

Notes on the contents

■ The theme of the *Historical Journal* 4/2006 is With or without rights.

In her article “Kelvoton valtiokansalaiseksi? Yleisen äänioikeuden rajoitukset ja äänioikeusanomukset Suomessa 1906–17” (An unsuitable citizen? Restrictions to general suffrage and petitions for the right to vote in Finland 1906–1917), Minna Harjula examines the grounds for refusing suffrage, and who were those people denied a vote. She asks how general the general suffrage, enacted a hundred years ago, really was. Ville Pernaa’s column “Punaisesta viivasta vaalikoneisiin” (From the red line to voting machines) discusses the nature of democracy on the occasion of the Finnish jubilee year of general and equal suffrage.

In her article “Naisten oikeudet maatiloilla – suomalaisen modernisaatiokehityksen pitkä historia” (Women’s rights on farms – the long history of Finnish modernisation), Anu Pykkänen treats modernisation most of all as a historical process, the key characteristics of which are individual rights and formal equality. By her choice of topic, Pykkänen does not actually take a stand on feminist criticism of modernisation, rather her aim is also to analyse how modernisation is built on similarity on the one hand and difference on the other.

Heini Hakosalo’s article “Kivuton murros? Naisten oikeus akateemisiin opintoihin 1800–1900-luvun taitteen Suomessa” (The painless revolution? Women’s right to academic studies in late 19th and early 20th century Finland) takes a comparative view of the beginnings of women’s academic studies in Finland. She asks how smoothly did women’s university studies begin at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Kaisa Huttunen takes consumer rights as the theme of her article “Sinäkin olet kuluttaja’. E-liikkeen poliittisesta etujärjestötoiminnasta konsensus-hakuiseseen kuluttajapolitiikkaan” (‘You too are a consumer’. From the cooperative movement’s political interest group activities to consensus-seeking consumer policy). Today, all political parties are interested in consumer rights and safeguarding consumer interests, and the task of creating consumer policy rests mainly with the Ministry of

Trade and Industry. However, as late as in the 1950s, the term “consumer” referred to wage earners who were politically inclined to the left.

Jyrki Loima’s article “Lain ja aatteen voimin vähemmistöä vastaan? Venäläisen maanomistuksen muutokset Viipurin läänissä 1917–1927” (Law and ideology against a minority? Changes to Russian land ownership in the Viipuri Province in 1917–1927) deals with land ownership issues in the Viipuri Province. In summer 1917, Russians registered titles to properties in the Karelian Isthmus. During the 1918 war, the Karelian commander of the White Guards ordered that Russian properties could be confiscated “without further ado”. Loima takes a look at the change in which legislation expedited by nationalistic factions also increasingly transferred Russian properties into Finnish hands after the war. The goal was a province with homogenous land ownership where foreign population and land ownership were felt to be a hindrance.

Satu Matikainen discusses European minorities in her article “Vähemmistöt ja vähemmistöoikeudet maailmansotien välisessä Euroopassa” (Minorities and minority rights in inter-war Europe). As a consequence of the First World War, the old empires in Central and Eastern Europe disintegrated and were replaced with new nation states. However, up to a third of the population in any given area constituted minority populations in their states of residence. Minority rights were addressed in mi-

nority agreements, which new and expanded states had to sign. A new international organisation, the League of Nations, guaranteed the minority agreements.

Dozens of heads of state and religious leaders have recently apologised and expressed regret for tragic historical events. What kind of problems could such symbolic reparations possibly have from the perspective of defining the terms of citizenship? Jan Löfström attempts to find answers to this question in his article "Historialliset anteeksipyyntöt eksklusion välineenä? Symboliset hyvitykset ja kulttuurisen kansalaisuuden politiikka" (Historical apologies as an instrument of exclusion? Symbolic reparations and the politics of cultural citizenship).

The boundary defined in the Pähkinäsaari Peace Treaty (1323) is a key boundary in Finnish national history and it is used for explaining culture, identity and the present world. Earlier research has concentrated on identifying the boundary stones, which, however, is irrelevant from the medieval perspective, as Jukka Korpela points out in his article "Keskiaikainen itäraja läpi itäisen Fennoskandian metsävyöhykkeen – mikä se on! (The medieval eastern boundary through the eastern Fennoscandian forest zone – What does this mean?). However, more relevant questions are how the boundary was originally understood in the multi-layered medieval world, how it changed as a result of nation building and how it eventually

came to be imbued with anachronistic super-historical meanings, which have been used to legitimise various political and cultural views.

In his article "Anders Chydenius ja maailman ensimmäisen tietämisen vapauden lain synty" (Anders Chydenius and the creation of the world's first law on the freedom of knowledge), Juha Manninen discusses the concepts of freedom and freedom of knowledge as expressed by the 18th century Finnish economist Anders Chydenius. Chydenius's formulations were the basis for the freedom of the press laws enacted by the Swedish Diet, which were unprecedented anywhere at the time.

(Translation: *Valtasana Oy*)