The title of this book refers to Väinö Linna’s trilogy Täällä pohjantähden alla (‘Here under the North Star’ 1959–62). An undisputed classic of Nordic literature – it was voted the most significant twentieth-century Finnish novel in a 1997 survey – the trilogy is, however, much less well known outside Finland, and an English translation appeared only in 2001–2003.¹ The translator, Richard Impola, described the first novel as an ‘epic of work’, a story of how ‘wilderness is turned into productive land’ through the sheer bodily efforts of the main protagonist, Jussi.² Linna’s ambitions were greater than this however, and the novels were set against the background of the immense social, political and economic changes of the period from the 1880s to the 1950s. Focusing on the lives of one tenant farming family and the village community in which they live, the trilogy takes the reader through the events of the 1905 revolution, the 1918 civil war and post-war reconciliation, up to the Winter and Continuity Wars of 1939–1944. It explores such themes as the tension between landowners and tenant farmers and the political struggles before and after independence and the civil war.

As a writer who gave the Finnish people a voice, a face and an historical significance – taking the everyday experiences of ordinary people as a point of departure – Linna’s writing became very important for the identity of the Finnish people and the conception of history in post-war Finland.³ Linna had no higher education and for several years
after the turning point in his literary career, which came with the success of *Under the North Star*, he worked in a textile mill during the day and wrote during the night. He is an example of a writer who wrote about the environment in which he was embedded. In the same vein, the Icelandic worker Tryggvi Emilsson (1902–1993) wrote a very well received and critically acclaimed autobiographical trilogy (*Fátekt fólk*, *Baráttan um brauðið* and *Fyrir sunnan*). Published in the 1970s, it follows Tryggvi from the farm where he was raised in poverty at the beginning of the twentieth century, to the growing town of Akureyri in the north of Iceland and eventually to Reykjavík where Tryggvi was active in working-class politics.

Many of the themes described in these novels about the lives of working-class people are explored in the different contributions to this volume. Through the examples presented in this book, we seek to contribute to debates about a new global labour history that takes class, gender, ethnicity and race into account and that does not limit its narrative by national borders or confine it to the historical period of industrialization. We have sought to include contributions representing all five Nordic countries and to cover the history of work and the history of workers’ organizing. In the hope that this book might also stimulate further Nordic discussions on labour history and its future, we also seek to explore the implications of shared histories and the attempts to create transnational spaces. The selection can never be representative in every sense and there are a number of issues that we do not address, including the history of everyday working-class life, the history of consumption, the history of working-class culture and – with the exception of the chapter on forestry workers – the history of certain occupations typical for the region, such as fisherman, sailors and agricultural workers. These choices are influenced by available research and by trends in labour history outside the Nordic region. Moreover, although most of the contributions in this volume are written by historians and economic historians, it should also be noted that ethnologists, historians of ideas, feminist researchers, political scientists and sociologists have made important contributions to the field of labour history in the Nordic countries and that these in turn have created specific research traditions.

This introductory chapter presents an historical survey of the political history of the Nordic countries, focusing on their shared labour histories, which is intended to give the necessary context for the contributions in this volume. We have organized our summary in terms of five periods: 1) the ‘classic’ period of labour movement mobilization during the era of industrialization from 1860; 2) the reform or revolution debates during and after the First World War; 3) the Great Depression and the 1930s; 4)
the period of social democratic hegemony after 1945; and 5) the period since the early 1970s. This is followed by a short account of the development of the oldest existing labour history archives in the world, since the availability of sources has structured the ways in which labour history has been written in the Nordic region. We then examine some of the most important historiographical currents in Nordic labour history and end with a short presentation of the contributions to this volume.

It should be noted that not only the level of interest in labour history but also the number of historians in general has varied between the Nordic countries. The content of what has been defined as labour history has of course varied in different contexts, but in the Nordic languages the term ‘labour history’ (arbeiderhistorie; arbejderhistorie; arbetarhistoria; työväenhistoria; verkalýðssaga) includes both the history of work and the history of the working classes and their institutions and organizations. Since the 1980s, labour historians have sometimes described labour history as being in decline, but this book shows rather the opposite.9 One of the current challenges for the field is the need to broaden concepts of work to include free and unfree labour, paid and unpaid work. The broadening of concepts in this way can lead to more imprecise definitions, but exposing labour history to longer time frames and transnational perspectives can also make our results more reliable and help to deepen our analysis. Most of the chapters in this volume do indeed refer to the ‘classic’ period of labour history, namely the era of industrialization c.1870–c.1930, but we have also included contributions from earlier periods until the turn of the millennium.10 Some of the chapters deal with specific countries or regions; others adopt a Nordic perspective, or seek to place the Nordic examples in a wider transnational context.

The history of Sweden has sometimes been presented and understood as synonymous with the history of social democracy. The political dominance of Sveriges Socialdemokratiska Arbetareparti (Social Democratic Party, SAP), which was in government 1932–76, cannot be denied, but this has also implied the marginalization of other political movements on the Left within the historiography, including, for example, the history of communism and its meaning for individuals and movements. In contrast, communism has been more thoroughly researched in the other Nordic countries.11 Even if we want to understand Nordic labour history as the shared histories of the Nordic labour movements, we need to take the splits between political parties into account, as they have affected not only domestic and foreign politics but also relations to the institutions of international socialism.12

In addition to taking stock of the dominant directions in Nordic labour history, as well as its blind spots, we also want to focus on another
common trend in labour history in the Nordic countries and in general. Despite the fact that a number of studies have been carried out on women and work and women in labour movement organizations, from most of the literature a particular worker emerges: white, male and employed in industry. This dominant, albeit often implicit, understanding has resulted in an under-representation of specific groups of workers outside industry and for a long time has consolidated the importance of a division between productive and reproductive work. Feminist critique has pointed to the fact that productive work is not possible without reproductive work. However, understandings of the spaces in which work takes place have changed in recent years, just as the boundaries of work and the nature of work itself has changed. Definitions of what is work, who is a worker and how workers and work are connected through local, national and global developments have challenged the focus on the national institutions of the labour movement and also the male industrial worker as the main character in this narrative. These issues are also relevant for historians, as the contributions to this volume by Malin Nilsson and Helle Stenum illustrate. The figure of the worker has evolved in tandem with changes in the labour market and the political landscape, where, in echoes of the decade before the Second World War, different political parties now claim to represent the workers.

**Labour Histories of the Nordic Countries during Industrialization**

Scholars have acknowledged the shared histories that have shaped the development of Norden as a distinctive ‘historical region’. These shared histories produced several common historical features that are relevant to our discussion of labour history, including the dominance of the Lutheran faith, the absence of feudalism or serfdom and traditions of local self-government within a strong and centralized state. David Kirby distinguishes a number of ‘Nordic’ characteristics in the labour movements of northern Europe. These include the absence of a reactionary land-owning class and a strong political culture of participation and representation, which meant that the mobilization of ordinary people in popular movements was tolerated. The emergence of the Nordic labour movements has often been understood within the context of the general mobilization of popular movements (folkebevegelser; kansalikkeet; folkebevegelser; folkrörelser; félagsbreyfingar) in the nineteenth century, including the free churches, temperance societies, adult education organizations and cooperative societies.
An example of this can be seen in Iceland, where the first labour newspapers in Iceland predated the founding of a political party in 1916. Published at the beginning of the twentieth century, these papers provided a forum for discussions concerning the social and political situation of the urban poor. Their publishers and contributors stood on the border between two worlds. On the one hand there was the old rural society, in which the urban poor were considered outcasts, a kind of cancerous disease. Clearly the labourers contributing to these newspapers felt that they were marginal, but wished that they could be of real use to their nation. But on the other hand, and alongside rural views and values, one may discern a still obscure idea of a modern society, where workers demand recognition as fully fledged members of the nation. This demand did not appear in the guise of Marxist ideas about the redefinition of power relations within society, but rather in an attempt to expand the definition of who really belonged to the nation, so that it also included workers. In the newspapers, an attempt is made to appropriate the characteristically positive image of the farmer and apply it to the worker. Another manifestation of this was the use of the term alþýða – meaning ‘people’ or ‘the common people’, equivalent to folk in the Scandinavian languages – to describe the workers’ identity rather than verkamáður, ‘worker’, or verkalýður, ‘proletariat’. In due course, when a political party and national organization of unions were founded in 1916, these features influenced the way in which the movement defined its objectives and role. The political discourse of the social democrats was, right from the beginning, embedded with claims that workers be recognized as a homogeneous group that not only played an important role in society, but were really the core of the nation and thus had a right to demand that the state secure them the possibility of leading a decent life. The name chosen for the party was Alþýðuflokkur (the party of the common people), not the labour or social democratic party as was common practice in Europe at the time.

Kirby also notes – as have many other scholars – the distinctively rural character of the Nordic labour movements and the absence of a large urban, industrial working class. Despite the long international depression, which lasted until about the mid 1890s, the Nordic economies grew rapidly after 1870. This was largely in response to international demand for the products of their primary and extractive industries: processed agricultural products such as butter and meat; fish; timber, pulp and paper; iron and metal products. The largest individual sector was the household sector, but other industries such as textile production, shipbuilding and seafaring were also important. However, although an urban working class began to emerge in industrial centres like Tampere,
Bergen, Norrköping and the capitals, it was still outnumbered by the rural population until well into the twentieth century. As Kirby writes, one of the remarkable features of the late nineteenth-century Nordic countries was that there was little or no fear of a mass degenerate and potentially revolutionary slum population comparable to that found in the large metropolises of countries such as Britain, France and Germany. One possible reason for this was the relatively high rates of emigration from rural districts in Sweden and especially Norway, though it was lower in Denmark and Finland.

Nonetheless, this did not preclude the possibility of labour market conflicts, which took place as a consequence of industrialization across the region, in industries such as timber, paper and pulp, mining and ore processing, hydroelectric power, engineering, electro chemicals and electrometallurgy. One particularly significant conflict was that between joiners (snedkere) and their employers in Denmark in 1899, which resulted in the so-called September Agreement between the national employers and trade union federations, which was to set the rules of labour market bargaining. In Sweden there were conflicts in the engineering sector in 1903 and 1905 followed by a general strike in 1909, while in Norway there was a major conflict in the paper industry in 1907, but the same year also saw the first nationwide industrial agreement between workers and their employers in the metal industry. Finland had symbolically important strikes by building workers in 1896 and at the Voikkaa paper mill in 1904, and Finnish workers participated in the general strike that took place across the Russian Empire in 1905, but these strikes were less significant in shaping Finnish industrial relations. Iceland had no collective bargaining during the first half of the twentieth century and did not experience any general strike.

