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Why does Stockholm love Brooklyn? The question was posed by the British network BBC in January 2014 in a program on the Swedish capital and its southern district of Södermalm. In interviews with bar owners, bartenders, and young professionals—interspersed with pictures of the gritty-gone-gentrified area—the producers zoomed in on the local craze for the New York City borough. “Sweden has this love for Brooklyn,” one of the interviewees explained, “we see this special relationship with New York.” This relationship, viewers soon learned, was based on a shared interest in music and arts, on a cultural presence of New York in Sweden, and on the city’s position as a popular Swedish tourist destination. In a part of the segment, BBC took its viewers to Bar Brooklyn where the managers and employees stated that the bar “sort of, encompasses what we try to do, in making the culture from New York come to Stockholm.”

As a parallel to the BBC report, the New York Times in August of the same year declared that “nobody would mistake the municipality of Sävsjö [in southern Sweden] for the borough of the Bronx.” Yet, the alleged Swedishness of the Bronx was the underlying stake in the municipality’s claim that the first European inhabitant of the
borough, Johan Bronck, had been born in this rural Swedish town. Although the New York Times article saw the claimed links between Sävsjö and the Bronx as an unusual curiosity, it also attracted at least some attention of the borough’s business community. When Sävsjö hosted celebrations for the 375th anniversary of Jonas Bronck’s American settlement in 2014, with the specific aim of attracting international tourists to the area, the president of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce was in attendance to deliver an official proclamation.²

For those of us who have visited both cities, the claim of the BBC segment that “Brooklyn and Stockholm is [sic] similar in many senses” might seem like somewhat of a stretch.³ The actual merits of the comparison aside, however, the segment can be viewed as a litmus test of a cultural trend. There is clearly a great interest in Sweden for all things New York, but this interest does not only go one way. In 2013, the Williamsburg-based craft beer producer Brooklyn Brewery opened a brewery in Stockholm. The reason for this location of the company’s first branch outside of New York is that Sweden constitutes the brewery’s largest export market, as well as its second biggest market overall after New York City.⁴ The Swedish love for Brooklyn (and, possibly, also of the Bronx) is, indeed, not only peculiar enough to be covered by foreign media, but it is also something potentially profitable.

The intersections of New York and Stockholm are not that easy to delineate within national frameworks, or to explain as processes of Americanization. The relations are rather shaped by transcultural exchanges of customs, styles, and behaviors, as well as transnational flows of capital, people, and goods. It is also clear, moreover, that the particular relation between Sweden and the United States is not set on a level playing field; the flows of “hipster culture” might go one way and its capital outcomes another, but, as this Special Forum shows, that is not always the case when it comes to other social, cultural, and political expressions. The Swedish fascination with New York is not new, nor is it unique. It was informed by images of its skyline, jazz music, and Hollywood movies in the twentieth century, and might be characterized by the proliferation of American-styled food trucks and hamburger joints today.⁵ Sweden and the United States have been interconnected for centuries, and the negotiation of these factors has left Sweden in both a peripheral and a privileged position in relation to the United States.

The aim of this Special Forum is to find new ways of understanding the relations between Sweden and the United States. By building on the foundations of previous research, we seek to adopt transnational frames of interpretation to explore Swedish and American interactions. The two countries lack a geographical border, but as the example of Brooklyn and the Bronx shows, a Swedish–American borderland still exists in which circulation of people, ideas, and goods have both challenged and confirmed the national boundaries. The result of these processes have been new spaces of mutuality between Sweden and the United States. These spaces, however, have been asymmetrical. We propose that these concepts, of circulation and asymmetry, can be
adopted to understand the ways in which power has permeated phenomena that have crisscrossed Swedish and American borders.

2.

The transatlantic circulations between Sweden and the United States have involved people, culture, and ideas, and the articles in this Special Forum contribute to all three of these areas of study. At the end of this introduction, we have also included a Selected Bibliography providing suggestions for further reading and research on Swedish–American relations.

The first area concerns the histories of Swedish settling in and immigration to America that have been formative for the relations between Sweden and the United States. The history of settling and immigration and their cultural historical consequences, are studied in three articles of the Forum. In their article about the short-lived New Sweden colony in the Delaware River Valley (1638–1655), Gunlög Fur, Magdalena Naum, and Jonas M. Nordin show the ways in which the colony has affected lives and legacies on both sides of the Atlantic on several levels—socially, materially, and historiographically. The twentieth century commemorations of the New Sweden colony by both Sweden and the United States is the topic of the article by Adam Hjorthén, analyzing the attempts of Pennsylvania governor George H. Earle in the late 1930s to establish New Sweden as the foundational history of the state. Finally, Dag Blanck studies how histories and ideas about the Viking in late nineteenth century circulated across the Atlantic, demonstrating how the Viking was transnationalized as a mythological foundational history in Swedish, Swedish-American, and Anglo-American contexts.

