

## Chapter 26 : Money & privileges

Since the royal family was not allowed to make a living from a profession or a business, they were from 1809 granted an appanage. This consisted of annual maintenance and disposition rights to certain castles, properties and land areas. The Parliament of 1840/41 split it into two parts, the castle estate and the court estate, the first of which had to be accounted for. The royals only private income was inheritance, gifts and returns on capital. The mix of policies, special legislation and old-fashioned practices makes the subject difficult to penetrate.

\* \* \*

As Charles John started his career with two empty hands, it took a long time before he had any capital of consequence. In 1798, he married Desirée Clary and had to borrow for their residence. The couple had a marriage contract so Charles John initially only had his military pension. Around 1802 he speculated on the stock exchange with borrowed money, which went wrong, and he had to ask Napoleon to help pay his debts. It seems to have meant, among other things, that he was forced to re-enter active service. His finances do not seem to have recovered until he was appointed Marshal in 1804. He then had the proceeds of a number of spoils of war at his disposal: the Italian Duchy of Ponte Corvo, and later while stationed in Germany a number of German estates. In 1810, Charles John was wealthy, but in no way loaded. He was in noway able to honour Fournier's promises to pay the Swedish national debt. The more so as when he was appointed successor to the Swedish throne, most of his properties reverted without compensation to the French state. It was only with the so-called Guadeloupe funds that Charles John once again had money to burn. (See also chapter 11.)

\*

The Guadeloupe interest rate became a Republican issue of principle in 1908. It was revived in 1954. In 1957, an investigation<sup>1</sup> was made which resulted in that the legal situation was unclear but that the 1815 Parliament had approved the agreement. (However, it was not clear whether the decree was related to the interest or the funds. Other information may be interpreted as the decision on the interest was taken by the Council in 1817, but not the Parliament.) The question refused to die. When the Parliament finally in 1978 voted, it was 260-22 to keep the Guadeloupe interest and 23 abstained. The debate continued though:

”The annual sum, [by now] barely 4 percent of the King's annual appanage, can be considered insignificant in the broad context (although in the current economic situation there may be differences of opinion on this). More important, however, in our view is the fact that the country's most important official - who is personally innocent - should receive interest appertaining to at a time when corruption and bribery were not uncommon. This is increasingly perceived as morally offensive and justifies a comprehensive examination and investigation of the legal basis of the decision.”<sup>2</sup>

In 1981, the proposers lost another vote. In 1982, however, something changed in the zeitgeist. Or the drop had eroded the stone. The majority gave way to the minority and the government was instructed by the Parliament to discuss the issue with King Carl Gustaf. He felt the matter so politically sensitive, it had on and off been debated throughout his lifetime,

---

<sup>1</sup> Waller 1952; Wadén 1957.

<sup>2</sup> Andersson m.fl. 1980.

that he urged the Marshal's Office to find a solution. The solution was to abolish the payment of the Guadeloupe interest, but at the same time increase the appanage by the corresponding amount. This may well be regarded as a victory for the Republican League because its chairman Sten Sjöberg has put a lot of work into the matter, 1978 even published a book.<sup>3</sup>

An alternative theory is that the royal house's compliance was related to the introduction of the cognate succession January 1, 1980. The Guadeloupe interest rate was legally an entailed estate that passed on to the eldest son. Thus not the Crown Princess. A further advantage of the appanage solution was that the interest rate now inflation-protected.

In 2004, a similar agreement was reached for the interest on Karl XIII's dowry capital, SEK 7,500 annually.

\*

The Guadeloupe funds seem to have been a consequence of the 1812 Parliament when all of Sweden's foreign possessions were handed over to the state, i.e. Charles John, to administer & tax without the Parliament's involvement. Swedish Pomerania until 1815, Saint-Barthélmy until 1878, "the Guadeloupe interest" until 1982. On top of this was the ruble fund from 1812, the piaster fund from 1813 & the Pomeranian fund. Since Sweden lacked a banking system, Charles John invested the money in goods and jewels. The estates, agricultural, mining and forestry, were spread throughout the country, required a lot of time to administer but gave about 2.5 percent return. At the inventory after his death Charles John's reserve fund - 400 thousand Rdr in jewels & 250 thousand Rdr in cash – were found in a safe in the office. This was nearly a quarter of his wealth. One guess has been that he wanted to have a spare exit in case the Swedes got tired of him or vice versa.

Charles John's agriculture, mining and forestry were sold after his death. The last of them, Älvdalen's porphyry, in 1857. After that the King and the Parliament argued about the appanage and the maintenance of the castles. The appanage was awarded to the king personally, who distributed it among himself, the children and others according to often unclear criteria. The criticism has been that the Parliament in this way strengthened the king's power over his family. King Gustav V in particular was prone to financial blackmail.

There is unconfirmed evidence that Oscar II lost a large amount of private money on the Panama Canal, but that this was compensated by an increase in the Guadeloupe interest rate. This must be a misunderstanding. The Guadeloupe interest rate was recalculated in connection with the 1873 currency reform from 200 thousand Rdr Banco to 300 thousand SEK. The Panama money was lost (?) in the crash of 1881-1889.