Another peculiarly Nordic feature was the relatively large number of women responsible for earning their own income. Among other reasons, this was because the Nordic countries lacked a large upper class that could afford to keep their daughters and wives at home, which led early on to high rates of women’s labour market participation. From the late nineteenth century, women started to organize women’s unions and women’s committees in political parties, using journals and events such as International Women’s Day or congresses to exchange information across national boundaries. Finnish women were the first in Europe to gain suffrage in 1906 and in doing so attracted the attention of women campaigning for suffrage reform elsewhere. The experiences of the first social democratic women elected to the Finnish Parliament in 1907, as well as those in Denmark after 1915, were important for women’s mobilization in the Nordic countries and beyond, as were the experiences
of the first female ministers, Miina Sillanpää in Finland and Nina Bang in Denmark. Clara Zetkin also played an important part in spreading information about women in the Nordic labour movements, through reports published in her journal Die Gleichheit and the exchange of socialist women’s journals all over Europe. The second international socialist women’s conference was held in Copenhagen in 1910. However, these international connections also created domestic problems regarding suffrage. According to the decisions of the international socialist women’s congress held in Stuttgart in 1907, socialist women should only work together with organizations that demanded universal suffrage for men and women independent of income. For some years, for example, Swedish social democratic women were not able to form alliances with other women’s organizations in Sweden due to this decision.

The Nordic labour movements emerged against the background of democratization, but the achievement of political rights did not take place evenly across the region. As Nils Elvander noted, the Danish labour movement was a Nordic pioneer in its willingness to collaborate with the forces of bourgeois liberalism, following the new constitution of 1849, which gave most adult males the vote. After the establishment of parliamentarianism in 1901, a faction broke away from the agrarian liberals to form a new party, Radikale Venstre (usually translated as Social Liberals), which collaborated with the social democrats. In Norway, there was some electoral cooperation between Det Norske Arbeiderpartiet (the Norwegian Labour Party, DNA, founded 1887) and the liberal party Venstre during the 1890s, but this ceased after the introduction of universal male suffrage in 1898 and the end of the Swedish-Norwegian union in 1905, as Venstre moved to a more explicitly anti-socialist position. The union crisis was also politically significant in Sweden, where leaders of the social democratic movement were imprisoned for their anti-nationalist propaganda. In Sweden, the road to democracy was longer and more turbulent than in the rest of Scandinavia, though here too there was cooperation between social democrats and bourgeois liberals, especially at the local level. In Finland, Sosialidemokraattinen puolue (the Social Democratic Party, SDP) benefited from the introduction of universal male and female suffrage in 1906 to become the most successful labour party in Europe, measured by its parliamentary seats, and despite its Kautskyist programme it was committed to parliamentary democracy. The weakest of the Nordic social democratic parties, nationally as well as internationally, was the Icelandic one. Founded as late as 1916, at the same time as the trade union federation, it never gained momentum similar to that in the other Nordic countries. After the Second World War, and more or less
throughout the twentieth century, the relatively strong Communist and later Socialist Party left the social democrats as the smallest of the four main political parties in Iceland.\textsuperscript{44}

It is possible, therefore, to speak of a shared Nordic labour history from the very beginning of what has been regarded as the classical period of organizing. This can be attributed to the migration of workers within the Nordic region, to regional connections between workers’ organizations and to common international influences, mainly from Germany. Martin Grass has divided so-called ‘workers’ Scandinavianism’ (arbejds-skandinavism) – a form of regional internationalism – into three phases: the first during the mobilization of workers, the second from the start of regular Scandinavian worker congresses in 1886 and the third from 1912, when the decision was made to establish a permanent collaboration committee.\textsuperscript{45} We could also add a fourth with the foundation of SAMAK (the Nordic cooperation committee of the labour movement) in 1932, at a time when social democratic politicians were entering government.\textsuperscript{46}

During the second half of the nineteenth century, many artisans travelled within the Nordic region as well as to Germany, and this network remained important even after the guilds were gone, at least until the beginning of the First World War.\textsuperscript{47} More than a century before the construction of the Öresund Bridge, inter-Scandinavian labour markets were operating between Copenhagen and the Skåne region in southern Sweden, as well as between Bohuslän on the Swedish west coast and the south-eastern parts of Norway. Finnish apprentices working in various crafts and skilled occupations also travelled to the Scandinavian countries and beyond.\textsuperscript{48} According to Bernt Schiller, an analysis of the collections of workers’ memories at the Danish National Museum indicated that 41 per cent of the workers born between 1855 and 1890 had worked abroad at some point in their lives, which, although it might not be a representative sample, does indicate the mobility of workers at that time. Schiller also points out how the fear of foreign strike-breakers connected Scandinavian workers not only with each other but also to developments in Germany. He suggests that the Copenhagen hatmakers’ union was originally founded in 1872 as a branch of a German union, while in turn Copenhagen workers helped to organize a cork-cutters’ union in Malmö.\textsuperscript{49} Women domestic workers also migrated to work within Scandinavia, the Netherlands and the United States.\textsuperscript{50}

Cooperation between nascent labour movements was initially established through individual contacts. August Palm, traditionally regarded as the first Swedish socialist agitator, had been active in Germany and Denmark; influential in the early Norwegian labour movement were the Danish-born activists Marius Jantzen, Sophus Pihl, Carl Jeppesen and
the Swede O.J. Ljungdahl.51 Palm also travelled to the United States and agitated among Scandinavian immigrants there.52 Icelandic workers encountered labour politics and socialism as migrant workers in Denmark or while working alongside Scandinavian workers in Iceland. The Icelandic labour pioneer Pétur G. Guðmundsson claimed to have first heard about labour politics from Norwegians working in the whaling industry in the eastern fjords. Reading whatever he could find about international labour and socialist politics, he went on to establish correspondence with influential leaders such as Hjalmar Branting in Sweden and August Bebel in Germany.53 In Finland, too, first connections often depended on personal encounters. The Finnish furniture manufacturer Viktor Julius von Wright discovered the German labour movement while working in Nuremberg and Leipzig and later came into contact with Arbejderforeningen af 1860 (the worker’s association of 1860) in Copenhagen, which inspired the foundation of a similar association in Helsinki.54 Von Wright also wrote a report on the Norwegian and Swedish labour movements after a month long visit. In 1899 the leader of the Swedish Social Democratic party, Hjalmar Branting, attended the founding congress of Suomen Työväenpuolue (the Finnish Labour Party (the Finnish Labour Party, from 1903 the Finnish Social Democratic Party, SDP).55

Denmark was the Nordic representative at the First International and was the first country in the region to found a section of the International Workers’ Association, in October 1871.56 Variations in economic development in the Scandinavian countries led to different paces of organization. The economic recession of the 1870s hit Sweden and Norway more severely than it did Denmark and, according to Bernt Schiller, this temporarily halted developments until the 1880s.57 A second phase in the development of Nordic labour cooperation can be discerned from the 1880s, when workers’ Scandinavianism became more organized. This can be seen as part of what Ruth Hemstad has called an ‘Indian summer’ of transnational Nordic cooperation, which emerged following the defeat of pan-Scandinavianism in 1864, though it also reflects the broader tradition of internationalism within the labour movement.58 Cooperation between different unions resulted in a Scandinavian labour congress in Gothenburg in 1886. The congress discussed trade union issues such as strikes but also the political role of trade unions. The idea was to create a common platform among the three Scandinavian labour movements, with a focus on union issues.59

Despite the fact that internationalism was generally understood as an expression of the sum of national units – inter-nationalism, as Kevin Callahan has described it for the Second International – early attempts at practical internationalism meant creating a transnational space in the
Scandinavian context. Solveig Halvorsen has shown that for a short period of time the early labour congresses were in favour of organizing pan-Scandinavian unions. A resolution on this was first debated in 1886 and passed in 1890. Among the seven Scandinavian unions proposed were those for tanners, cork-cutters, basket makers, saddlers and upholsterers, stonemasons, seamen and stokers and tobacco workers. Most of these were short-lived but the saddlers and upholsterers’ union survived until 1941. The example of the Scandinavian stonemasons’ union shows how strikes and solidarity with striking workers could be organized transnationally across the Scandinavian region. Employers also began to move production to neighbouring countries, and as Grass notes, discussions of the 1912 cooperation committee were motivated partly by the experience of ‘employers’ Scandinavianism’ across the region in the years 1909–1911. However, the vision of pan-Scandinavian unions was never properly realized, as none of these unions could exist until they had representatives in each of the three Scandinavian countries. In 1897, therefore, the decision of the Scandinavian workers’ congress was revised and it was decided that only national unions and federations should be formed. Soon after, national union federations were established: Denmark (De samvirkende fagforbund; from 1960 Landsorganisationen i Danmark, LO) and Sweden (Landsorganisationen, LO) in 1898 and Norway in 1899 (Arbeidernes faglige Landsorganisasjon i Norge, LO); Finland followed in 1907 (Suomen Ammattijärjestö, SAJ) and Iceland in 1916 (Alþýðusamband Íslands, ASÍ).