Although the Swedish–American relations date back to the colonial era of the seventeenth century—or even to the Viking era settlements that in the 1960s were discovered on Newfoundland—it has most markedly been influenced by the mass migration of between one third and one fourth of Sweden's population to North America between 1850 and 1930. It was a process that profoundly shaped Swedish society. The mass migration was a part of the great European migration patterns to North America, and was fundamentally a product of the social, economic, and demographic transformations of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Academic scholarship on the migration began developing on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1930s and 1940s. Although migration studies inherently suggest the adoption of transnational approaches, the national paradigms of history have been important in the study of Swedish-American migration history. The migrants were often discussed within separate Swedish and American contexts; in Sweden, the migrants were described as emigrants, compelled to leave, whereas in the United States they became immigrants, builders of the new country.
The scholarly questions raised both in Sweden and the United States have reflected these national concerns. In the United States, historians of Swedish (and Scandinavian) background, rooted in the Scandinavian-American heartlands in the Midwest, made the Scandinavian-American groups a part of the emerging scholarly field of American immigration history. These scholars worked within a Turnerian framework of the settling of America, and were able to draw on their cultural and linguistic resources for their work. During this time, the homeland showed less interest in the migration, and it was not until the arrival of social history in Sweden in the 1960s that the topic began to be systematically studied. For these historians, however, questions of geographic and social mobility were central, and American history as such played a smaller role in their inquiries.

Following Frank Thistlethwaite’s suggestion at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Stockholm in 1960, some scholars began viewing the migration process as a whole. It was a change that opened up for more circular perspectives on migration history. By following the migrants from their point of origin to their point of arrival, scholars could emphasize the enduring links that were created between specific sending and receiving areas, and the extensive migration networks that were created across the Atlantic. These networks were durable and had long-lasting consequences, often proceeding along their own trajectories, autonomously of national interests and policies.

An important dimension of migration history is the question of remigration. In the Swedish case, return migration across the Atlantic remains understudied, especially in comparison to other countries. It is vital to recognize that the migration links between Sweden and the United States meant that individuals moved back and forth between the countries, at times repeatedly. This fact challenges the unilineal view of migration. It has been estimated that 19 percent of all migrants returned, but that the share was much higher during the end of the migration era in the 1920s. The returnees brought material wealth back to Sweden, mostly to buy property, but they also carried non-material aspects from the United States to Sweden. There were numerous religious impulses, both in the religious revival movements and within the state Church of Sweden. It is also the case that the individual experiences of America contributed to an increased social standing and prestige, especially in smaller towns and in rural communities in which many of the returnees settled. In that way the migration back across the Atlantic meant that Swedish Americans and the United States became an integral and natural part of everyday life in Sweden. Successful Swedish Americans became part of the local elite and at times the term “Swedish American” became an honorific, following the individuals all the way to the gravestone in the local cemetery.

The second area to which this Forum contributes is the question of transatlantic influences and ideological interactions. Since the beginning of the 19th century, different images and fantasies of ideological contacts have informed the relations between the countries. Swedish notions of America have been a part of the larger
European discourse of what is today the United States, and has followed many of the patterns of the larger European imaginations of America.\textsuperscript{14}

In Sweden, the American republic has been viewed in both a favorable and negative light. From the early 19th century liberal and eventually radical opinions in Sweden embraced American republicanism and constitutional freedoms, while conservatives warned of a crude society with a short history and a dangerous rule of the masses. After World War II the tables turned and conservative opinion makers welcomed the American political and economic system, while radicals criticized a repressive, commercialized, and militaristic society. Interestingly, many of arguments were resilient and remained the same while the protagonists changed places on the political spectrum, such as claims that the United States was a country with no culture or a short history.\textsuperscript{15} In the larger European context, Sweden seems to have harbored more positive attitudes towards the United States, and the historical instances of anti-Americanism were fewer than in other European countries. One reason for this is related to the significant Swedish-American migration.\textsuperscript{16}

The 1930s became a turning point in the ideological exchanges between Sweden and the United States, as Sweden embarked on a set of social reforms to improve the living conditions and economic dislocations that in the 19th century had resulted in the massive emigration to America. In 1932 the Social Democratic party won the general elections and would remain in power until 1976. During this unprecedented time in government, much of what has become known as the Swedish welfare state (\textit{folkhem}, or “the people’s home” in Swedish) was constructed, attracting a great deal of attention outside of Sweden. As Adam Hjorthén shows in his analysis of Pennsylvania’s 1938 commemoration of the New Sweden colony, governor George Earle sought to establish relations with Sweden partly because of the ideological connections between the state’s “Little New Deal” and the Swedish Social Democratic welfare state.

