control, since “the course that has been chosen is not leading to the goal”. According to Gustav Möller, there was “a general deficiency in the application hitherto of current regulations for the treatment of the young people at issue here”. The great problem was that the deficiencies had combined to “reduce general confidence in the public actions in the area”. It was thus important to restore the reputation of the public authorities, according to Gustav Möller. Besides bringing the reformatory schools under state control, the commission also proposed increased boarding in private homes for children taken into care. The proposal met vehement protest from both politicians and people working in child welfare, but it was nevertheless passed.

In the light of the discussion being carried on today about the relation of civil society to the state, where the private and the state are portrayed as opposites, the social democrats' proposal is interesting because they wanted to increase the influence of the state and of private families at the same time. To be able to do this, the social democrats changed the image of the state. Social liberals and others who advocated the existing organization argued that state control would be synonymous with increased bureaucracy, higher costs, lack of initiative, inhumanity, and sterility. The state could approve the rules and have a supervisory function in the form of inspectors, as the Child Welfare Act prescribed, but its influence should end there. Cooperation between municipal child welfare committees, reformatory home boards, and county councils worked well as it was. State control

SUMMARIES

would mean increased costs for the municipalities and hence tax rises. Else Kleen, Gustav Möller, and the commission of inquiry held forth a contrasting picture. They portrayed the state as professionalized, effective, rational, cost-conscious, child-friendly, and humane. In short, it was modern and possessed precisely the qualities associated with contemporary notions of modernity. At the same time, Gustav Möller declared that the private element in public child welfare was still justified, but on condition that the state had the chief responsibility for the work, with a stronger influence on the boards, and that the private families, the foster-homes, should become more important.

As is the case today, "private" was not an unambiguous concept in the 1930s, although previous research has failed to notice this. It was even a concept that the social democrats exploited to win political victories. In the debate about reformatory schools which went on for two years in the 1930s, this was particularly clear. Whereas representatives of a liberal welfare policy safeguarded the interests of the middle and upper classes in a time of great political change, the social democrats acted as the spokesmen of the ordinary citizens, those who had gained suffrage just over a decade before. The effect was that they were simultaneously mobilized, in some sense, in a political project. The families became part of the private society that was exalted by the social democrats. As a result, the constantly pursued process leading to increased state control was given a popular, human face. The public tax revenues became the cement that linked the different parts – the institutions, the foster-families, and the state. In this way, the good of the people's children was linked to the good of the state. The state thereby acquired preferential right of interpretation and took the initiative in formulating problems and solutions, while the families in private society became executive authorities.

Without judgement or trial

A case of administrative detention during the Second World War

Tomas Hammar

IN FEBRUARY 1940 EMERGENCY legislation was passed as a supplement to the Aliens Act. The central authority responsible for aliens, the National Board of Health and Welfare, was given the power to detain certain undesirable foreign citizens, interning them for an indefinite time in special closed facilities. This paper is an attempt, sixty years later, to study in detail one such case of administrative detention. Ulrich Herz, a German citizen, political economist, and proponent of adult education, was reported by the defence staff as a pacifist and a public danger and was interned by the Board of Health and Welfare for two years and four months in a closed facility at Smedsbo in Dalarna. After the end of the war Herz complained to the parliamentary inquiry (the Sandler Commission) investigating the refugee policy that was pursued during the war. The Commission expressed heavy criticism in its report, published in 1946, but it said nothing about Herz's case. On the basis of this case which the Commission did not mention, the aim is to further elucidate and discuss the Swedish refugee policy of the war years.