The third phase of Nordic labour cooperation started during the 1912 Scandinavian workers’ congress in Stockholm when a decision was made to establish a permanent committee for cooperation between the Nordic labour movements: Kommittén för skandinaviska arbetarrörelsens samarbete. Similarly to the workers’ congresses, both unions and parties were represented in the committee. The committee gave recommendations that could be rejected or accepted by the national organizations and it worked like the other Internationals, although on a more limited regional level. Because of its political orientation, the leadership of the Finnish SDP, at that time dominated by Kautsky supporters, declined to participate in cooperation under such elaborate organizational forms. The committee was criticized for being a meeting place for the leaders only and no longer representing the workers, while the Finnish representatives regarded it as a Scandinavian section of the Second International and stated that the interests of the Finnish movement lay elsewhere; for example, in maintaining contacts with the labour movement in Russia. Despite this, the Finnish movement stayed in touch with the committee.
Between Reform and Revolution

The Nordic societies were profoundly shaken by the revolutionary currents of the early twentieth century. One of the central debates of Nordic labour history has been the need to explain variations in support for revolutionary politics across the region; in particular why there was apparently greater support for radicalism in Norway (where the majority of DNA voted to join the Comintern in 1919) and in Finland (where an attempted revolutionary coup d’état in January 1918 sparked a full blown civil war) than there was in either Denmark or Sweden. Similarly, until well into the twentieth century there were few indications that Iceland would be fertile ground for revolutionary politics. Most people seemed rather conservative and prudent in their outlook, and there was no history of contentious political struggles. The later strength of communism, imported to Iceland by students and intellectuals, has been explained in a recent study by its strong political identity as opposed to the weak political identity of the social democrats and in particular the party’s efficient use of a combination of communist and nationalist discourses.67

As Einar Terjesen discusses in his contribution to this volume, one of the earliest and most influential interventions in the debate about Norwegian radicalism came in an article by the Norwegian social democrat and historian Edvard Bull, first published in 1922.68 According to Bull, the radical left wing of the labour movement was strongest in Norway and relatively weak in Denmark, with Sweden adopting a middle path. These differences were attributable to three reasons: the suddenness and rapidity of Norwegian industrialization, compared to more gradual developments in Denmark and Sweden; the greater decentralization of the Norwegian labour movement and its failure to form coalitions with the liberal parties; and the influence of personalities: the Norwegian party was much more open to the theoretical influences of academics, compared to its more empirical Swedish and Danish counterparts.69 Subsequent studies have refined and qualified Bull’s thesis.70 But most scholars have been at pains to emphasize the anomalous and atypical nature of the revolutionary outbursts in Norway and the other Scandinavian countries, which also explains why they ultimately failed to result in permanent revolution.71

Finland, which experienced a brief but violent civil war following the proclamation of revolution by the SDP in January 1918, must therefore be regarded as an anomaly in the Nordic context. The conflict and its aftermath were deeply traumatic and rarely discussed by academic historians before the 1960s, meaning that literary works of fiction had some impact on the historiography, notably those of Väinö Linna.72
reasons for the conflict must be understood in the context of the social and political turmoil following the Russian revolutions of 1917. Even so, the situation remained ‘recognizably normal’, in the words of one historian, until the late summer of 1917, with socialist and bourgeois politicians cooperating in the administration. Following the rejection of its valtalaki – a proposal for independence based on parliamentary sovereignty – in the summer of 1917, the SDP accepted the provisional government’s dissolution of Parliament and contested new parliamentary elections in October, but these resulted in a defeat for the party. Thereafter social order deteriorated rapidly, with the appearance of rival socialist and bourgeois paramilitary organizations. Rising social tensions were severely exacerbated by high unemployment and rapidly worsening food shortages. The situation was polarized still further by the Bolshevik seizure of power on 7 November 1917, which united the bourgeois parties behind a declaration of full independence. Meanwhile the SDP was rapidly losing control of its own ranks after it called off an attempted general strike in mid November and it proclaimed revolution in Helsinki on 26 January 1918, precipitating the civil war.

The difficulty for labour historians has been to explain why the SDP adopted a revolutionary position from late 1917. Although it was formally committed to a Kautskyist position and, like its Scandinavian sister parties, had based its ideology on the German Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands’ (SPD) Erfurt programme, the SDP was also prepared to collaborate with bourgeois groups to uphold Finnish autonomy and secure parliamentary reform. ‘The entire earlier history of the Finnish [workers’] movement spoke against organized revolutionary action’, wrote the sociologist Risto Alapuro; ‘it could not be created in a few months’. What tipped the balance, according to Alapuro, was the rulers’ loss of control over the forces of law and order after the Tsarist state collapsed. More recent research has complicated this picture further, drawing attention to the deepening social divisions emerging in Finland in the years before 1917 and the conflicts over land ownership in particular. These cleavages were further exacerbated by the frustrations of the final years of autocracy and the rapid deterioration in the food supply during the war. The collapse of the Tsarist regime in 1917 unleashed enormous expectations that no political group was in a position to respond to. The SDP leadership struggled to keep control of the situation and use it – like their Swedish counterparts – to negotiate further political reforms, but the situation was becoming increasingly chaotic and dangerous, as both worker and bourgeois groups formed private militias. By the end of January 1918, the party had no choice but to launch a revolution for which it was extremely poorly prepared. According to
recent research, the violence that ensued – during the military conflict itself and the subsequent terror campaigns by both sides – cannot be dismissed simply as irrational acts or the deeds of rogue individuals, but was in many cases ideologically and strategically motivated.\textsuperscript{78}

While Finland was the only Nordic country to experience a violent uprising during the revolutionary years 1917–1923, the potential for revolutionary unrest elsewhere in the region should not be overlooked. Despite being non-belligerents, all three Scandinavian countries were affected by the food shortages and price rises of the First World War, which led to mass hunger demonstrations in Sweden, especially during the spring of 1917.\textsuperscript{79} There were further disturbances throughout 1917 and 1918, with riots in Copenhagen and Kristiania (Oslo) following the German revolution in November 1918.\textsuperscript{80} In all three cases the social democratic leadership was able to channel this popular feeling into successful demands for constitutional and social reforms, even in Norway where a majority of DNA voted to join the Comintern.\textsuperscript{81} Nor did the possibility of unrest cease after the establishment of parliamentary democracy; as Stefan Nyzell has shown, there were violent demonstrations in the city of Malmö during the autumn of 1926, in a dispute that originally stemmed from the use of strike-breaking labour. As Nyzell argues, the potential for violent conflict was never very far away throughout the 1920s, and even afterwards, in the Nordic countries as elsewhere in Europe.\textsuperscript{82} Against this, Knut Kjeldstadli has pointed out that despite the threats of revolution only one person in Norway lost their life in a class-based political conflict, a fact he attributes to a ‘pacificist political tradition’ in Norway.\textsuperscript{83}

\textbf{Nordic Labour during the Interwar Period}

The political divisions in the labour movement also affected Nordic and international cooperation. In 1917 labour representatives from the neutral Scandinavian countries planned an international socialist conference, together with their Dutch colleagues, but this never took place.\textsuperscript{84} As a member of the Comintern from 1919, DNA ceased to participate in Nordic meetings, though the Norwegian LO continued to collaborate. Like the International Information Bureau of the Second International, Nordic labour movement cooperation remained a form of practical internationalism based on the exchange of information, though it differed in its inclusion of trade unions. After 1920 there were suggestions that collaboration should be based solely on contacts between the Nordic trade union confederations.\textsuperscript{85} However,
even the trade union confederations split in 1922 when the Norwegian
LO left the so-called Amsterdam International, the social democratic
International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), while the Swedish
and the Danish trade union confederations remained members and the
Finnish trade union confederation had never joined.86

With the exception of Norway and Iceland, communist parties split
from the majority social democratic labour movement after 1917 and re-
mained an influential political force in close contact with Moscow.87 The
majority of the labour movement remained committed to parliamentary
socialism. Even in Norway, where DNA had joined the Comintern in
1919 and was regarded by many as a party committed to socialist revo-
lation until the early 1930s, socialists were still prepared to cooperate
with bourgeois parties to secure social reforms, among them the labour
movement’s long-standing goal of the eight hour day.88 In Denmark
and Sweden social democrats even participated in government, while in
Norway DNA was particularly active in municipal reforms.

The stability of parliamentary democracy could not be taken for
granted in the uncertain post-war world, however. Nordic societies in
the 1920s remained fractured by the cleavages of worker and bourgeois,
town and country, reflected in a fragmented political system that made
it very difficult for any political party to form a stable government on its
own.89 The situation was in no way helped by the economic difficulties of
the post-war period. Taken as a whole, the Nordic economies performed
relatively strongly during the 1920s and 1930s, in comparison with else-
where in Europe. The neutral countries were able to benefit from war-
time demand, and manufacturing industry continued to expand, with
high growth rates for Finland and Norway in particular.90 Although the
Scandinavian social democratic parties largely rejected nationalization as
an economic strategy, they shared with the bourgeois parties a belief in
the role of the state and its technocratic experts to plan the economy and
to stimulate industrial development and modernization, and a tolerance
of the concentration of capital as a means to business rationality and
efficiency.91

Despite this, the region could not avoid the economic problems of
the era. The initial post-war boom gave way to recession, not helped by
the deflationary policies of governments determined to restore the gold
standard.92 The effects of this were particularly severe in Denmark and
Norway, where there were also difficulties in the banking sector. But the
great scourge of the period, in the Nordic region as in the rest of Europe,
was unemployment.93 This also had an impact on industrial relations,
with employers able to profit from the weakened trade union movement
to force reductions in wages. Throughout the 1920s there was labour
unrest, and stimulated also by the intervention of the communist parties, social cleavages became more and more deeply entrenched. In some cases these were to lead to outbreaks of violence, most famously in Ådalen in northern Sweden in 1931, where military police sent to control large demonstrations fired into the crowd, killing five people.94

In the context of high unemployment, women’s work and married women’s work was under attack during the interwar years, in the Nordic countries as in other industrialized regions. Some regarded married women’s work as a way for women to take men’s jobs. This debate can also be analysed in terms of the shifting role of women in the labour market during the interwar years, when more women moved to new positions in the service sector at the same time as fewer women were willing to work as domestic servants and preferred to work in industry. As a consequence, domestic workers demanded the regulation of working hours and working conditions, but their demands were accepted only after the Second World War, when conditions had already changed in practice.95

In Sweden this debate led to a large investigation on married women’s right to work, which was also important for later International Labour Organization (ILO) investigations.96 In an example of state feminism, well-known feminists formed a state committee of experts to investigate the conditions for women’s work, revealing gender segregation in the labour market as well as women’s comparatively large role in part-time work. Even today this characterizes women’s position in the labour market despite comparatively high rates of labour force participation.97

It was also during this time that the first attempts were made to make women’s labour force participation easier in combination with motherhood and childcare. This debate, started by the Swedish social democrats Alva and Gunnar Myrdal, also initiated new ideas about day care and collective housing.98

Although urbanization was increasing fast during this period, the proportion of the population living in the countryside remained high and thus the social and political conflicts of the era also had a strongly rural dimension.99 Some farmers had benefited from land reform, for example in Finland where, following nearly a decade of debate, legislation in October 1918 was passed allowing tenant farmers the right to purchase their land with the assistance of state loans.100 Many of the region’s farmers struggled, however, with rising debts, especially as the nineteenth-century solution to rural poverty – that is, emigration – had largely ceased to be an option.101 This situation contributed to the consolidation, during the 1920s, of farmers’ parties as a distinctive political interest.102 Moreover, as in the rest of Europe, a further political development of the era was the rise of political groups willing to embrace
explicitly anti-liberal and anti-democratic positions. The greatest threat was perhaps in Finland, where the populist right-wing Lapua movement started to take violent action against communists from 1929 and even made an unsuccessful attempt to stage a coup d’état in the small community of Mäntsälä in 1932.  