The image of Sweden as an example of social progress was launched in the United States in the 1930s, and was closely tied to the 1936 publication of \textit{Sweden: The Middle Way} by the American journalist and Marquis Childs.\textsuperscript{17} The book described the attempts to deal with the effects of the Great Depression and to control capitalism in Sweden, where “[t]he state, the consumer, and the producer have intervened to make capitalism ‘work’ in a reasonable way for the greatest good of the whole nation.”\textsuperscript{18} At a press conference in June 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt referred directly to the book, saying that it was “very interesting” and that he had become “tremendously interested” in what went on in Sweden with “a royal family and a Socialist Government and a capitalist system, all working happily side by side.”\textsuperscript{19} The impact of the book was significant. The first edition went through nine printings, and three more editions appeared, including a special twenty-fifth anniversary foreword to the third edition in 1961.\textsuperscript{20} Political scientist Steven Kelman commented in 1980 that the book “launched the country as a model for many who longed for a humane alternative to the Depression era extremes of fascism and Stalinism.”\textsuperscript{21}
The Americanvalorization of Sweden was important in establishing the country as a social model to the rest of the world. The American interest was also important for bringing these impulses back to Sweden. In their jointly authored book Kontaktenmed Amerika (Contact with America) from 1941, Swedish social scientists Gunnar and Alva Myrdal write that even though Sweden had received a great deal of attention in the United States during the preceding decade, “[w]e Swedes have a lot to learn from America,” not least in economic, social, and technical spheres. The book pays particular attention to education, and the Myrdals claimed that it was a “matter of survival for our nation” for Sweden to take into account new pedagogical developments in the United States. The Swedish school reforms of the 1950s are an example of how ideological discussions in America had a concrete influence on policies in Sweden.

Gunnar and Alva Myrdal who spent significant time in the United States in the 1930s and 1940s played a crucial role in establishing an ideological and academic Swedish–American exchange, where influences went in both directions across the Atlantic. They had first come to the United States in 1929 under the auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation to study American sociology and psychology. In 1938 Gunnar Myrdal was invited by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to lead a study of the conditions of African Americans in the United States, which resulted in the massive An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy, published in 1944. The study had a significant influence on American race relations, both academically and politically, and established Myrdal as a major authority on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Carnegie Corporation had deliberately chosen a non-American scholar to conduct the study in order to find “someone who could approach his task with a fresh mind, uninfluenced by traditional attitudes or by earlier conclusions,” as the President of the Corporation put it in the foreword to An American Dilemma. Even if Myrdal came from outside the American academy he sought out the advice of and worked with a group of American colleagues who helped shape the study, including, for example, Louis Wirth, Guy Johnson, and Ralph Bunche.

Still his approach to his subject was influenced by his Swedish academic and political experiences. His understanding of issues of majority–minority relations and of discrimination was shaped by the discussion of social issues in Sweden in the 1930s, where he and his wife had written a highly influential book on Swedish demography and population growth. Moreover, he made what he called “the American creed” central to his analysis, arguing that a set of political and ideological ideals rooted in the Enlightenment, Christianity, and English law formed the foundations of the American republic and that the continuing discrimination of African Americans could not be sustained. Myrdal also introduced his view of the American creed in Swedish which left a lasting impression on Swedish views of the United States during the post-World War II era. Ultimately, then, Myrdal was convinced that an opportunity existed through which American creed would help resolving the dilemma of American racial discrimination.
Finally, the circulation of discourses and ideas of Swedish and American modernity is a theme explored in this Forum through the article by Carl Marklund, dealing specifically with the phenomenon of “Sweden-bashing” during the years of Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme. Marklund argues that critical American discussions about the Swedish welfare state in the 1970s and 1980s were incorporated into the discourse of Swedish conservatives. This is one example where notions about American and Swedish modernities have resonated with each other during the twentieth and twenty-first century. Both Swedish conservatives and liberals used the United States as a source of inspiration as well as a warning, seeking not primarily to understand the United States but to promote or prevent social change in Sweden. Sweden has, in fact, occupied a similar position in the United States, as both a model and a dangerous example of a welfare state.

