

HISTORY OF CHILD WELFARE: A Present Political Concern

Johanna Sköld and Pirjo Markkola

The self-archived postprint version of this journal article is available at Linköping University Institutional Repository (DiVA):

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-168831>

N.B.: When citing this work, cite the original publication.

Sköld, J., Markkola, P., (2020), HISTORY OF CHILD WELFARE: A Present Political Concern, *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 45(2), 143-158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2020.1764383>

Original publication available at:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2020.1764383>

Copyright: Routledge

<http://www.routledge.com/>



History of Child Welfare: A Present Political Concern

Abstract

This is the introduction to a Special Issue on the past failures of child welfare in the Nordic countries. Since the 1990s, an increasing number of inquiries into the history of children's out-of-home care have shown that child welfare sometimes failed to protect children. In this Special Issue, we explore how the Nordic countries have responded to allegations and scandals of historical child abuse within child welfare, and also how history matters in these political processes. We ask how Nordic societies have acknowledged past historical child abuse and how they aim to deal with its legacy. Attempts to redress, and provide compensation for, past failures are discussed in the context of transitional justice.

Keywords: child welfare, inquiries, transitional justice, child abuse

Introduction

Since the 1990s, an increasing number of inquiries into the history of children's out-of-home care have shown that child welfare has sometimes failed to protect children. Calls for symbolic and material compensation have intensified in all the countries in which inquiries into the past failures of child welfare have been pursued, which today encompass more than twenty nations, mainly Western democracies.¹ A common feature amongst all these inquiries internationally is that they are testimonial-based, providing victims/survivors/care leavers with a state-sanctioned space in which to bear witness to their experiences of child welfare.² While the emergence of the welfare state during the 20th century saw numerous policy-setting inquiries addressing child welfare, and child abuse was by no means an unknown issue, the voices of those subjected to child welfare interventions constitute a new characteristic that ensures lived histories of abuse are present in the current political debate.³ All the Nordic countries have issued such testimony-driven inquiries, which is the ultimate proof that the history of child welfare has become a public as well as a political concern. To date, 20 national or regional inquiry reports, published between 2003 and 2016, have addressed the failings of child welfare and subsequent child abuse during various parts of the 20th century in the Nordic countries.⁴ In total, approximately 2,400 care leavers have testified before a Nordic inquiry.⁵

But how should society deal with the legacy of historical child abuse and propose justice for the victims/survivors? Various forms of redress mechanisms have been applied in different national contexts. Public apologies and financial redress schemes are relatively widespread but are not uncomplicated forms of justice. Other forms consist of peer support, memory work, memorials and promises of improvements in current child welfare. In this Special Issue, historians explore how the Nordic countries have responded to allegations and scandals concerning historical child abuse within child welfare, and also how history matters in these political processes. We ask how Nordic societies have acknowledged past historical child abuse and how they aim to deal with its legacy.

Transforming transitional justice

Interestingly, no Nordic inquiries, and hardly any other child abuse inquiries, have resulted in prosecutions or legal action against the perpetrators.⁶ Perpetrators might be deceased, crimes sealed by a statute of limitations, or what is considered a crime today may not have constituted a criminal offence at the time. Instead, the issue at stake is what responsibility current governments can take for past abusive practices. This is a question that is not only limited to child welfare. Rather, the child welfare inquiries, and their subsequent restitution mechanisms, are part of a wider framework for dealing with past atrocities that need to be addressed politically. It is needed to transform society so that victims, alleged perpetrators, bystanders and an oblivious public can co-exist whilst acknowledging the wrongs that have been perpetrated. This framework, entitled *transitional justice*, consists of not only political practice but also a rapidly growing field of academic research. As a political practice, transitional justice has mainly been concerned with the aftermath of wars and other conflicts, large-scale human rights violations and authorized wrongdoings. In the field of academic studies, scholars of transitional justice have launched several publications, journals and conferences to analyse and discuss these phenomena.⁷ Originally, transitional justice consisted of mechanisms both judicial (for example, trials) and non-judicial (for example, truth commissions) that were set up to facilitate the transition from dictatorship to democracy. The Nuremberg trials or the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission constitute prominent models that have been a source of inspiration for subsequent transitional justice practices. However, the label of transitional justice has also been applied to historical reparations within established democracies, where the issue of the current state's responsibility for the past has been put to the test.⁸

In 2013, Johanna Sköld raised the question of whether this political practice and academic field would include historical child abuse inquiries and their subsequent restorative frameworks. They

too deal with issues related to transitional justice, such as ‘a willingness to come to terms with history and “making whole what has been smashed” – an expression borrowed from the sociologist John Torpey’.⁹ In her article, Sköld recognized the common traits between many transitional justice mechanisms and the historical responses to child abuse. She also identified differences that may explain why even now, seven years after her original question, historical child abuse is still not a fully integrated part of the academic field of transitional justice.¹⁰ One such difference concerns the fact that historical child abuse inquiries do not address specific historical events that can be delimited to a certain era of rule, war or practice. Instead, they are addressing wrongdoings that occurred across wide timeframes, often covering several decades and sometimes whole centuries. Moreover, historical child abuse inquiries and the subsequent responses ‘usually do not indicate a dissociation from or settlement with a former regime’.¹¹ This means that the transitional aspect is somewhat unclear – which relations are expected to be transformed?¹²

However, political science scholar Stephen Winter argues that, rather than facilitating a regime change from authoritarianism to democracy, transitional justice in established democracies reflects efforts to change a state’s legitimacy: ‘...grievous wrongdoing by a state burdens its legitimacy and... transitional justice works to resolve that burden’.¹³ The legitimizing aspect is also addressed by sociologist and historian Jeffrey K. Olick, who argues that political legitimation depends on collective memory but, instead of a nation’s heroic past, ‘...this collective memory is now often one disgusted with itself, a matter of “learning the lessons of history...”’.¹⁴ Olick calls this the politics of regret and refers to the early 21st century as the age of compensation. In a similar vein, others have conceptualized our current times as ‘the age of apology’¹⁵ or ‘the age of inquiry’¹⁶. As the historian Berber Bevernage has suggested, time is politicized within such processes. The ultimate goal of transitional justice is to reform the relationship between past and present, now and then. However, this almost never happens without causing disputes. Bevernage describes this as politics of time where democratic societies, or states, ‘actively positing what belongs to their historical present and what does not.’¹⁷ Consequently, redressing and providing compensation for the past is not only an urgent moral issue but also a relevant scholarly topic dealing with epistemological issues, as well as the uses and politics of history.