This also underlined the fact that the social democratic labour movement could not remain – if it had ever been – a party of the industrial working class only. In the era of universal suffrage it was quite clear that political success would be dependent on the mobilization of supporters in the countryside. As Ingar Kaldal discusses in his contribution to this volume, the largest union in the Norwegian trade union federation was Skog- og Landarbeiderforbundet, representing forestry and agricultural workers, with over 30,000 members by 1940. Perhaps one of the most remarkable features of the Nordic social democratic parties during this period, with the exception of Iceland, was the ease with which they were able to complete the transition from being parties of the industrial working class to the broader incarnation of ‘people’s parties’ based on an appeal to the folk.

Inter-Nordic contacts were intensified in 1932 when SAMAK was founded to coordinate the work of the labour movement committees formed by unions and parties. This meant that the leaders of the parties and the trade unions met regularly and SAMAK created a meeting place where they could speak very openly and off the record about their concerns. After 1935, SAMAK also became a meeting place for the leaders of social democratic governments in the Nordic countries. Mirja Österberg’s chapter in this volume analyses an important theme of Nordic social democracy, namely the cooperation between social democrats and farmers’ parties against the threats of the political Right. Contacts in SAMAK were influential in stimulating a remarkable convergence in Nordic experiences during the 1930s, namely the negotiation of coalition agreements between the social democrats and the farmers’ parties, which took place in all five Nordic countries. The Danes were first, in January 1933, followed by Sweden later that same year, with similar agreements in Iceland (1934), Norway (1935) and Finland (1937). The details of the agreements varied across the region, but in each case social democrats were able to agree to some support for agricultural subsidies in return for the farmers’ support for social democratic welfare reforms.

In Sweden the 1933 agreement also allowed the social democrats to introduce a countercyclical stimulation policy. Three years before Keynes published his *General Theory* this was certainly an innovative departure from the orthodox economic thinking of the time, though economic
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Historians have cast doubt on how much it was able to influence Sweden’s relatively swift recovery from the depression. Perhaps the compromise was most remarkable in Finland, as it brought together two separate interests that less than a generation earlier had committed terrible atrocities against each other during the civil war. The crisis agreements also went some way to resolving tensions in the labour market. In Denmark, the Kanslergade Agreement included a compromise on industrial relations, with the farmers agreeing to support a state-negotiated agreement to end the bitter round of strikes and lockouts. This was followed by separate labour market agreements in Norway (Hovedavtalen 1935), Sweden (Saltsjöbadsavtalet 1938) and Finland (Tammikuun kihlaus, 1940), all of which were seen as milestones in the history of industrial relations.

The interwar period also marked the high point in the development of the institutions of the labour movement as a culmination of the mobilization of the popular movements in the nineteenth century. Although the idea of a Nordic workers’ culture never quite attracted the same fame as similar culture-building efforts in Austria’s ‘Red Vienna’ or Germany, it was nonetheless significant. Central to the movement were the ‘people’s halls’ (folkets hus; työväentalo; alþýðuhús) where much of the labour movement’s activities took place. Although in the cities these could be elaborate demonstrations of proud working-class culture – for example in the areas around Norra Bantorget and Youngstorget in Stockholm and Oslo respectively, the workers’ house and Hakaniemi square in Helsinki or Alþýðuhúsið by Arnarhóll in Reykjavík – in the rural districts they were more likely to be modest buildings, usually constructed by the workers themselves. During the 1920s and 1930s it became theoretically possible to live one’s life in the embrace of the workers’ movement: shopping at the cooperative store, benefiting from trade union insurance schemes, receiving education through the numerous study circles or workers’ colleges in Denmark and participating in recreational activities through guest houses, sports clubs, choirs and the entertainments organized at the people’s halls. During the 1930s, women from the Nordic labour movements also started to meet regularly for so-called women’s weeks and Nordic summer schools, which intensified their cooperation.

The experiences of the Nordic countries during the Second World War created differences in attitudes and politics among the labour movements. Although DNA had rejoined the Nordic community in the early 1930s, cooperation between the movements was challenged, especially during the Second World War when solidarity and neutrality could not be practised in the same way due to the German occupation of Denmark and Norway and the fact that Finland fought on the German side against
the USSR. Sweden remained officially neutral, which in practice meant that the government did everything to avoid being drawn into the war, including tolerating the passage of German troops through Swedish territory to occupied Norway. These experiences had long-lasting effects on the foreign politics of the social democratic governments and their views on internationalism and international cooperation. One of the challenges was that international solidarity could hinder Nordic solidarity, or, as Klaus Misgeld has put it, the opposite was true and Nordic solidarity hindered international cooperation. However, for a large part of this period the internationals were already largely defunct, as a result of the varying experiences of war.

From 1933 the Scandinavian countries received political refugees from the German-speaking regions, though after the occupation of Denmark and Norway this was confined to Sweden. Among these refugees were some of the future leaders of the German-speaking labour movements, including Willy Brandt, Herbert Wehner and Bruno Kreisky. Although it is not possible to talk about large numbers, the experience of receiving anti-fascist refugees and the mistakes made during this period resulted in a much more open policy towards refugees after the Second World War. Holger Weiss’s chapter in this book analyses the early communist networks that were later also used to escape from persecution by the Nazi regime.

Nordic Labour during the Period of Social Democratic Hegemony

The historiography of Nordic labour after 1945 distinguishes itself from most other parts of Europe in one important respect: it was written in the context of success or what Francis Sejersted has called the ‘happy moment’ of social democracy. As Donald Sassoon has pointed out, the years immediately after the Second World War marked a high point for socialists in western Europe. Stimulated by the spirit of collective sacrifice and equality of the war years, labour seemed poised on the threshold of a major victory, and this optimism was vindicated by election victories for labour parties in Sweden in 1944 and in Britain and Norway in the summer of 1945. But in Britain, at least, the initial enthusiasm faded and Clement Attlee’s reforming government was voted out of office in 1951. Only in Scandinavia were social democratic electoral successes sustained, so much so that it is justified to speak of social democratic hegemony in the post-war years. In Sweden, the SAP had an almost unbroken run in government from 1932–1976; in Norway DNA was
equally dominant in the two decades 1945–65. Even in Denmark, where the social democrats never commanded a parliamentary majority and governed instead in coalition with other parties, they were rarely out of office. The thesis of social democratic hegemony holds less true for Finland and Iceland, where conservative and farming interests remained more dominant and where there was also still substantial support for communism within the labour movement. These splits also hindered the development of centralized industrial relations, but Finland at least also shared some of the ‘Nordic’ characteristics of its neighbours, not least in its corporatist organization of interests.

With the 1930s agreements, Sweden seemed to have abandoned the bad old days of poverty and conflict and entered a golden age of prosperity and stability. The industrial economy boomed in response to international demand for Swedish exports, and the result of this prosperity was the construction of the welfare state. From the 1940s, the proportion of the population engaged in industrial work had surpassed that employed in agriculture, and Sweden was rapidly becoming a highly urbanized society. These transitions were partly eased by the institutions of the state – in particular Arbetsmarknadsstyrelsen (labour market board, AMS), founded in 1948 – which assisted employees with moving jobs and homes, and introduced reforms including the three week summer holiday and the five day week. Even so, and despite rapid depopulation of rural northern districts in particular, this was not enough to meet the rising demand for labour. With all formal obstacles removed, women entered paid work outside their homes to a larger degree than before, but there was still not public childcare. To begin with, most of the women worked in retail, production industries and in the public sector. At the end of the 1940s there was a discussion on how to meet demand for labour in industry and whether it should be through the recruitment of women, which would lead to the demand for public childcare, or migrant men. Women were recruited to work in the public sector and Swedish employers actively recruited workers from southern Europe, as Johan Svanberg’s contribution to this volume discusses. During the 1960s, labour migration from Finland became significant, with several hundred thousand Finnish workers moving temporarily or permanently to work in industrial areas of Sweden such as Malmö, Gothenburg, Västerås or Eskilstuna.

The industrial boom was not matched in the other Nordic countries to the same degree as it was in Sweden in the immediate post-war years. In Denmark, the agricultural sector was still making a substantial contribution to Danish exports in 1950, though it was losing ground to industry. In Norway, strongly regional patterns of development
prevailed: in contrast to the centralizing impulses of the Swedish state, the Norwegian government invested in regional development, especially in the north of the country. Nonetheless, in all the Nordic countries the trends were similar to that of the rest of Europe: the decline of agriculture, an increase in women’s labour force participation, rising wages and productivity in industry, urbanization and rising consumption of new goods and services for the mass of the population.

There is, however, a danger of overstating the degree of social and political consensus that this generated. Firstly, social democratic hegemony was never complete or unchallenged, even in Sweden. It is now widely acknowledged that social democrats were not the principal architects of the welfare state, but the inheritors of a longer tradition of tolerance for state intervention in welfare policy that dated from the late nineteenth century or even earlier. Post-war welfare legislation was introduced through political compromises with the bourgeois parties, though such compromises were by no means a foregone conclusion, as the example of the Swedish supplementary pension reform – voted through the Riksdag by one vote in 1959 – demonstrates. Nor was everyone a beneficiary of welfare reforms. As Klas Åmark has pointed out, social insurance in Sweden and Norway was conceived largely with the male, waged, industrial worker in mind. Many other groups remained unseen or were otherwise excluded: women engaged in unpaid work within the home; migrant workers and indigenous ethnic minority groups such as the Sami and Roma; farmers and agricultural workers; and those falling short of the hegemonic labour movement values of respectability, sobriety and diligence (skötsamhet).