\* \* \*

After the death of King Gustaf V, several attempts were made to penetrate the Royal Household's finances. Karl Kilsmo (fp) commissioned an inquiry in 1964, but the court refused to provide information:

---

<sup>3</sup> Sjöberg 1978.

In addition to government grants and other benefits granted by the state, the royal house currently receives income almost exclusively from capital and - to a lesser extent - from property. Because of the capital is tax-free, no direct information can be obtained from public documents either on the size or composition of the royal assets or on the interest rate. The only sources available are the documents - wills, estate inventories, etc. - that highlight the inheritances, that at various times have benefited the members of the royal house. However, in view of the fact that the most important - and the only ones to be taken into account here - inheritances date back quite a long way - from 1947 to 1950, it is very difficult to calculate the current yield.”<sup>4</sup>

Around 1969, a 100-page letter was published on economic issues related to an audit of the castle estate. It included criticism of the unclear delimitation of the king's personal economy from the rest.<sup>5</sup> In 1972, King Gustaf VI's Chief Superintendent Herbert Bexelius confirmed that the appanage of 3.8 million was actually increased by a million of Gustaf VI's personal money.<sup>6</sup> Despite this there was a widespread notion that the royal house profited at the public's expense. This would be done by: (1) Their court, representation and private life-style was more luxurious or costly than justified. (2) Their appanage and miscellaneous funds were used for private purposes rather than the public good. (3) Their private economy benefited from their special social status, a form of corruption. To illustrate this, there are a number of parliamentary motions and newspaper articles. A sample is provided below:

\*

### The royal court

The royal court has always consisted of two parts, the working court and the ceremonial court. Gustaf V & VI were uninterested in the ceremonial court - they were too old for festivities - and upon Carl Gustav's accession the ceremonial court was for all practical purposes dead. However, the old organization remained: The Marshal of the Realm (CEO; with the official rank 4 next to the King, the Speaker and the Prime Minister) had the outwards responsibility (contacts with the Parliament and the government; securing the appanage). The 1<sup>st</sup> Marshal of the Court (deputy CEO) had the inwards responsibility (economy & administration). The Governor of the State was responsible for the king's immovable properties.

Each royal person had their own Marshal of the Court or equivalent responsible for the representation. There were maids of honour, ladies-in-waiting, mistress of the robes, chamberlains, master of ceremonies, aid-de-camps, adjutants, maids, valets, guards, stable workers, gardeners, curators, archivists, etc. Gustaf VI's personal court consisted of some 30 employees - "the canasta gang" & the castle staff: "The King only lived at Stockholm Castle for a few months in the autumn. Between December and April he lived at Drottningholm Castle, April and May he moved to Ulriksdal Castle and June, July and August he spent at Sofiero. During the autumn he travelled to Italy, because he was very interested in archeology.”<sup>7</sup> This royal manor life had under Carl Gustaf a rude ending.

---

<sup>4</sup> RUT 1964.

<sup>5</sup> Sture Palm. I: Republiken, 1971:2. [Det har inte gått att identifiera vilket pm, rapport eller annat som Palm refererar till.]

<sup>6</sup> Roslund 1972.

<sup>7</sup> Marianne Eriksson. Christer Adolfsson serverar under prinsbröllopet. <nwt.se> (2010-06-16).

1973-1975, the head of Atlas Copco's long-term planning, the civil economist Count Tom Wachtmeister, was on loan to the court as the 1<sup>st</sup> Marshal of the Court. His first task was to carry out an organizational inquiry. Because wage benefits such as food and lodgings at the castle during Gustaf V's time were not counted as taxable income, many people's pensions were very low and they were allowed to continue working at the castle for as long as they could. This continued under King Gustaf VI. Trade union affiliation was discouraged & the employees had no agreement with AMF. The first concrete measure was to dismiss domestic staff at the various castles and to introduce an upper age limit for employees of 70 years. (This was especially relevant for the castle guards. It was something of a tradition among the Stockholm police that they spent their last years at the castle. As guards, they worked every three days and continued for as long as they could.<sup>8</sup>)

The subsequent measures aimed at reducing administrative costs by reducing duplication and making the allocation of responsibilities more comprehensible to outsiders. The number of employees was reduced to about 200 full-time and another 400-500 if necessary. The ambition was to pay market wages. However, this only applied to the lower positions. Management positions were moderately paid honorary duties. Wealth was a must. The number of employees at the Royal Court in the turn of the year 1975/76 was reported to have been 15 full-time and 61 pensioners, half-time employees and remunerations.<sup>9</sup> Neither before nor after Carl Gustaf's actions did the Swedish National Audit Office (RRV) have any formal insight, but a certain plausibility check was part of the appanage application. The 1980 procedure was:

”The costs for the Royal Court is divided into two endowments under the first main title of the Swedish state - A1. His Maj:t the Kings och the Royal Household [court estate] and A2. Maintenance and care of furniture and other estates belonging to the royal palaces [castle estate]. Proposals for the calculation of the resources needed for the latter of these two appropriations are submitted to the Ministry of the Budget by the Marshal's Office after detailed cost assessment of the offices of the governors of the royal castles and the Royal moveables property chamber.