The third area covered by the articles of this Forum concerns cultural circulations and interactions. The images and discussions of Sweden in America were during the 19th century largely connected to the Swedish-American migration. It was most prominent in those parts of the country with significant Swedish-American population groups, such as Minnesota and other parts of the Midwest, or in the Pacific Northwest. As with other diasporas, the Swedish immigrants were the target of stereotyping, being described as rural bumpkins, green horns, and as somehow slow. The character of Yon Yonson from Wisconsin is one example of this representation of the Swedes. The many young Swedish women who found work as domestic servants in American cities also helped shape an American view of Sweden and the Swedes, as for example represented in the silent films about Sweedie: The Swedish Maid from the 1910s, or The Farmer's Daughter from 1947 (with Loretta Young as the Swedish maid Katrin Holstrom, which rendered Young an Oscar for best actress).

Studies of American influences in Sweden also show how the circular movement of impulses creates new, hybridized cultural forms, that exist in the tensions between Sweden and the United States. American cultural elements have experienced particular domestic receptions in Sweden through which they have been transformed and domesticated into a Swedish context. This is not unique to Sweden, and the question is to what degree these impulses and flows back and forth should be seen as part of cultural globalization rather than “Americanization.” In this Special Forum, these dimensions are analyzed in articles by Ulf Jonas Björk, Maaret Koskinen, and Louise Nilsson, discussing three central aspects of contemporary cultural phenomena that have crossed Swedish–American borders: ice hockey, the film industry, and crime fiction.

The article by Björk shows the effects of the globalization of ice hockey in the 1990s, analyzing how the heated debate about the commercialization of the sport was played out in conflicts about the Swedish hockey league’s adoption of NFL-styled team names and logos. In her study of Swedish-Norwegian actress Liv Ullman, Koskinen contributes to the study of transnational cinema through an analysis of the life and work of Ullman, demonstrating how her career has been characterized by in-between
positions and cultural hybridizations. Ullman is a person whose life has been informed by a movement between different contexts, and this is a theme further developed in Louise Nilsson’s article on the circulation of Swedish crime fiction, through a study of Stieg Larsson’s international bestseller the Millennium Trilogy. Together with the articles on the histories of settling in and immigration to America, the discussions on cultural and ideological flows contribute to the study of Swedish–American relations by showing how dimensions of circulation and asymmetry can be used to gain deeper understandings of exchanges and interactions across the Atlantic.

3.

Although there have been significant exchanges between Sweden and America, with people, goods, and ideas moving back and forth across the Atlantic, previous research has largely nationalized these phenomena. The Swedish and American experiences have often been compartmentalized and the cultural interchanges grasped as one-way processes.

Our hope is that this Special Forum will open new ways to conceptualize Swedish–American relations by transnationalizing the frames of interpretation, through the examination of different dimensions of asymmetry and circulation between the two countries. These, we argue, are relevant dimensions when studying cross-border relations that are informed by various inequalities of power, yet where the relations have been frequent and significant. By using these concepts, we will challenge national frameworks of interpretation to formulate a set of tools for future research on Swedish–American relations.

The articles in this Special Forum contribute to the theorization of the place of Sweden in American Studies by transnationalizing three levels of scholarship: the historiographical level, concerning frameworks of interpretation; the level of commercial and political infrastructures, that have influenced relations between the countries; and the level of cultural, historical, and political representations, relating to the object of study. We propose that studies of Swedish–American relations can be transnationalized on all of these levels.

Firstly, we want to think about ways of reconceptualizing the historiography of Swedish–American relations. One way to transnationalize historiography is thus to actively work with different contexts and concepts in the interpretative process, to find new ways of writing about cross-border relations in ways that go beyond national frameworks. In her article about the actress Liv Ullman, Maaret Koskinen discusses the difficulty of using traditional concepts such as “star” and “auteur” in describing Ullman—two concepts that have American and European connotations. Instead, Koskinen argues that Ullman is “situated in a kind of ‘in-between-ness,’ in possession of just the right mix of the ordinary and the extraordinary, similarity and difference,
‘European’ and ‘American,’ national and transnational,” advancing the hybrid concept of “auteur-star” for understanding Ullman’s career.

What Koskinen effectively demonstrates is the inadequacy of nationalized categories for understanding cross-border characteristics of the film industry. It might be, as Adam Hjorthén writes in his article on settler memory and foundational sites, that entangled history provides a better way of studying cross-border processes. This has both historiographical and moral implications as it complicates the question of to whom the history of American settling and Indian dispossession “belongs.” Writing entangled history enables analytical discussions where nations are both real and influential, but where national contexts do not constitute the end point of the analysis.