Moreover, although the so-called spirit of Saltsjöbaden seemed to prevail in Sweden and industrial conflicts were relatively infrequent, this was not true of the other Nordic countries. Iceland, Finland and Denmark continued to experience very high strike rates, even in comparison with other west European societies. Social conflict erupted from the late 1960s as part of wider international currents. Like elsewhere, there were many different aspects of these protests: part youth rebellion, part post-materialist critique of post-war politics, part reaction to changing international circumstances. But there were also some distinctively Nordic elements, not least in the relative mildness with which the authorities reacted to protests and demonstrations. The legacy of social democratic hegemony was influential here too: on the one hand, left-wing politics was part of the fabric of society, but on the other, the criticism of the conservative establishment was, by necessity, also directed against the social democratic leadership. This was perhaps most marked in Sweden, where the truly shocking event of the era was not the 1968 student
demonstrations, but a wildcat strike by workers at the state-owned iron ore mine in Kiruna, in the winter of 1969–70. The miners’ action was a direct criticism of the Stockholm-based social democratic leadership of the Swedish labour movement and as such a profound challenge to traditional hierarchies, at work and in trade unions. This triggered a new emphasis on industrial democracy in the Swedish labour movement, but radical plans for wage earner funds were never realized in full.

International events were also important in 1968 in Scandinavia, with opposition to the Vietnam War one of the most symbolic issues. In Norway, the ‘New Left’ was mobilized partly in opposition to Norway’s membership of NATO and proposed entry to the European Community. In Denmark, the international split in communism in 1956 led to the formation of Socialistisk Folkeparti (SF) in 1958, but the main challenge to the established party political system came instead from the populist Right, which gained ground on an anti-establishment, anti-tax platform in the so-called ‘earthquake’ elections of 1973. In Sweden, the SAP was voted out of office in 1976 for the first time since 1932. But social democracy was also threatened in other ways. On the one hand, the legacy of the traditional popular movements that had been so important to the development of Scandinavian social democracy continued to be influential, perhaps in the distinctively ‘puritan’ character of the Nordic 1968 protests. But on the other hand, they also faced decline against the rise of newer organizations – based on issues such as environmentalism, feminism and international solidarity – that also broke with the organizational traditions associated with the popular movements by adopting more informal and less hierarchical styles and strategies.

Nonetheless, although in retrospect the signs of a profound challenge to the Nordic social democratic model of high taxation and the redistributive welfare state were already present in the 1970s, the region still seemed to offer a favourable climate for labour. Trade union membership remained very high – partly due to the ‘Ghent system’, meaning that unemployment benefits were allocated through trade unions – and centralized collective bargaining arrangements prevailed in most industries. With the exception of Iceland, the consensual corporatist system of making policy through negotiations between representatives of labour, industry and the government was more or less unchallenged.

The welfare state expanded during the 1970s, partly as a consequence of the incorporation of women into paid employment, and the consequent expansion of collective arrangements for childcare and other responsibilities previously associated with the family. Sweden was the first country to give fathers as well as mothers the right to paid parental leave. In 2006 80 per cent of mothers and 93 per cent of fathers with children
under the age of seven were in gainful employment. However, one third of all women in gainful employment worked part-time, a percentage that had been decreasing.\textsuperscript{154}

**Challenges and Crisis: 1970s to the Present**

The Nordic countries were all affected by the economic slowdown after 1970 and the ideological influences of neo-liberalism.\textsuperscript{155} The timing of the late twentieth-century crisis varied across the Nordic region, however. The impact of the OPEC oil price rises in the early 1970s was greatest in Denmark, but somewhat less severe in Sweden, Norway and Finland.\textsuperscript{156} Economic historians now agree that government actions in response to the 1970s difficulties failed adequately to address what in retrospect was a major structural shift: the decline of heavy industry, the outsourcing of production to lower wage economies overseas and the rise of the service sector.\textsuperscript{157} Coupled with the results of a short-lived speculative boom in the 1980s, the consequence was a very severe recession in Sweden and Finland during the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{158} From the 1990s Norway was shielded by its exploitation of North Sea oil reserves, which allowed for the rapid growth in national income and living standards. In 1973 Norwegian GDP per capita was still below the European average; by the first decade of the new millennium it was one of the richest countries in the world and frequently topped international surveys in measurements of its human development indicators.\textsuperscript{159}

In Sweden, the early 1990s also marked a political, social and cultural watershed in that the crisis triggered a profound questioning of many aspects of twentieth-century development; in short, of what could be described as the social democratic legacy.\textsuperscript{160} Despite the contemporary political rhetoric about the need to break with the past and reform – or even abandon – the Swedish or Nordic model, many scholars have concluded subsequently that the political impact of the crisis was less severe than it appeared, at least up until the mid 2000s. Although there were some attempts to reform welfare benefits, the fundamental premises of the welfare state remained intact, and unchallenged in political legitimacy.\textsuperscript{161} In Finland and Sweden the recovery was based on rapid developments in the information, communication and technology sector, but in both cases this was as likely to involve older well-established companies as new start-ups, with Nokia and Ericsson as the outstanding examples.\textsuperscript{162} In 2008 the Swedish business sector was still dominated by a small number of large family firms founded before 1914, even though many of these had shifted much of their operations away from Sweden overseas.\textsuperscript{163}
One very profound change in the Nordic societies in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has been the experience of mass immigration and the greatly increased ethnic diversity this has brought with it. The Nordic societies were never homogeneous societies, though perhaps it is fair to say that they did not experience the very significant ethnic and religious cleavages found in some other parts of Europe. Among historically significant minorities can be mentioned the Sami people of northern Finland, Norway and Sweden; Jewish communities, which grew following the late-nineteenth pogroms in eastern Europe; the Swedish speakers of Finland and the Finnish-speaking minorities in northern Sweden and Norway (Kvens); the Orthodox religious minority in Finland; the German-speaking minority in southern Jutland; and ethnic minority groups such as the Roma.164 Until the post-war era, the Nordic countries were largely societies of emigration, and, as previously discussed, Finland remained so until the 1970s, as large numbers of citizens left to find industrial employment, mostly in Sweden. During the 1990s and after (earlier in Sweden) the composition of the Nordic populations changed enormously. Labour migration – mostly from southern Europe and also inter-Nordic migration from Finland – gave way in the 1990s to increased immigration of people from outside Europe, many arriving as refugees from conflict.165 This became very significant again in 2015 with the arrival in Europe of hundreds of thousands of individuals fleeing conflicts in Syria, Afghanistan and elsewhere, and at the time of writing in early 2016, this seemed likely to have profound consequences for the Nordic passport union established in the 1950s. The introduction of border controls early in 2016 threatened to disrupt the common Swedish-Danish labour market that had emerged in the Öresund region between Copenhagen and Malmö in particular.166

Immigration has also had political consequences, provoking resistance from some who see ethnic diversity as a threat to social cohesion and national identity. This has – as in the rest of Europe – generally taken the form of new political parties espousing a right-wing populist brand of anti-immigration and ‘welfare chauvinism’, but more rarely it has also led to confrontations and even outbreaks of violence. Examples include the Mohammed cartoons controversy of 2005–6 in Denmark, the riots in parts of suburban Stockholm in the summer of 2013, and most horrifically, the Breivik massacre in Oslo in summer 2011.167 The reputation of the Nordic societies for egalitarianism and tolerance has been challenged by the presence of ethnic ‘others’ and the responses of institutions and individuals towards this diversity.168 The challenges seem to be most marked in the labour market, where instances of ethnic discrimination have been well documented.169 Moreover, the tightening of controls
in response to increased immigration, coupled with privatizations and subcontracting in the hotel and restaurant sector, construction, cleaning and in care work seems also to have led to the growth of the semi-formal or informal sectors of the economy and employment.\textsuperscript{170} This is explored in Helle Stenum’s contribution to this volume on Danish au pairs.\textsuperscript{171} In this respect, too, the notion of Nordic exceptionalism seems to be increasingly difficult to sustain.

The Infrastructure of Labour History

Perhaps more than anywhere else in the world, the development of labour history in the Nordic countries is closely connected to the development of the labour history institutions. In the Nordic case, this means the development of national labour movement archives and libraries as well as the local social movement archives. The national labour movement archives are today among the largest non-governmental archives in the Nordic countries and their libraries are also regarded as being extremely valuable for research. The collections of these institutions have long structured the study of labour history, not only by making historical sources available and by the systematic acquisitions of literature and journals from all over the world, but also through the organization of seminars and conferences and the publication of their own books and journals.

The history of the Nordic labour archives is from the beginning an entangled history. Their developments are closely intertwined with each other and reflect the close connections between the Nordic labour movements. The Swedish Labour Movement Archives and Library (Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek, ARAB) is the oldest existing institution of its kind in the world, founded in 1902. The establishment of the Norwegian equivalent (Arbeiderbevegelsens arkiv og bibliotek, ARBARK) was directly inspired by a visit of the Norwegian labour leaders to ARAB in 1904 or 1905.\textsuperscript{172} The Danish Labour Library and Archives (Arbejderbevægelsens Bibliotek og Arkiv, ABA) and the Finnish Labour Archives (Työväen Arkisto/Arbetararkivet, TA) were both founded in 1909. It is important to note that these institutions were not established by professional historians, archivists or librarians but by the leaders of the movement, which shows how important they were considered to be. It is remarkable that the young labour movements were so concerned about documenting the history of their own organizations, especially during historical periods when they were more interested in revolution than tradition.\textsuperscript{173} According to the statutes of the Swedish archives, the original
intention was to collect material and make it available to write the necessary ‘counter history’ of the movement, including the work and success of the Scandinavian-American labour movement. One of the reasons for the close cooperation was the Nordic labour congresses discussed above. During the 1907 Nordic labour congress, the delegates discussed the need for a Nordic information office similar to the Information Office of the Second International, with the ambition to collect statistics and to inform and educate the members of the Nordic labour movements. The labour press was not considered capable of fulfilling this task. The information office was never started, but what was left of this initiative became an agreement to start an archive in November 1908.

The situation in Finland differed from that in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, due to the political history of the country. Here, the archives of the communist labour organizations are kept in a separate institution, the People’s Archives (Kansanarkisto/Folkets arkiv) founded in 1945. Today, both archives share a common webportal, together with a number of museums with interests in labour history, including the Labour Museum Werstas in Tampere. The Labour Movement Library (Työväenliikkeen kirjasto) was founded as a joint initiative of the Labour and People’s Archives and is today situated in the same building as TA.

The situation in Iceland was different again, as even today there is no comparable institution. The archives of ASÍ are held at the National Archives of Iceland. But the archives of the political parties – the social democrats, communists and socialists – have not yet been collected into one place and made available for public or academic use.