Alongside the more established research on transitional justice, a new and vibrant scholarly field has emerged on the redress, restitution and apologies directed towards victims of historical child abuse in child welfare.¹⁸ A few scholars have argued that transitional justice has much to offer as it is a framework promoting a victim-centred approach to this history.¹⁹ But one could also ask: how can research on political responses to historical child abuse and the history of child welfare

contribute to the transitional justice framework? Firstly, responses to historical child abuse have the potential to address past as well as prospective future victims, i.e. children in care today and tomorrow. Many child abuse inquiries reveal an obvious link between past, present and future at both a personal and a societal level. For example, both the Finnish and Swedish inquiries report that victims experienced continuing personal shame and severe social consequences of out-of-home care decades ago. Several care-leavers testified before the inquiries not only to help them cope with their own trauma but also because they wanted to help contemporary children.²⁰ Secondly, child welfare, and ultimately the welfare state, constitutes the context for such authorized wrongdoing. This will have a bearing on our understanding of how transitional justice mechanisms work in established democracies. Thirdly, the fact that the subjects are positioned as children, even if they are well into adulthood when testifying, has the potential to further transform our understandings of victim-centred approaches. This Special Issue seeks to contribute to this emerging scholarly field by contextualizing child welfare history in this new age of apology/inquiry and by analysing the different uses of history and time in public inquiries, redress processes and restitution policies addressing historical child abuse in the Nordic countries.

The historical and legal context of child welfare in the Nordic countries

Defining the current state's responsibility for past failings within child welfare ultimately concerns the legal context in which the abuse took place. The history of child welfare has developed in two major contexts: poor relief stipulated by Poor Laws, and juvenile delinquency regulated by criminal laws. In late 19th-century Europe, concern for child welfare was explicitly related to reforms in the criminal law. The idea of controlling children was promoted as both child welfare and the protection of society from immoral youth. In this spirit, the first Child Welfare Acts in Norway, Sweden and Denmark date back to the turn of the 20th century, whereas in Iceland and Finland child welfare was not subject to legislation until the 1930s.²¹ Until then, attempts to fight juvenile delinquency generally took place in the context of the legal system, and other child welfare measures were regulated by Poor Laws and specific legislation on illegitimate children. In Finland, the administration of reform schools was reorganized and subjected to the school authorities but, compared to the other Nordic countries, the heritage of poor relief continued longer in Icelandic and Finnish child welfare.

From the 1930s onwards, all the Nordic countries promised social protection for all children in need of care. It was made the clear responsibility of public authorities to intervene if children were not

provided with the necessary care and upbringing by their parents, and hence public interventions into families and children's lives received stronger legal support.²² However, child welfare legislation, intended to improve the position and status of vulnerable children from all social classes, still proved to have shortcomings. Some of the problems were structural, such as the violence-bound routines of reform schools, and some other problems closely related to institutional failures when children were taken into care and placed in out-of-home care. Throughout the Nordic countries, occasional cases of public misconduct were noted by professional social workers, teachers, women's societies and the labour movement, among others. Some changes in child welfare legislation and administrative practices were made, but national legislation did not follow a similar timeline everywhere. The Swedish Child Welfare Act, for example, was renewed in 1924 and 1960, and the new Norwegian legislation dates to the 1950s, whereas in Finland no major reforms were undertaken before the second Child Welfare Act in 1983.²³ Nevertheless, recent Nordic inquiries into the failures of child welfare suggest that some forms of abusive patterns continued regardless of reforms or the lack of them. Legislation as such does not guarantee ideal conditions if individuals and institutions fail to comply with the norms and regulations.

There have also been some discrepancies between the normative level of national recommendations and the practical level of local social welfare boards and offices. All too often, good intentions did not translate into good practices. The Finnish inquiry, among others, shows that the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health issued several recommendations and instructions to improve the level of child welfare in both municipalities and child welfare institutions, but local resources were so sparse or the views of local authorities so firmly established that these recommendations fell on deaf ears.²⁴ This could be one of the explanations for the continuation of violence and abusive practices. Moreover, more structural or systemic failures were possible, as some articles in this Special Issue suggest.

What distinguishes the Nordic context of redress processes?

The Nordic countries have taken somewhat differing approaches to dealing with the historical legacy of child abuse, which will be evident through the articles presented in this Special Issue, but there are also features that distinguish the responses of the Nordic countries from redress processes in other parts of the world.

First of all, the prevalence of abuse and neglect within child welfare in the Nordic countries has been associated with the discourse of 'the dark side of the welfare state',²⁵ whilst in many other

countries the absence of a strong welfare state appears to be part of the problem. In nations where the Roman Catholic Church and other faith-based organizations have played prominent roles administering many children's institutions and carried out a significant part of the day-to-day running of institutions, the state's trust in the Church has been considered one root of the problem.²⁶ The discourse of the dark side of the Nordic welfare state emerged during the 1990s as a response to interventionist social policies.²⁷ In Sweden, it first tackled the forced involuntary sterilizations motivated by the eugenics laws that were in effect between 1935 and 1975. This eventually led to the establishment of an inquiry and a state-financed redress scheme which proved to be pivotal to the subsequent redress process aimed at the victims of historical child abuse. Historians focused on forced sterilizations in all the Nordic countries, and in 2001 this was one of the main topics at the Nordic conference of historians in which welfare policies were discussed.²⁸

The relation between the redress process for the involuntarily sterilized 'victims of the welfare state' and historical abuse victims has been investigated by Malin Arvidsson, who concludes:

Victims of abuse in Swedish institutions for children thus raised their voices for redress at a time when the politics of regret had emerged as new international norm, a re-evaluation of the welfare state had taken place and the public critique of the civil rights infringements involved in interventionalist social policies were well accepted.²⁹

However, this changed context did not result in similar opportunities for historical child abuse victims everywhere. In this Special Issue, Arvidsson explores the issue further by comparing the different approaches to the discourse of 'the dark side of the welfare state' taken by the Swedish and Danish governments.