Secondly, we seek ways of transnationalizing the relations between Sweden and the United States that are part of a globalized market economy. Here, the Special Forum provides examples of two central phenomena situated in the intersection of business and culture, namely ice hockey and crime fiction. In her article on the Millennium Trilogy, Louise Nilsson analyzes how the international book market and mediascape interact in the creation and recreation of literary images and narratives. To understand the trilogy, Nilsson shows how the original Swedish storyline and the central character of Lisbeth Salander have been reconceptualized through translations, international movie adaptations, and, not least, through their very packaging. Although a different topic, Ulf Jonas Björk’s discussion on transnational ice hockey displays some similarities with the Millennium Trilogy. Björk demonstrates that the commercial packaging of the Swedish folk pastime ice hockey has been entwined with the conceptualization of the very thing being packaged. When ice hockey in Sweden underwent a transformation in the 1990s, colored by intense discussions of excessive Americanization, it was surrounded by both cultural and commercial interests. The Swedish hockey league has been situated in the intersection of the Swedish fascination with the NHL, the domestic concerns of the Swedish national hockey association, and the interests of the teams, most of which today are located in small to mid-size towns where the teams’ value can be measured in financial terms.

Thirdly, it is useful to think of ways to transnationalize representations of history, culture, and politics. The study of the Viking is one such example. As Dag Blanck shows, the representations of the Viking have been malleable. It is a history that has been made meaningful in different contexts and for different reasons, but the fundamental notion that the Viking era constituted a significant myth of origin was in the late nineteenth century shared between Sweden, Anglo-America, and Swedish-America. Although they interpreted the meaning of this history in different ways, all groups were involved in transnationalizing the representation of the Viking age. Similarly, the authors of the Special Forum demonstrate that representations of the New Sweden colony, Swedish crime fiction, and critical discussions about the Swedish welfare state—or, as Carl Marklund calls it, “Sweden-bashing” —have been constructed out of interactions and exchanges across the Atlantic. As Gunlög Fur, Magdalena Naum, and Jonas Nordin show, the material culture and cultural history of
the New Sweden colony provided a basis for present and future reimaginings of Sweden’s position in early modern America, a topic which has been of interest to Swedes and Americans alike. What these scholars demonstrate is the significance of cross-border interactions in understanding developments and reconceptionalizations in history, culture, and politics.

These three levels of Swedish–American relations have been affected by different types of circulation and asymmetry. In terms of the relations between the United States and a geopolitically less powerful country such as Sweden, it is not surprising that cross-border circulations are shaped by asymmetrical relations of power. What the articles of the Forum demonstrate, however, is that asymmetry is not a static category. On the contrary, our hypothesis is that the impact of specific spaces, actors, and times are crucial in understanding these relations, and the question of why certain people have been able to assert greater influence in certain contexts. American hegemony has been real, but it also needs to be nuanced. It is simply not the case that the United States has always exercised power over Sweden. Rather, American political, social, and commercial interests—with both local and international outlooks—have contributed with assigning power to the agency of Sweden. It seems to us that the Swedish–Americans power relations are not something easy to generalize about, but a factor in need of transnational empirical analysis.

It is possible to read the articles of this Special Forums as Swedish history, United States history, Swedish-American history, Pennsylvania history, or as studies of American and Swedish culture. The histories presented in these articles have been made meaningful in many contexts. Yet, to only work within separate and discrete (often national) contexts reduces the complexities of these phenomena. The contributions to this Special Forum show how culture, history, politics, and economics are related to different contexts at once. The Forum demonstrates the significance of working to transnationalize the ways we study cross-border interactions. This effort, we suggest, can be adopted to develop the field of Swedish–American relations.

This brings us back to the BBC question that began this introduction. We will not give a definitive answer to why Stockholm loves Brooklyn, but if we were to provide one, we suggest looking at cultural intersections, interpersonal movements, and economic overlaps. Moreover, as this Special Forum demonstrates, it is impossible to explain this infatuation without exploring it beyond national frameworks.

Notes


7 Dag Blanck, “Five Decades of Research on Swedish Emigration to North America,” in Language Contact Across the Atlantic, eds. P. Sture Ureland and Ian Clarkson (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1996), 190.


13 Beijbom, Mot löftets land, 51.


21 Quoted in Logue,” The Swedish Model,” 163.


35 Erik Åsard, ed, Det blågula stjärnbaneret. USA: s närvaro och inflytande i Sverige (Stockholm: Carlssons förlag, 2016), passim.

Selected Bibliography on Swedish–American Relations