Today the Nordic archives collect the material of all parties from the left as well as material from the unions connected to the central trade union confederations, left-wing social movements and private individuals connected with the labour movement. In Norway, Denmark and Finland parts of the cooperative movement have also delivered material to the labour movement archives, while the Swedish cooperative movement started its own archives and library in 1927. From the very beginning the labour archives also shared the aspiration to encourage workers to read about international socialism in books, journals and newspapers, and together with workers’ education organizations, the archives were regarded as an educationally important tool for the movement until the beginning of the 1970s. They were also important in the exchange of information across the Nordic region. Copies of publications were sent to all institutions and regular exchanges of information between the institutions continue today.

The availability of sources and literature is important for the choice of research topics but also in influencing methodological approaches more
generally. Early labour history was above all an organizational history of the movement, often produced in connection with anniversaries and undertaken within the labour movement itself. There was a revival of this type of organizational history in connection with the centenaries of many of the Nordic labour organizations from the 1980s. However, the Nordic labour history archives not only collected what was delivered to them by the main organizations, but also took their own initiatives to create sources. In 1949, under the leadership of Edvard Bull the younger, ARBARK planned a collection of interviews with ordinary workers, partly carried out by the Norwegian Folkmuseum (people’s museum). A similar project was undertaken by Nordiska museet (the Nordic Museum) in Stockholm. Bull’s initiative was an attempt to move the focus of labour history from the leaders to the ordinary people and bore fruit when this collection was used to write the first part of the Norwegian labour movement’s history, published in 1985. Parallel to this, in the 1940s, Swedish LO took the initiative for a history of the Swedish working class, which was exceptionally broad in terms of time frame and definition of the working class compared to what had existed before and what was to come. A whole volume was concerned with craftsmen since the middle ages, while the work also included an analysis of proto-industrialization, the history of agricultural workers and a cultural study of the working class. In Finland, work began in 1960 under the auspices of Työväen Sivityslitto/Arbetarnas Bildningsförbund (workers’ educational union), initially to collect workers’ memories of the 1918 civil war. These collections are now preserved in TA, covering many aspects of twentieth-century Finnish history. In Denmark ordinary workers were interviewed about their time in school and their working lives. Nationalmuseet (National Museum of Denmark) was responsible for a collection on workers’ and craftsmen’s labour migration supported by the trade union movement, and workers’ memories have been an important source for the history of everyday lives since the 1980s.

Over time the labour archives have moved away from close relations to the labour movement to position themselves between the movement and academic institutions. With the exception of the Norwegian ARBARK, all the institutions have now moved from central locations in the ‘red squares’ of the capital cities, where they were close to unions and party offices. The number of staff has decreased and the archives have become modern documentation centres. In the meantime, union confederations have established successful units for their own investigations, using academic research methods. Labour history itself has developed into an established field of academic research. The Norwegian archives’ visitors
book from 1910 shows that most of the visitors at that time were ordinary workers and leaders of the labour movement, whereas today most of the visitors are students, researchers and journalists from all over the world. In Sweden and Norway the archives were consciously positioned closer to academic research, with the requirement that the archive managers had to be qualified historians. From the 1970s most visitors were academics, reflecting the growing interest in the period after the Second World War as a topic for academic historical research, though journalists have also become frequent visitors. Personal papers collected by the archives have become increasingly important for the studies of governments and political developments.

In Denmark the new academic interest in labour history led to the establishment in 1970 of Selskabet til Forskning i Arbejderbevægelsens Historie (Association for research in the history of the labour movement, SFAH). Danish ABA chose not to become a research institution, so SFAH became responsible for publishing scholarly research in its journals, even though the board of the ABA, consisting of labour movement representatives, was initially sceptical. As a result of this academic turn, unions and political organizations hired professional historians to write their history. In 1974 the first Nordic labour history conference was held in Finland, coordinated by the archival institutions, and these conferences for academic researchers took place regularly until 2004. The tradition has recently been revived, and the fourteenth Nordic Labour History Conference took place in Reykjavík in November 2016.

The upswing in academic labour history during the 1970s can also be seen in the foundation of labour history journals. In Sweden Arkiv för studier i arbetarrörelsens historia was started by a left-wing academic group in Lund in 1972. Meanwhile Arbetarhistoria was first published as a newsletter by Swedish ARAB in 1977 but soon became the leading journal straddling the divide between academic and public history. The Norwegian journal Arbeiderhistorie was founded in 1976 and became a yearbook from 1987. Between 1971 and 1994 the Danish SFAH published both Årbog for arbejderbevægelsens historie and the journal Meddelelser om forskning i arbejderbevægelsens historie, which changed its name to Arbejderhistorie in 1982. Finally, in Finland the journal Työväen tutkimus was first published in 1987 as a joint venture between the different archives and library. Since 1992 it has been published as a yearbook. The Finnish society for labour history was founded in Tampere 1984. As its full name in Finnish (Työväen historian ja perinteen tutkimuksen seura) suggests, it had from the start the ambition to bring labour historians together with those working on folklore and ethnology, both professional and non-professional researchers. Its publications
were also important in helping to disseminate knowledge about Finnish labour history outside Finland.\textsuperscript{193}

The academic turn was also mirrored in the financial situation of the institutions. From the end of the 1960s the Swedish labour archives started to receive state funds to finance more academic expertise, just as in Norway and in Denmark from 1971. The Norwegian archives are still funded largely by the labour movement with around 30 per cent of their funding from the state, while ARAB receives 40 per cent of its funding from the state and the Finnish archives are funded between 70 and 80 per cent by the state. The Danish ABA was merged with Arbejdermuseet (workers’ museum) in 2004 to reduce the running costs.

**Historiographical Currents**

Nordic labour history also needs to be understood against the background of broader historiographical currents and the larger framework of labour history in other parts of the northern transatlantic region. As a subfield its trajectory has much in common with the development of labour history in Germany, Britain and the United States. In many cases the starting point for the new labour history at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s was the work of British Marxist historians such as Eric Hobsbawm and E.P. Thompson, which resulted in a large number of dissertations at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s.\textsuperscript{194} As more students from working-class backgrounds entered higher education from the 1960s, this stimulated an interest in class formation as a field of study and research in all of the Nordic countries. And as elsewhere, the ebbs and flows of this academic field were also connected to interest in other so-called hyphenated histories such as women’s history. Although labour history certainly existed before the end of the 1960s, Daniel Nyström has shown that earlier studies were seldom maintained in the historiographical writings of those who were part of the new labour history.\textsuperscript{195} One of the first examples of this new labour history was the large research project on the history of social movements in Sweden, relating labour history to the general development of society.\textsuperscript{196} In the following, we try to consider what – if anything – has been characteristically Nordic about Nordic labour history, shaped as it was by the shared institutional legacies discussed above and also by the tradition of Nordic labour cooperation discussed earlier in this introduction. At the same time, it is important not to overlook important differences between the Nordic countries, in this respect as in others.
Firstly, in contrast to Britain or the United States, for example, where labour history has often been dominated by a kind of pessimistic exceptionalism, Nordic labour history tended – until the 1980s at least – to be written in the context of success. The obvious exception here is Iceland. Despite considerable interest in the history of workers and labour politics and a number of specialized studies looking at political issues as well as local labour politics, Iceland has not produced a strong group

**Illustration 0.1** Woman working in the fishing industry, Iceland. Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek, Lantarbetaren. Unknown photographer.
of academic labour historians. As a result, the first extensive academic histories of the big labour unions – a couple of two-volume histories of the trade union confederation and the largest union of non-skilled workers, Dagsbrún – are a very recent addition to the historiography. These works, written in the vein of ‘new labour history’, looking at the social as well as the political side, were commissioned by the unions and had been planned for a couple of decades before publication. One explanation for this lack of research is the smallness of the population and thus the academic community; another, the relatively weak position – in the Nordic context – of social democracy and the labour movement.

Elsewhere, Nordic labour history has been shaped by the success of the reformist social democratic wing of the labour movement. In Sweden, recent historiographical research has demonstrated the influence of the party’s hegemony on the history of the Swedish labour movement. Earlier histories such as Herbert Tingsten’s study of the ideology of Swedish social democracy, or the popular movements project mentioned above, tended to emphasise the largely peaceful and consensual nature of popular politics. This was challenged by a new generation of labour historians, who, radicalized by the ‘New Left’ of the 1960s and in many cases by a strong sense of their own working-class roots, insisted on the largely revolutionary nature of Nordic working-class consciousness in the years 1880–1920. Central to the more radical understanding of labour history, often strongly influenced by Marxism, was a focus on the politics of the class struggle. Class consciousness was forged through the shared experiences of political struggle over suffrage and workplace rights and through the conflicts over land and living conditions, but above all through work: the introduction of the factory system and the consequent loss of worker autonomy and skill. Research on working life, at least in Sweden, was from the early 1980s strongly influenced by Harry Braverman’s study of the labour process, which was applied to studies of occupational groups such as printers, shipbuilders and forestry workers. Such studies were also stimulated by the social and political context of the times in which they were written. As we saw above, the economic difficulties of the early 1970s resulted in large-scale deindustrialization in Norway and Sweden. This was the trigger for several large popular history projects where laid-off workers studied the history of their former work place, often under the leadership of academics. Parallel to the History Workshop movement in the United Kingdom, for example, or Geschichtswerkstätten in Germany, Sven Lindqvist’s 1978 book Gräv där du står (‘Dig Where You Stand’) on how to organize these kinds of projects was also published in the Swedish labour history journal. The book was later translated and became well known outside Sweden.
Local history and history from below also became important during the first half of the 1970s, connected to the interest in microhistory as a new way of studying history in general. The foundation of local labour history archives had been on the table since the beginning, but a new initiative was taken during the 1960s when the Swedish ARAB acted as midwife for the Norwegian local social movement archives. In the Norwegian case, regional politics became more important during the debate about membership in the European Union. A quick comparison of publications shows that local studies were much more common in Norway than for instance in Sweden during the 1970s. In contrast to Sweden, Norwegian studies focused much more on local developments and less on the centralized organizations of the labour movement.