Another aspect that distinguishes the Nordic responses internationally is the wide spectrum of neglect, abuse and violence against children that has been acknowledged through the inquiries. Several inquiries and redress packages internationally (the Australian Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse; the Independent Inquiry into Sexual Abuse in England and Wales; de commissie-Deetman van Onderzoekscommissie Seksueel Misbruik and the Commissie Samson on Sexual Abuse of Children in Out-of-home Care 1945–2010 in the Netherlands), have focused solely on child sexual abuse, which has had detrimental effects for care leavers seeking justice for the violence they encountered in care.³⁰ No Nordic inquiries have targeted sexual abuse exclusively, but it has been a category of abuse in all Nordic inquiries.

Nevertheless, the Nordic countries have chosen differing approaches in their inquiry processes. In Norway, Iceland, Denmark and Åland, the focus has been on child welfare institutions, whereas in Sweden and Finland inquiries covered all forms of out-of-home care for children, including foster

care. Internationally, only the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry and the Dutch Samson Inquiry have had an explicit remit to tackle foster care, whilst many other inquiries focus mainly on institutional abuse. The Swedish and Finnish inquiries, however, suggest that foster homes may have been even more abusive than institutions.³¹ Through international comparisons, the Nordic example may motivate and encourage other national inquiries into neglect, abuse and violence against children to take a closer look at foster care as well.

In conclusion, the Nordic countries – while responding differently to victims of historical child abuse – have all had a strong focus on the history of the welfare state and its out-of-home care arrangements when investigating the legacies of a broad spectrum of historical child abuse.

The contributions of this Special Issue

In conjunction with the inquiry process, most of the Nordic parliaments or governments have been relatively willing to apologize to victims, but in Denmark an official apology and other forms of state redress were denied for a long time with reference to the present society's inability to take responsibility for past treatment or notions of children that were different from current ideas. After 15 years of political and activist struggle, on August 13, 2019, the then newly appointed Prime Minister, Mette Fredriksen, offered a public apology to the victims/survivors. In this Special Issue, Malin Arvidsson explores how these two neighbouring countries of Denmark and Sweden came to take such different approaches to state redress. She analyses the arguments whereby Danish and Swedish politicians opposed or promoted state redress and argues that a 'retroactivity dilemma' is an issue that any redress process will face. Uses of history and the ways in which history matters in current politics have been given very different interpretations by Nordic decision-makers, as Arvidsson shows in her article.

In the cases of Norway, Iceland and Sweden, financial redress schemes have also been established. However, such schemes enact the 'retroactivity dilemma' in new ways, within which the uses of history can be critically scrutinized. Johanna Sköld, Bengt Sandin and Johanna Schiratzki demonstrate in their article how the design and practical implementation of the Swedish redress scheme came to displace the interpretative prerogative of understandings of past abuse from victims/survivors to legal expertise. The definition of which abusive practices were considered severe enough in the past to be eligible for compensation in the present built on the assumptions of this legal expertise about history. The article shows that the idea of money as a symbol for justice to the victims is different from the legal practice and outcome of financial redress schemes. In

Sweden, only 46 % of claimants were compensated. This figure is in stark contrast with the outcome of the Icelandic redress scheme, commented upon by Ólöf Garðarsdóttir in her article, under which 97 % of claimants received compensation.

The formal context in which inquiries have been implemented differs between the various Nordic countries. While inquiries in Sweden, Iceland and Norway have been conducted by state officials working in either regional or national government commissions, the Danish inquiry was awarded to a museum and the Finnish inquiry to a university research team. As representatives of this research team, Antti Malinen, Pirjo Markkola and Kirsi-Maria Hytönen discuss the benefits and pitfalls of conducting commissioned research in their article. A commissioned academic project can be strong in its political neutrality and knowledge production, but its impact on political decision-making processes can remain marginal. Nevertheless, the tendering process between the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health and the academic research team made it very clear that the inquiry was to rely on historical knowledge production and that the explicit aim was to use narratives of past experiences to improve future practices of child welfare. The authors argue that the link between past, present and future practices was strikingly direct.

While the inquiries in all the Nordic countries have collected evidence largely by interviewing care leavers, their remit and focus have differed somewhat. The Icelandic, Danish and Norwegian inquiries have concentrated on mapping abuse within specific institutions, while the Finnish and Swedish inquiries have focused on individuals' experiences of abuse and hence have not conducted thorough investigations of abusive practices within named institutions. For historians, turning to the inquiry reports in order to explore what their content can tell us about the practices of past childhoods and child welfare, such different approaches provide alternative potentials to historical research. In her article, Kjersti Ericson examines two inquiry reports from one Norwegian institution – the Stavne Reformatory – in order to investigate which conditions stimulated and counteracted violence, and how the context for the setting up of an inquiry impacted upon its outcome for victims and survivors. Ericsson demonstrates that an inquiry addressing violence and maltreatment at Stavne Reformatory in 1984–85 led to the institution's closure, but the victims were not recognized until a new inquiry was appointed in 2007, when their testimonies were finally taken into account. A case study like this, in which a thick description of one institutional context is prioritized, provides insights into the ways in which historical institutional child abuse has become a pressing political issue today, while similar earlier accusations were mainly considered isolated failures.

Another aspect that might shed some light on the various approaches taken to investigating and addressing historical abuse relates to the organization of child welfare, which has differed slightly between the Nordic countries. In Iceland, no child welfare institutions, apart from one school for deaf children, existed before the Child Protection Bill was enacted in 1932. Boarding out to private families was the main solution for children who could not live with their parents. However, the Icelandic inquiries into child abuse and the subsequent associated redress scheme, focused exclusively on abuse within institutions. In her article, Ólöf Garðarsdóttir contextualizes the legal and political background to the institutional care of wayward youth. Iceland was occupied by British troops during World War II and subsequently American forces were installed as well. Their presence shaped the views on institutional care in the country. For example, there was a fear that female adolescents' morality would be affected by the presence of foreign male soldiers. Garðarsdóttir's article demonstrates how the international politics of war continued to affect child welfare long after the war had ended.

The future of the Age of Inquiry in the Nordic countries

What can be said about the future for redress processes addressing historical child abuse in the Nordic countries? In Canada and Australia – two nations in which numerous inquiries, memorials and redress schemes have been established – the upsurge in such processes came as a response to human rights violations imposed upon indigenous populations. The abuse of children was not originally the primary focus for such inquiries and justice claims. The Australian report *Bringing them Home* was based on the testimonies of 535 aboriginal people removed from their families as children, while in its investigation the Canadian Commission interviewed more than 6,000 witnesses, most of whom had been pupils at residential schools. The forced removals of indigenous children to white settler families and institutions in Australia, or Indian residential schools in Canada, came to be considered the ultimate oppression by racist settler colonization. The forced removals of children from their families and cultures have been claimed as genocide in Australia and cultural genocide in Canada, and consequently articulated as a distinct human rights violation.³²

By contrast, the Nordic countries have not yet seen a similar influential political response to the abuses of children of indigenous or minority origin. However, back in the 1990s, the Norwegian government initiated research about how minority children had been treated and removed from their homes, and in 2004 it apologized to the Sami, Kven and Traveller minorities for the Norwegianization policy and promised redress for depriving them of their education.³³ But the main

focus of Nordic inquiries has been directed towards abuses within the child welfare sector, which means that violations concerning ethnic minorities or indigenous populations have been downplayed or at best reported as discrimination practices within child welfare. In Finland, for example, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health explicitly stated that, as a minority group in child welfare, Roma children should receive special attention in the inquiry, whereas Sami children were not mentioned at all.³⁴ However, recent years have seen an increasing political will to deal with the colonial history of the Nordic countries and its consequences for indigenous children and their families.

Civil society organizations, in particular, have reflected upon the impact of their past practices on indigenous populations. The Church of Sweden has conducted a white paper project on the Church's relations to the Sami population, and the Lutheran Church of Finland apologized to the Sami people in 2012. Danish Save the Children apologized in 2015 for its involvement in the forced migration of 22 Greenlandic children to Denmark in 1951.³⁵ Moreover, the state's responsibility for cultural and/or linguistic assimilation policies is also addressed in several ongoing or newly appointed truth and reconciliation commissions in the Nordic countries. A Danish-Greenlandic inquiry was established in 2019 to investigate the abovementioned forced child migration of Greenlandic children, which will report in 2020;³⁶ in Norway, a truth and reconciliation commission with the mandate to map the Norwegianization policy of the Sámi people and the Kven minority with special focus on the residential school system, established in 2017, will operate until 2022;³⁷ and the Swedish government has recently agreed to appoint two truth and reconciliation commissions – one to investigate the country's relations with the Tornedalen minority and the other its relations with the Sámi population.³⁸ Moreover, on the initiative of the Sámi Parliament, the Finnish government decided in November 2019 that it will appoint a truth and reconciliation commission concerning the Sami people. This commission will identify various forms of discrimination, such as assimilation policy and the violation of rights.³⁹

Aside from responses relating to Nordic relations with the state and indigenous populations and ethnic minorities, inquiries are underway to address injustices and violations of the rights of deaf people in Finland. The scope of this inquiry is wide, including deaf children's upbringing and schooling, their encounters with health and social welfare authorities, forced sterilizations and the marriage ban. Another ongoing inquiry concerns the treatment of citizens in disability and mental care institutions during the period 1933–1980 in Denmark, which will include the care of children in such residential facilities.⁴⁰

These forthcoming truth and reconciliation commissions and inquiries address people who, as children, were often removed from their families, and sent either to boarding schools or children's homes. This happened to children of ethnic minorities, deaf children and disabled children. It remains to be seen how the situations of these children will be analysed and conceptualized in the ongoing inquiries and reconciliation processes. Will they be contextualized as a violation of children's rights, as some of the previous child abuse inquiries have done (see for example the Swedish inquiry), or as a violation of human rights? What difference does it make in relation to the state's responsibility for the past? One future question is whether children's rights will be interpreted as human rights, and whether the rights of children will thus gain stronger political weight.

References

Nordic inquiries

Denmark

Rytter, Maria. *Godhavnsrapporten*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2011.

Kragh, Jesper Vaczy, Stine Grønæk Jensen, Jacob Knage Rasmussen, and Klaus Petersen. *Anbragt i Historien. Et socialhistorisk projekt om anbragte og indlagte i perioden 1945–1980*. Svendborg Museum, 2014. Rapporten udgivet af Socialstyrelsen.

Finland

Hytönen, Kirsi-Maria, Antti Malinen, Paula Salenius, Janne Haikari, Pirjo Markkola, Marjo Kuronen, and Johanna Koivisto. *Lastensuojelun sijaishuollon epäkohdat ja lasten kaltoinkohtelu 1937–1983*. Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriön raportteja ja muistioita 2016:22. Helsinki: Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö, 2016.

Hytönen, Kirsi-Maria, Antti Malinen, Paula Salenius, Janne Haikari, Pirjo Markkola, Marjo Kuronen, and Johanna Koivisto. *Misförhållanden och vanvård av barn inom barnskyddets vård utom hemmet 1937–1983*. Social- och hälsovårdsministeriets rapporter och promemorior 2016:55. Helsingfors: Social-och hälsovårdsministeriet, 2016.

Åland

Roos, Sanna, and Liselotte Lund. "Det värsta var övergivenheten – det tog mer ont än alla slag". En utredning om vanvård av samhällsvårdade barn på Åland under 1953–1971. Landskapsregeringens socialvårdsbyrå, Åland, 2015.

Iceland

Skýrsla um framkvæmd á greiðslu sanngirnisbóta á grundvelli laga nr. 47/2010 [Report on a Redress Scheme Based on Law No. 47/2010]. Government of Iceland, Prime Minister's Office, December 2018.

Skýrsla nefndar samkvæmt lögum nr. 26/2007. Könnun á starfsemi Breiðavíkurheimilisins 1952–1979 [A Report of a State Commission on the Operation of the Boys Home of Breiðavík]. Reykjavík: Government of Iceland, Prime Minister's Office, January 31, 2008.

Skýrsla nefndar samkvæmt lögum nr. 26/2007. Áfangaskýrsla nr. 1. Könnun á starfsemi Heyrnleysingjaskólans 1947–1992, vistheimilisins Kumbaravogs 1965–1984 og skólaheimilisins Bjargs 1965–1967 [A Report of a State Commission on Care-Leavers in Public Institutions]. Reykjavík: Government of Iceland. Prime Minister's Office, August 31, 2009.