During the 1990s and afterwards, the ‘conflict perspective’ in Nordic labour history became less prominent, as historians returned to earlier themes of consensus and compromise in the history of popular politics in the Nordic countries. Again, this was influenced by contemporary political currents, in particular the decline of the social democratic parties that had dominated electoral politics for the previous half century, as well as world events such as the fall of the Soviet Union, the rise of neo-liberalism and debates about the ‘end of history’. As formerly dominant Marxist perspectives were questioned, fewer studies were defined as labour history. At the same time, new theoretical insights were emerging. From the turn of the 1980s, power relations and power resources became an important part of theoretical models, borrowed from sociologists such as Walter Korpi. The labour movement archives also played a role in the introduction of cultural studies approaches to labour history. Objects such as banners and emblems were made accessible at the archives, and several Nordic projects were started on the history of banners and labour movement art, for example.

Given the international reputation of the Nordic countries for high levels of gender equality, it is perhaps not surprising that Nordic labour history has long been shaped by insights from first women’s and later gender history. Many early studies in the evolving field of women’s history owed their origins to labour history, especially in the history of women’s work but also the history of politics concerned with women workers. Yvonne Hirdman’s history of the Swedish labour movement from the mid 1970s was the first to integrate women more systematically into this historiography. Her theoretical work on the gender system, based on her research on the politics of women’s work, became well known in the other Nordic countries. Many of the pioneering works of women’s and gender history were in fact first published in the Nordic labour history journals, surfing on the same wave of radicalization of
society that inspired labour history in general. Currently, a number of historians are or have been working on the history of labour and women’s history in one or several Nordic countries. Ulla Wikander’s work on the gender segregation of work in the porcelain industry and on the prohibition of night work was path-breaking, not only within the Nordic countries but also beyond. In Sweden it was scholars of women’s history that initiated studies of the history of the welfare state, as a response to the contemporary sense of crisis in the Nordic welfare states during the 1990s and the growing interest in a broader history of politics concerning women and their family responsibilities. Nonetheless, it is notable that today only a few women’s and gender historians define themselves as labour historians, even though they work in the field of labour history. Part of the explanation is the development of gender history in the Nordic countries as a separate field, which also resulted in regular Nordic women’s history meetings.

Another consequence of the relative success of the Nordic labour movements is the extent to which they have attracted international attention. A bibliography on the foreign language literature on the Nordic labour movements, published by the four labour history archives in 1992, includes publications in English, French, German, Russian, Italian and Spanish. The SAP’s centenary history, the publication of which was funded by one of the largest Swedish research funds, was subsequently translated into English and Russian and has been used both as a source of information in research and public education. International connections also shaped the development of the archive collections. Sweden received a number of political refugees who left their personal papers to the labour archives. For example, the SPD in exile left all its papers from the time of its exile in Prague in Stockholm, a deposit that was only discovered at the end of the 1960s and returned to the German archives. Other organizations in exile such as Polish Solidarność or the Workers’ United Center of Chile had offices in Stockholm and some of their material is still kept by ARAB.

Although it is probably fair to say there has been a decline in research on the labour history of the early twentieth century in recent years, those studies that have appeared have done much to broaden the subject. Several studies have emphasized the importance of alternative ideological currents beyond the reform or revolution dichotomy (such as anarcho-syndicalism) for particular groups of workers such as miners and quarrymen. A rich tradition of local studies in labour history has continued to emphasize the diversity of labour politics across the region, while also noting the importance of transnational influences. Studies of other types of labour organization apart from political parties
and trade unions, such as the workers’ cooperative, for example, have also greatly enriched our knowledge of the Nordic labour movements. Some trends were closely connected to the institutional framework of the labour movement, such as the historical studies of working life in Sweden from the late 1970s, referred to above. At the same time as the new Medbestämmandelagen (law on co-determination in the workplace from 1976) was adopted by the Swedish Parliament, the state invested in social science research on working life. One emerging field was the growing interest in the history of the Nordic welfare states. Another was the field of Cold War studies, which focused attention on the foreign politics of labour governments and biographies of leading politicians.

During the first decennium of the new millennium, under the influence of a general upswing in global labour history as well as a growing consciousness about the results of globalization, the field of labour history had a renaissance among academics. In all of the Nordic countries, the situation of migrant workers has come into focus, as well as different forms of international solidarity movements and the transnational and international activities of trade unions. In Sweden, many of these studies have taken place at history departments, in gender studies, sociology and political science. Many have been particularly concerned with what for some time has not been regarded as productive work and work that is invisible both in official records and in research, such as Gro Hagermann's large research project on the work of housewives in Norway. Another example is the large gender and work project at Uppsala University.

**Contributions to this Volume**

This book is organized around two themes: the history of work and trade unions and the history of labour politics and their organizations. Some of the contributions in this book revisit classic themes in Nordic labour history, while others present new fields of investigation. The first section on the history of work includes two chapters on industries characterized by high capital concentration in production, namely iron and wood, while the other two deal with work outside the traditional sites of investigation for labour historians, namely paid work at home.

The chapter by Göran Rydén and Chris Evans presents an entangled microhistory of ironmaking in Sweden during the eighteenth century. Although the role of Swedish iron in eighteenth-century Europe is well known, very little is known about the work process. Through a micro-historical study, Rydén and Evans connect workers producing bar iron in Uppland to the iron processing industry in England and the transatlantic
slave trade and the work of slaves in parts of the British Empire. Previous attempts by labour historians to research earlier periods have often implied the application of modern concepts of work and society, leading to teleological explanations of the development of work in Sweden. By looking at the everyday life of workers – women as well as men – Rydén and Evans argue that it is possible to make comparisons of everyday life across time and space.

Similar to ironmaking, forestry was a typical occupation among workers in the Nordic countries and also a highly capital-intensive sector. The typical worker during the 1800s and early 1900s was not a factory or industrial worker but often a logger, and the history of work in this sector has long attracted the interest of labour historians. Ingar Kaldal’s chapter not only adds to our knowledge of the everyday life of loggers in some Swedish and Norwegian regions, but also directs our attention to the importance of narratives about the life and work of loggers, which contributed to the construction of their identities as free men of the forest. Although the everyday life of loggers was very different to that of industrial workers or farmers, Kaldal also reminds us of the need to take stories about working life into consideration and how these have shaped individuals’ outside work. Analysing more than 100 interviews with loggers, Kaldal shows how these stories remained important despite the fact that work in the forest underwent major changes since the 1950s.

Malin Nilsson’s chapter on women in the Swedish home industry enters an entirely new field of labour history that has long remained underresearched in Sweden and elsewhere. Her chapter on industrial home work in the textile industry is based on more than 270 historical interviews with industrial homeworkers in Gothenburg. In contrast to earlier research on this group of workers outside Sweden, Nilsson shows that industrial production in the home was not limited to married women who had to earn an extra income to support their families. Instead, women in many different situations worked in this branch of production. None of them was described as a housewife or as a secondary breadwinner in the reports and articles on home-based production. Nilsson’s study also reminds us of the high female labour market participation rates in Sweden compared to other parts of the northern transatlantic region. Female homeworkers formed a large group of workers during the early twentieth century, not only limited to the textile industry but also important in the metal trades. Nilsson’s study also allows for future comparisons on a global scale and between different historical periods, as home-based production remains one of the largest sites of production in the global South.

Helle Stenum’s chapter compares the working and living conditions of domestic workers at the turn of the twentieth century with Filipino au
pair women working in Denmark in the early twenty-first century. With a few exceptions, domestic workers have only recently come into focus for historical research and have remained under-represented in the history of work. Stenum shows the many similarities between working conditions in domestic work over a period of more than 120 years. Despite improvements, the mobility of household workers is still tightly controlled through resident permits, which makes them an extremely vulnerable group. Despite attempts to professionalize and regulate this work, Stenum shows that even today domestic work is not regarded as ordinary wage work. Rather than wages, Filipino au pairs receive ‘pocket money’, which is subjected to tax regulations, and they do not require work permits but only residence permits. The chapter illustrates the necessity of studying working conditions in long-term perspectives and on a global scale.224

Knud Knudsen’s chapter on Danish trade union history can be read as an attempt to build a bridge between the history of work and the history of trade unions. Knudsen argues that we need to focus on the ideology of work as well as the socio-economic aspects of work in order to find a new way of writing trade union history. Starting from a historiographical background, Knudsen suggests that Danish trade union history has either been a history from above, analysing the organizational history of trade unions and their relations to employers and the state, or a history from below, focusing on the workplace, working conditions and conflicts in the workplace. Knudsen argues that these hitherto incompatible perspectives can be reconciled if we combine the material approach of the 1970s with the cultural turn of the 1990s and use work as both a socio-economic and an ideological category of analysis. Using this approach, the chapter also shows the necessity of analysing the continuity and changes in work created through the ‘second industrial revolution’ and its consequences for the structures of organized labour.

Johan Svanberg’s chapter is an example of a new trend in Nordic trade union history investigating the relationship between migrant workers and unions. Studying the processes by which migrant workers were recruited to the metal trades in Sweden, Svanberg’s work is one of the few to use an industrial relations approach in labour history. The negotiations and agreements between Metall (the metalworkers’ union), Verkstadsföreningen (the engineering employers’ association) and the national labour market authority concerning the recruitment of foreign-born workers were the first compromises the labour market parties had to make directly after the Second World War and the first time the Saltsjöbaden Agreement was put into practice. It shows how employers, unions and the social democratic government were able to compromise in a gainful way.
The chapters by Sami Suodenjoki and Marko Tikka both focus on the political turmoil of early twentieth-century Finland, exploring questions about collective action and political strategy, rural workers, the land question and the links between socialism and nationalism in the Grand Duchy of Finland. According to Suodenjoki, previous research has overlooked the role of ordinary workers in the nationalist struggle for autonomy. Although Governor General Bobrikov’s ‘February Manifesto’ of 1899 is often seen as a catalyst for nationalist mobilization in Finland, it was actually supported by many of the poorer rural classes, who looked to the tsar for assistance in their struggles for land reform. Focusing on the Häme district of south-western Finland, Suodenjoki shows that although the SDP tried to mobilize tenant farmers and rural labourers in support of suffrage reform, these groups adopted different tactics of protest, such as the spreading of rumours and the organization of mass petitions. He paints a portrait of early twentieth-century rural Häme as a deeply restless society and reminds us of the importance of long-established traditions of rural protest in the agrarian Nordic countries. The general strike of 1905 gave the SDP the opportunity to channel popular dissent into support for suffrage reform, and at the parliamentary elections in 1907 the party gained an overwhelming majority of votes among the tenant farmers and landless labourers.