Skýrsla nefndar samkvæmt lögum nr. 26/2007. Áfangaskýrsla nr. 2. Könnun á starfsemi vistheimilisins Silungapolls 1950–1969, vistheimilisins Reykjahlíðar 1956–1972 og heimavistarskólans að Jaðri 1946–1972 [A Report of a State Commission on Care-Leavers in Public Institutions]. Reykjavík: Government of Iceland, Prime Minister's Office, August 31, 2010.

Skýrsla nefndar samkvæmt lögum nr. 26/2007. Áfangaskýrsla 3. Könnun á starfsemi Upptökuheimilis ríkisins 1945–1971, Unglingaheimilis ríkisins 1971–1994 og meðferðarheimilisins í Smáratúni og á Torfastöðum 1979–1994 [A Report of a State Commission on Care-Leavers in Public Institutions]. Reykjavík: Government of Iceland, Prime Minister's Office, November 21, 2011.

Skýrsla nefndar samkvæmt lögum nr. 26/2007. Könnun á vistun barna á Kópavogshæli 1952–1993 [A Report of a State Commission on Care-Leavers at One Public Institution]. Reykjavík: Government of Iceland. Prime Minister's Office, December 29, 2016.

Skýrsla um viðbörgð og starfshætti kaþólsku kirkjunnar á Íslandi vegna ásakana um kynferðisbrot eða önnur ofbeldisbrot vígðra þjóna og annarra starfsmanna kirkjunnar [Report on the Organization of the Catholic Church due to Accusations of Sexual Assault]. Reykjavík: Rannsóknarnefnd kaþólsku kirkjunnar á Íslandi, November 2, 2012.

Norway

Rapport fra Granskingsutvalget for barnevernsinstitusjoner i Bergen, Fylkesmannen i Hordaland, 2003.

Barnevernsinstitusjoner benyttet av Oslo kommune 1954–1993. Gransking av overgrep, omsorgssvikt, tilsyn og tvangsplasseringer. Fylkesmannen i Oslo og Akershus, 2005.

Rapport fra Granskingsutvalget for barnevernsinstitusjoner i Rogaland, Fylkesmannen i Rogaland, 2006.

Rapport fra granskingsutvalget av barnehjem i Kristiansand, Kristiansand kommune, 2007.

Omsorg og overgrep. Gransking av barnehjem, skolehjem og fosterhjem benyttet av Trondheim kommune fra 1930-årene til 1980-årene. Fylkesmannen i Sør-Trøndelag, 2007.

Rapport fra granskingsutvalget for barnehjemmene i Finnmark. Finnmark fylkeskommune, 2008.

Gransking av skole- og barnehjem i Aust- og Vest-Agder. Fylkesmannen i Vest-Agder, 2009.

Norway Public Reports 2004:23, Barnehjem og spesialskoler under lupen. Nasjonal kartlegging av overgrep og omsorgssvikt i barnevernsinstitusjoner 1945–1980. Statens forvaltningstjeneste, informasjonsforvaltning, 2004.

Sweden

SOU 2009:99. *Vanvård i social barnavård under 1900-talet*. Delbetänkande. Statens offentliga utredningar. Stockholm: Fritze, 2009.

SOU 2011:9, Upprättelseutredningen. Barnen som samhället svek - åtgärder med anledning av övergrepp och allvarliga försummelser i samhällsvården: betänkande. Stockholm: Fritze, 2011.

SOU 2011:61. *Vanvård i social barnavård. Slutrapport*. Slutbetänkande av Utredningen om vanvård i den sociala barnavården. Statens offentliga utredningar. Stockholm: Fritze, 2011.

Websites and internet sources

Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence in the History of Experiences (HEX). Accessed March 5, 2020. <https://research.uta.fi/hex/>.

Government of Greenland 2019. Nu starter undersøgelse af grønlandske børns flytning til Danmark, 2019-04-10. Accessed February 21, 2020. https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Nyheder/2019/04/1004_undersoegelse.

Prime Minister's Office 2019. Saamelaisten totuus- ja sovintokomission valmistelu (Establishing a truth and reconciliation commission concerning the Sámi people). Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://vnk.fi/saamelaisasioiden-sovintoprosessi>.

Prime Minister's Office 2020. Valtioneuvoston selvitys- ja tutkimustoiminnan vuoden 2020 ensimmäinen täydentävä haku (Government's analysis, assessment and research activities, call for proposals). Accessed April 17, 2020. https://tietokayttoon.fi/haku/ilmoitus/-/asset_publisher/valtioneuvoston-selvitys-ja-tutkimustoiminnan-vuoden-2020-ensimmainen-taydentava-haku.

Sannhets- og forsoningskommisjonen 2020, website: <https://uit.no/kommisjonen>.

Speech from the Ministry of Employment 2020-01-27, Åsa Lindhagen, Minister of Gender and Equality, Speech at the UN Periodic Review in Geneva. Accessed February 26, 2020. <https://www.regeringen.se/tal/2020/01/jamstalldhetsminister-asa-lindhagen-tal-vid-fns-upr/>

The Prime Minister's Office 2019. Statsminister Mette Frederiksen's tale ved arrangement for Godhavnsdrene og andre børnehjemsbørn den 13. august 2019, (Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen's apology speech aimed at the Godhavn Boys and other care leavers from children's homes August 13, 2019). Accessed March 11, 2020. http://www.stm.dk/_p_14843.html

Svenska YLE. Statlig samekommission för sanning och försoning - men blir det också konsekvenser? 2019-11-17. Accessed February 26, 2020. <https://svenska.yle.fi/artikel/2019/11/17/statlig-samekommission-for-sanning-och-forsoning-men-blir-det-ocksa-konsekvenser>.

The Danish Welfare Museum. Accessed March 20, 2020. <https://www.svendborgmuseum.dk/visforsorgnyhedermtemplate/993-historisk-udredning>.

Bibliography

Andresen, Astri et al. *Barnen och välfärdspolitiken. Nordiska barndomar 1900–2000*. Stockholm: Dialogos förlag, 2011.

Andresen, Astri. *Hender små. Bortsetting av barn i Norge 1900–1950*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2006.

Anttonen, Marjut. *Menetty koulunkäynti. Norjan valtion hyvitykset saamelaisille ja kveeneille*. Tutkimuksia A 33. Turku: Siirtolaisuusinstituutti, 2010.

Arvidsson, Malin. 'Contextualizing Reparation Politics.' In *Apologies and the Legacy of Abuse of Children in Care: International Perspectives*, edited by Johanna Sköld and Shurlee Swain. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, 70–82.

Arvidsson, Malin. *Att ersätta det oersättliga: Statlig gottgörelse för ofrivillig sterilisering och vanvård av omhändertagna barn*. Örebro: Örebro universitet, 2016.

- Barkan, Elazar. *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustice*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000.
- Bevernage, Berber. 'Writing the Past Out of the Present: History and the Politics of Time in Transitional Justice.' *History Workshop Journal* 69, no. 1 (2010): 111–131.
- Broberg, Gunnar, and Nils Roll-Hansen, eds. *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland*. East Lansing: Michigan University Press, 1996.
- Brooks, Roy. 'The Age of Apology.' In *When Sorry Isn't Enough: The Controversy over Apologies and Reparations for Human Injustice*, edited by Roy L. Brooks. New York and London: New York University Press, 1999, 3–11.
- Curthoys, Ann, and John Docker, eds. 'Special section: "Genocide"? Australian Aboriginal History in International Perspective.' *Aboriginal History* 25 (2001).
- Dahl, Tove Stang. *Barnevern og samfunnsvern*. Oslo: Pax, 1978.
- Daly, Kathleen. *Redressing Institutional Abuse of Children*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- De Wilde, Lieselot, Bruno Vanobbergen, and Greit Roets. 'The Role of Life Histories in an Age of Apology: A Presence of the Past?' *Qualitative Social Work*, 19, no. 1 (2020): 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325018796687>.
- Eisikovits, Nir. 'Transitional Justice.' In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta. Accessed February 29, 2020. <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/justice-transitional/>>.
- Ericsson, Kjersti. 'Victim Capital and the Language of Money: The Norwegian Process of Inquiries and Apologies.' *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth*, 8, no. 1 (2015): 123–137.
- Gallen, James. 'Jesus Wept: The Roman Catholic Church, Child Sexual Abuse and Transitional Justice.' *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 10, no. 2 (2016): 332–349.
- Gallen, James, and Kate Gleeson. 'Unpaid Wages: The Experiences of Irish Magdalene Laundries and Indigenous Australians.' *International Journal of Law in Context*, 14, no. 1 (2018): 43–60.
- Gibney, M., R. Howard-Hassmann, J-M. Coicaud, and N. Steiner, eds. *The Age of Apology: Facing Up to the Past*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Golding, Frank. 'Sexual Abuse as the Core Transgression of Childhood Innocence: Unintended Consequences for Care Leavers.' *Journal of Australian Studies*, 42 no. 2 (2018): 191–203.
- Haave, Per. 'Tvangsterilisering i Norge. En velferdsstatlig politikk i sosialdemokratisk regi?' In *Frihed, lighed og tryghed. Velfærdspolitik i Norden* edited by Hilda Rømer Christensen, Urban Lundberg & Klaus Petersen. Århus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, 2001, 140–162.

- Hamber, Brandon, and Lundy, Patricia. 'Lessons from Transitional Justice? Toward a New Framing of a Victim-Centered Approach in the Case of Historical Institutional Abuse.' *Victims & Offenders*, (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1743803>.
- Harrikari, Timo. *Lastensuojelun historia. Tutkielma oikeussäätelystä, kulttuurisista kerrostumista ja hallinnan murroksista*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 2019.
- Hietala, Marjatta. 'From Race Hygiene to Sterilization: The Eugenics Movement in Finland.' In *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland*, edited by Gunnar Broberg and Nils Roll-Hansen. East Lansing: Michigan University Press, 1996, 195–258.
- Honouring the Truth: Reconciling for the Future*, Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015.
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. *Bringing them Home*. Sydney: HREOC, 1997.
- Jensen, Stine Grønbæk. *At åbne skuffen – om tidligere børnehjemsbørns transformationer af selvet og den sociale verden gennem erindringsarbejde*. Institut for historie, Syddansk universitet og Danmarks forsorgsmuseum, 2018.
- Karlsdóttir, Unnur. 'Sterilization Policy in Iceland.' In *Frihed, lighed og tryghed. Velfærdspolitik i Norden*, edited by Hilda Rømer Christensen, Urban Lundberg, and Klaus Petersen. Århus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, 179–190.
- Koch, Lene. 'Tvangssterilisation i Danmark 1929–67.' *Frihed, lighed og tryghed. Velfærdspolitik i Norden*, edited by Hilda Rømer Christensen, Urban Lundberg, and Klaus Petersen. Århus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, 2001, 163–178.
- Koch, Lene. *Racehygienje i Danmark 1920–56*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1996.
- Koch, Lene. *Tvangssterilisation i Danmark 1929–67*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2000.
- Krasnik, Benjamin. Tvangsfjernede grønlandere fik deres undskyldning. *Kristelig Dagblad* 2015-10-22. Accessed February 28, 2020. <https://www.kristeligt-dagblad.dk/danmark/tvangsfjernet-helene-fik-sin-undskyldning>.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka. *Saamelaiset. Historia, yhteiskunta, taide*. Inari: Puntsi, 2015.
- Leuenberger, Marco, Lea Mani, Simone Rudin, and Loreta Seglias. "Die Behörde beschliesst" – zum Wohl des Kindes? *Fremplatzierte Kinder im Kanton Bern 1912–1978*, Baden: Verlag für Kultur und Geschichte, 2011.
- Lindmark, Daniel, and Olle Sundström, eds. *De historiska relationerna mellan Svenska kyrkan och samerna: en vetenskaplig antologi*. Bd 1. Skellefteå: Artos & Norma, 2016.
- McAlinden, Anne-Marie. 'An Inconvenient Truth: Barriers to Truth Recovery in the Aftermath of Institutional Child Abuse in Ireland.' *Legal Studies* 33, no. 2 (2013): 189–214.