Marko Tikka’s chapter takes up the story of the General Strike of 1905, which took place across the whole of the Russian Empire. Tikka notes that the labour movement’s role in the strike has been downplayed in Finnish historiography, which until recently interpreted it as part of the struggle to restore the autonomy of the Grand Duchy within Russia and thus as a milestone in a nationalist mobilization culminating in independence in 1917. For the labour movement, the strike was a moment that created ‘not only political victories but also the opening of entirely new social concepts and possibilities’, in Tikka’s words. Although the initial outcome was a victory for the bourgeois constitutionalists, with the tsar’s decision to restore the civil rights lost in the February Manifesto of 1899, only a year later the labour movement achieved its goal of a unicameral Parliament elected by universal male and female suffrage. As Tikka notes, this was an extremely important change in twentieth-century Finnish politics, which had lasting and significant repercussions. Unlike in Sweden, where the general strike tactic resulted in defeat and a lasting split in the labour movement, the 1905 strike in Finland strengthened social democracy and marginalized other traditions of political protest. The chapter also sheds some light on the geography of politics and protest in early twentieth-century Finland, demonstrating the importance of the railway as a means of political communication, for example, and
the differences between centres of labour activity in Helsinki, Tampere and Pori.

Einar A. Terjesen’s chapter takes a fresh look at one of the classic debates in Scandinavian labour history, namely the apparently greater support for radical politics in Norway than in Denmark and Sweden. Earlier research attributed this to the greater pace and social upheavals of Norwegian industrialization, whereas more recently Francis Sejersted argued that the relatively early democratization of Norway was more significant in marginalizing and thus radicalizing DNA. Terjesen rejects both these explanations. He argues that DNA’s politics were less radical than has been claimed and indeed that the distinction between reformism and radicalism as consistent ideological positions is misleading. The Norwegian labour movement was not exceptional and like its Scandinavian and European counterparts it cooperated with liberals for democratic reform. More important than ideological differences were structural ones, namely the decentralized nature of the Norwegian labour movement, the strength of the peripheries and the absence of a strong leader like Hjalmar Branting in Sweden or Thorvald Stauning in Denmark.

As Mirja Österberg notes in her chapter, the Nordic cooperation committee of the labour movement, SAMAK, has been seen as significant in helping to draw the Norwegian labour movement into the social democratic fold from when it was established in 1932. Österberg examines in detail the SAMAK meetings of the 1930s, showing how the notion of a shared Nordic sphere was a resource that could be used by social democratic leaders in their domestic struggles against communism and fascism, while at the same time the aim was to present a united Nordic front in international organizations such as the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions. Moreover, Österberg shows that the Finnish delegates were not merely the passive observers of these developments, as has sometimes been assumed in previous research, but played an active role in negotiating a shared Nordic unity that overcame important differences in the parties’ positions. Österberg’s chapter demonstrates the interplay of the national, the regional (Nordic) and the broader international spheres in the history of labour politics in the Nordic region.

Finally, we have three chapters concerned with various aspects of the history of communism in the Nordic countries. While Weiss focuses on international communist networks, Ragnheiður Kristjánsdóttir considers the relations between communism and nationalism in all five Nordic countries during the first half of the twentieth century. While the Comintern was an important influence, for example through its Popular Front policy in operation 1935–1939, Ragnheiður Kristjánsdóttir
reminds us that we should not overlook the importance of the domestic political context and the legacies of varying nationalist traditions in the region. In Denmark, Norway and Sweden, the social democratic majority in the labour movement was conspicuously successful in fusing its ideology with nationalist symbols and rhetoric during the 1930s, the best-known expression of which is Per Albin Hansson’s concept of the *folkhem* or people’s home. This left the minority communist parties politically marginalized and although they had begun to use national symbols by the 1940s they largely remained so after the war, especially in comparison to the success of social democracy. In Finland and Iceland the story was rather different, however. Kommúnistaflókkur Íslands (the Icelandic Communist Party, KFÍ) opposed what it saw as examples of ‘bourgeois nationalism’, such as preparations to celebrate the millennium of the Althing (Alþingi, the Icelandic Parliament), but at the same time could not ignore the force of nationalism altogether and attempted to construct its own alternative nationalist tradition. After the war, communism continued to attract political support in Iceland as a broader-based Socialist Party opposed to the American defence agreement and to NATO. The situation was more complicated in Finland, where the Communist Party was banned following the civil war and communists were largely regarded as outcasts, at least until 1944, but here too the Communist Party re-emerged as a broader social movement in the post-war period that was able to mobilize much greater popular support than in the Scandinavian countries. The chapter thus offers an important comparative perspective on explaining the different trajectories of Nordic politics in the twentieth century.

Holger Weiss’s account of the northern European networks of the Comintern during the interwar period is an example of the importance of understanding Nordic labour history in a transnational and global context. Weiss focuses on the efforts of the Comintern to develop an underground communications network for the transmission of communist publications, funds and personnel between the Soviet Union and the rest of Europe. The Baltic Sea region was important in this network and especially so were the hubs established in the neutral Scandinavian states, where communists could operate more freely than elsewhere in Europe. The exception was Finland, where the Communist Party was illegal until 1944. After the collapse of the important Comintern centres in Hamburg and Berlin following the Nazi takeover in 1933, the activities of these cells were transferred to Copenhagen, though efforts to maintain a global communications network rapidly declined. Weiss’s chapter also reminds us of an important occupational group found in all the Nordic countries, namely merchant seamen and the shore-based harbour
trades (though regretfully this is beyond the scope of this book). Weiss shows how some of the most important sections of the Comintern’s International of Seaman and Harbour Workers (ISH), established in 1930, were based in the Nordic ports and operated communist cells among Nordic seamen of different nationalities. Finally, in his discussion of the relocation of the network after 1933, Weiss also reminds us of the importance of the relative openness of the Scandinavian countries to political refugees, even before the Second World War.

In the third of our chapters on communism, Chris Holmsted Larsen adopts a biographical perspective to explore the links between Danmarks Kommunistiske Parti (the Danish Communist Party, DKP) and the Soviet Union during the Cold War period. His sources are the letters of the DKP member Otto Sand (1915–1984), who together with his family spent two years in the Soviet Union in 1958–1960 as a student of the Moscow Party School. Sand travelled to the Soviet Union during a period of post-1956 crisis in Danish communism, which resulted in the foundation of a new Socialist People’s Party as a splinter of the DKP in 1959. As a loyal supporter of Khrushchev and a believer in the promise of communist utopia offered by the Soviet Union, Sand was willing to absorb the impressive spectacles presented by the Soviet hosts, but Larsen shows how the initial enthusiasm of the Danish students later turned to disillusion as they encountered what he calls ‘the depressing realities of Soviet life’. These criticisms could not be expressed openly, but the private letters home to family members give us some idea of Sand’s experiences. While much attention has been devoted to foreign interest in the Nordic countries as model societies, especially from the 1930s, Larsen’s work reminds us also of the necessity to turn the gaze outwards and to explore how Nordic individuals and organizations drew inspiration from foreign political models.
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Sejersted, Socialdemokratins tidsålder, 247.

Sejersted notes the ‘peculiar mixture of consensus and will to cooperate, on the one hand, and of fear and ideological oppositions, on the other’, in Sweden and Norway after 1945. See Sejersted, The Age of Social Democracy, 289 and ch. 10 passim.

For a summary, see Hilson, The Nordic Model, 96–102.


151. On the ‘earthquake elections’ and the changing party system see Arter, Scandinavian Politics Today, ch. 5; Hilson, The Nordic Model, 46–52.


153. According to Anders Kjellberg, Sweden, Finland and Denmark topped international rankings for union membership as a percentage of wage earners in 1980 (78%, 67% and 75% of wage earners respectively), and union membership continued to rise in Sweden and especially Finland throughout the 1980s. In Norway rates were slightly lower, 57% in 1980. Swedish trade union membership peaked at 86% of wage earners in 1986–87. A. Kjellberg. 2001. Fackliga organisationer och medlemmar i dagens Sverige, 2nd edn., Lund: Arkiv, 25, 27.


156. For a summary see Hilson, The Nordic Model, 76–84.


171. See chapter 4.


174. We are grateful to Martin Grass for bringing this to our knowledge.

175. Grass, ‘Från arbetarkongress till samarbetskommitté’. This is also the period when a number of Nordic trade secretariats were started such as the Scandinavian Transport Workers’ Federation or the Nordic textile workers’ union. These remain an under-researched area of Nordic labour history; see however A. Uhlén. 1957. Skandinaviska transportarbetarefederationen 1907–1957: historik, Helsingborg: Skandinaviska transportarbetarefederationen; K.E. Persson and C. Högmark. 1995. Nordiska beklädnadsarbetareunioner 1897–1993, Stockholm: Nordiska industriarbetarefederationen.
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186. Eriksen, Halvorsen and Terjesen, ‘Arbeiderbevegelsens arkiv’, 41. For example, the extensive personal archives of Gunnar and Alva Myrdal and of Olof Palme in Stockholm have attracted researchers both in and outside Sweden for many years.


192. Website of *Työväentutkimus*: http://www.tyovaenperinne.fi/tyovaentutkimus/, retrieved 16 March 2015. The journal is produced through the cooperation of a number of institutions, including the Labour Archives and Library, the People’s Archives, the Society for Labour History Research and two museums: the Lenin Museum and the Labour Museum Werstas, both in Tampere.


201. According to Tapio Bergholm labour history was strongly politicized in Finland, but from the 1980s this was replaced by a greater focus on work and working life. See Bergholm, ‘Historieforskning och fackföreningsrörelse i Finland’, 45–50.

movement also inspired similar attempts to organize history from below in Finland: see Markkola, ‘The Nordic and Gendering Dimensions’, 41.


207. See, for example, Gunnar Qvist’s pioneering study of women in the Swedish Trade union confederation: G. Qvist. 1974. Statistik och politik: Landsorganisationen och kvinnorna på arbetsmarknaden, Stockholm: Prisma.


209. Y. Hirdman, Genus: om det stabilas föränderliga former, Malmö: Liber.


In contrast to the thematic organization of the centenary anniversary publications of some of the Swedish labour movement organizations, publications in the other Nordic countries were organized chronologically.


The Institute of Working Life was established to follow up on new legislation and employed about 400 researchers, among them a number of historians. It was closed down in 2007 by the conservative Swedish government. See Åmark, ‘Den svenska modellen’.


Hoerder, van Nederveen Meerkerk and Neunsinger, *Towards a Global History of Domestic and Caregiving Workers*.
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