- Mattila, Markku. *Kansamme parhaaksi. Rotuhygienia Suomessa vuoden 1935 sterilointilakiin asti*. Suomen Historiallinen Seura, Helsinki, 1999.
- O'Sullivan, E. 'The Ryan Report.' In *Defining Events: Power, Resistance and Identity in 21st Century Ireland*, edited by F. Dukelow and R. Meade, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015, 200–217.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. *The Politics of Regret*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Pettersen, Karen-Sofie. *Tatere og misjonen: mangfold, makt og motstand*, Trondheim: Norges Teknisk-Naturvitenskaplige Universitet, 2005.
- Runcis, Maija. *Makten över barnen. Tvångsomhändertagande av barn i Sverige 1928–1968*. Stockholm: Atlas, 2007.
- Simonsen, Eva, and Karen-Sofie Pettersen. 'The Politics of Apology: The Norwegian Case.' In *Apologies and the Legacy of Abuse of Children in Care: International Perspectives*, edited by Johanna Sköld and Shurlee Swain. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, 114–123.
- Sköld, Johann, and Bengt Sandin. 'Att delta eller stå bredvid: Upprättelseprocesser och historikerns risker och möjligheter'. *Historisk Tidskrift*, 136, no. 3 (2016): 383–411.
- Sköld, Johanna, and Shurlee Swain, eds. *Apologies and the Legacy of Abuse of Children in Care: International Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Sköld, Johanna. 'Historical Abuse – A Contemporary Issue: Compiling Inquiries into Abuse and Neglect of Children in Out-of-Home Care Worldwide.' *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 14, no. S1 (2013): 5–23.
- Swain, Shurlee. 'Both Victim and "Perpetrator": Finding a Voice before Inquiries into Historical Abuse in Out-of-Home Care.' *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 12, No. 3 (November 2018): 464–478, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijy015>.
- Swain, Shurlee, Katie Wright, and Johanna Sköld. 'Conceptualising and Categorising Child Abuse Inquiries: From Damage Control to Foregrounding Survivor Testimony.' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 31, no. 3 (2020): 282–296.
- Tydén, Mattias. 'Socialpolitik och sterilisering. Operationalisering av ett forskningsproblem'. In *Frihed, lighed og tryghed. Velfærdspolitik i Norden*, edited by Hilda Rømer Christensen, Urban Lundberg, and Klaus Petersen. Århus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, 2001, 108–139.
- Vallgård Signild. 'Det goda litet och det goda samhället. Styrning i folkhälsopolitiken eller hur välfärdsstaten söker forma människor.' In *Frihed, lighed og tryghed. Velfærdspolitik i Norden*, edited by Hilda Rømer Christensen, Urban Lundberg, and Klaus Petersen. Århus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, 2001, 90–107.

- Von Wahl, Angelika. 'The Politics of Reparations: Why, When and How Democratic Governments Get Involved.' In *Historical Justice in International Perspective: How Societies are Trying to Right the Wrongs of the Past*, edited by M. Berg and B. Schäfer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 39–65.
- Winter, Stephen. 'Towards a Unified Theory of Transitional Justice.' *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 7, no. 2 (2013): 224–244.
- Wright, Katie, and Alasdair Henry. 'Historical Institutional Child Abuse: Activist Mobilisation and Public Inquiries.' *Sociology Compass*, 13 (2019): e12754. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12754>
- Wright, Katie, Shurlee Swain, and Johanna Sköld. *The Age of Inquiry: A Global Mapping of Institutional Abuse Inquiries*. Melbourne: La Trobe University. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4225/22/591e1e3a36139>.
- Wright, Katie, Johanna Sköld, and Shurlee Swain. 'Examining Abusive Pasts: Reassessing Institutional Violence and Care through Commissions of Inquiry.' *Traverse: Zeitschrift Für Geschichte / Revue d'histoire*, no. 3 (2018): 162–178.

-
1. Wright, Sköld & Swain, 'Examining Abusive Pasts', 162.
 - 2, Swain, Wright, and Sköld, 'Conceptualising and Categorising', 291.
 3. 'Lived history' and 'lived experience' emphasize the ways in which history matters in current societies. The Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence in the History of Experiences (HEX) studies the lived welfare state, among others, and focuses on institutionalized experiences and experienced institutions, such as child welfare and poor relief. The oral history method and the politics of history often link the past with the present and underline the historicity of the present. See <https://research.uta.fi/hex/> (accessed March 3, 2020).
 4. See the list of Nordic inquiries at the end of this article.
 5. The Danish Godhavnsundersøgelsen included testimonies from 85 care leavers (an additional 14 informants were former staff); the Swedish Inquiry was based on interviews with 866 care leavers claiming to have been abused whilst in care; the Finnish inquiry was based on interviews with 299 people (mainly care leavers); the Icelandic inquiries covering eleven institutions were based on interviews with approximately 400 care leavers, and finally, the seven regionally conducted inquiries in Norway are in total based on interviews with 743 care leavers (the inquiry conducted by Bergen City Council reports that the majority of the 133 interviewees were care leavers but that some former staff had also been interviewed, which makes it difficult to determine exactly how many of the 133 were care leavers). Numbers of witnesses are retrieved

from The Age of Inquiry database: Wright, Swain, and Sköld, 'The Age of Inquiry'; Hytönen et al., *Lastensuojelun sijaishuollon*; and Ólöf Garðarsdóttir's article in this special issue.

6. One notable exception to this situation is the trial of Catholic Cardinal George Pell, which was instigated in the wake of the Australian Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.
7. Eisikovits, Nir, 'Transitional Justice.' The *International Journal of Transitional Justice* was launched by Oxford University Press in 2007.
8. Von Wahl, 'The Politics of Reparations.'
9. Sköld, 'Historical Abuse: A Contemporary Issue', 10.
10. Hamber and Lundy, 'Lessons from Transitional Justice?', 2. A search for 'child abuse' in the *International Journal of Transitional Justice* conducted on April 8, 2020 generated only six hits, whereas just two articles address historical child abuse inquiries and related mechanisms of redress.
11. Sköld, 'Historical Abuse: A Contemporary Issue', 12.
12. Daly, 'Redressing Institutional Abuse', 192.
13. Winter, 'Towards a Unified Theory of Transitional Justice', 226.
14. Olick, *The Politics of Regret*, 122; See also Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations*.
15. Brooks, 'The Age of Apology'; Gibney, Howard-Hassmann, Coicaud, and Steiner, eds. *The Age of Apology*.
16. Wright, Sköld & Swain, 'Examining Abusive Pasts.'
17. Bevernage, 'Writing the Past Out of the Present', 122.
18. See, for example, Arvidsson, *Att ersätta det oersättliga*; Daly, *Redressing Institutional Abuse of Children*; deWilde et al., 'The Role of Life Histories'; Ericsson, 'Victim Capital'; Golding, 'Sexual Abuse as the Core'; Jensen, *Att åbne skuffen*; Leuenberger et al., *Die Behörde beschliesst*; Sköld and Sandin, 'Att delta eller stå brevid'; Sköld and Swain, eds., *Apologies and the Legacies of Abuse*; Swain, 'Both Victim and Perpetrator'; Wright and Henry, 'Historical Institutional Child Abuse'.
19. Hamber and Lundy, 'Lessons from Transitional Justice?'; Gallen, 'Jesus Wept'; McAlinden, 'An Inconvenient Truth'; Gallen and Gleeson, 'Unpaid Wages'.
20. Hytönen et al., *Missförhållanden och vanvård av barn*; SOU 2009:99. See also Grønbæk Jensen, *Att åbne skuffen*.
21. Vergerådsloven 1896/1900 and Pleiebarnsloven 1905 in Norway were the first, followed by the 1953 Child Welfare Act. In Denmark, the 1905 Child Welfare Act. In Sweden, child welfare acts were passed in 1902, 1924 and 1960, followed by new legislation in 1980. Child welfare acts

-
- were also passed in 1932 in Iceland, and in 1936 and 1983 in Finland. Dahl, *Barnevern og samfunnsvern*, 84–91; Pulma, *Suomen lastensuojelun historia*, 105–107; Andresen, *Hender små*, 27–33; Andresen et al., *Barnen och välfärdspolitiken*, 16; Harrikari, *Lastensuojelun historia*, 162–175.
22. Dahl, *Barnevern of samfunnsvern*; Runcis, *Makten över barnen*; Harrikari, *Lastensuojelun historia*, 205–207.
 23. Andresen et al., *Barnen och välfärdspolitiken*.
 24. Hytönen et al., *Missförhållanden och vanvård av barn*. See also Harrikari, *Lastensuojelun historia*, 226–249.
 25. Wright, Sköld, and Swain, ‘Examining Abusive Pasts’, 170; Arvidsson, ‘Contextualizing Reparation Politics’, 75; Simonsen and Pettersen, ‘The Politics of Apology’, 120; Jensen, *At åbne skuffen*, 18–19.
 26. Sköld, ‘Apology Politics’, 17; O’Sullivan, ‘The Ryan Report’.
 27. Arvidsson, ‘Contextualizing Reparation Politics’, 74; Simonsen and Pettersen, ‘The Politics of Apology’, 120; Jensen, *At åbne skuffen*, 18–19; The Prime Minister’s Office Denmark, ‘Statsminister Mette Frederiksens tale’.
 28. Broberg and Roll-Hansen, *Eugenics and the Welfare State*; Koch, *Tvangssterilisering i Danmark*; Koch, *Racehygiene i Danmark*; SOU 2000:20; The Nordic Conference, contributions by Signild Vallgård, Mattias Tydén, Per Haave, Lene Koch and Unnur Karlsdóttir in Christensen, Lundberg, and Petersen, eds. *Frihed, lighed og velfærd*. In Finland, eugenics and forced sterilizations were studied by Marjatta Hietala and Markku Mattila, but neither of them contributed to the conference report in 2001. Hietala, ‘From Race Hygiene to Sterilization’; Mattila, *Kansamme parhaaksi*.
 29. Arvidsson, ‘Contextualizing Reparations Politics’, 75.
 30. Golding, ‘Sexual Abuse as the Core.’
 31. SOU 2011:61; Hytönen et al., *Missförhållanden och vanvård av barn*.
 32. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Bringing them Home; Honouring the Truth*. See also, Curthoys and Docker, ‘Special section: “Genocide”?’ for a discussion of the application of the concept of genocide and associated terms.
 33. Simonsen and Pettersen, ‘The Politics of Apology’, 119; Pettersen, *Tatere og misjonen*; Lehtola, *Saamelaiset*, 232; Anttonen, *Menetetty koulunkäynti*, 54.
 34. Selvitystyön suunnitelma, 9.
 35. Krasnik, ‘Tvangsfjernede grønlandere fik deres undskyldning’; Lindmark and Sundström, *De historiska relationerna mellan Svenska kyrkan och samerna*.

-
36. Government of Greenland, 2019. Nu starter undersøgelse af grønlandske børns flytning til Danmark, 2019-04-10. Accessed February 21, 2020.
https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Nyheder/2019/04/1004_undersoegelse.
37. Sannhets- og forsoningskommisjonen 2020, website: <https://uit.no/kommisjonen>.
38. Speech from the Ministry of Employment 2020-01-27, Åsa Lindgren, Minister of Gender and Equality, Speech at the UN Periodic Review in Geneva. Accessed February 26, 2020.
<https://www.regeringen.se/tal/2020/01/jamstalldhetsminister-asa-lindhagen-tal-vid-fns-upr/>.
39. Prime Minister's Office 2019. Saamelaisten totuus- ja sovintokomission valmistelu [Establishing a truth and reconciliation commission concerning the Sámi people]. Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://vnk.fi/saamelaisasioiden-sovintoprosessi>; Svenska YLE. Statlig samekommission för sanning och försoning – men blir det också konsekvenser? 2019-11-17. Accessed February 26, 2020. <https://svenska.yle.fi/artikel/2019/11/17/statlig-samekommission-for-sanning-och-forsoning-men-blir-det-ocksa-konsekvenser>.
40. Prime Minister's Office, 2020. Accessed April 20, 2020. https://tietokayttoon.fi/haku/ilmoitus/-/asset_publisher/valtioneuvoston-selvitys-ja-tutkimustoiminnan-vuoden-2020-ensimmainen-taydentava-haku; The Danish Welfare Museum 2020. Accessed April 20, 2020.
<https://www.svendborgmuseum.dk/visforsorgnyhedermtemplate/993-historisk-udredning>.