As far as the appropriation A1. is concerned, no corresponding cost accounting is done by the Marshal's Office. The need for resources is examined here by the Ministry of the Budget after a more cursory presentation by the Marshal of the Court and is usually based on an automatic increase of the previous year's appropriations. This amounts to an increase, ”of which three-fifths are wage increases and two-fifths are price increases”. The appropriation A1. for the current financial year [1979/80] is SEK 7 500 000.”<sup>10</sup>

In 1993 further savings were made. The PR consultant, Mats Dellham, was commissioned to conduct a new organizational inquiry. The organization was flattened, the Marshal of the Realm became head of a regular management team and reported to Carl Gustaf. However, this change seems to have been limited to the castle state. The Royal Court under Carl Gustaf continued as before. In 2008, the appanage was identical to Denmark. Overall, the budget of the court state is well researched.

\*

---

<sup>8</sup> Bert Miller. Kungen och hans hus 1. Hemmets veckotidning, 1964:5.

<sup>9</sup> Per Gudmundsson. Kungens nya hov. Kvällsposten, 1975-11-01.

<sup>10</sup> RUT 1980.

## Representation

Carl Gustaf's appanage covers current expenditure. Everything else - for example state visits - requires special funding, or - for example municipal visits - is paid by the "client". Overall, the financing of the royal house is a jumble: For example: The Guard Parade is jointly financed by the Defence & the Non-profit Association The Mounted High Guard. The adjutants are financed by the defence. The bodyguards are funded by the police. The trips abroad are financed by the Foreign Ministry. Carl Gustaf disposes of the state's Gulfstream IV - a two-engined business jet. Etc. The Republican Association has published an overall calculation.<sup>11</sup> "Total cost of ownership" (TCO) for the royal house, court estate+castle estate was 2017 137 million. If you also include the costs of personal protection, operation, loss of rent for the castles etc., the total ends up at 1093 million. Since parts of the royal house's private life is public – e.g. weddings - the border public-private is difficult to draw. This has led to discussions, for example, about whether party dresses should be financed by the appanage. Carl Gustaf's position is that he is always on duty, but that is definitely not the case for the rest of the family. Comparisons with other countries are difficult to make, but seem to be: The more democracy (=more representation) the more expensive the Head of State.<sup>12</sup>

The overall assessment is that the appropriation is increasingly allocated to fixed overheads and less to parties. The parties are certainly as big as before but fewer. Carl Gustaf holds dinners for 160 people four times a year. Senior government officials attend some dinner every year. The number of MPs and the foreign ambassadors is so large that it becomes every three years for them - later every four years to be consistent with the parliamentary elections. Each year, the governors propose individuals in their counties worthy to participate. In addition, a variety of cultural personalities are invited. In 2013, "Sweden Dinners" were introduced once a year - all county governors and elected county representatives. There is no question of culinary overabundance. The food, some simpler feasting dishes, is cooked in Operakällaren's kitchen and transported by car to the castle. The the framing is magnificent though. There are three dining rooms, in case of emergency seven. Everyone, even the Royalist Association, is anxious that the monarchy should not appear wasteful. The Walmart mentality is spreading. Sweden's monarchy is not Europe's cheapest but almost. Only Spain and Luxembourg operate more on the cheap.

Conspicuous consumption was formerly a status symbol. Nowadays you keep quite about it. A major contributor to the change was the Norwegian-American sociologist etc. Thorstein Veblen (1857-1929), best known for his tract "The Theory of the Leisure Class" (1899) where the Norwegian small-holder hatred of nobility (with arguments culled from Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, Adam Smith & Herbert Spencer) carries the day. Science and hard work is good. Gaud, luxury & excess is bad. But the Bernadotte have adapted even to this.

\*

## Private Economy

Carl Gustaf's finances are his private assets, the appanage and his disposition rights. The most recent information is in the journal Scoop 2011:3 & Dagens Nyheter October 30 to November 1, 2012. The figures below are slightly older.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ahlqvist m.fl. 2018.

<sup>12</sup> Så mycket kostar kungen & hans kollegor. Hemmets Journal, 1970:39.

Carl Gustav's fortune is largely inherited. Gustav V was very wealthy, Gustaf VI less so. Carl Gustaf, with good advisers from the Wallenberg sphere, has managed to increase his fortune to about 200-300 million (varies with withdrawals and business cycles). With Prince Bertil's money, that's another 100 million. Half of the money is invested in real estate, half in shares. He has four properties: villa Solliden on Öland, a sports cottage in Storlien, a fishing house in Forsavan at Tärnasjön and a house in the old town, Skeppsbron 25. The shares are "safe placements": Ericsson, Atlas Copco, SEB, Astra Zenecka, ABB and so on. The children own shares for 15-20 million through the company Gluonen (established 1988). Solliden and Stenhammar are operated in corporate form and owned by the shell company Benson AB. Any surplus of Stenhammar is added to the guaranteed black hole to keep Solliden's garden in shape.

Disposition rights are: (1) Eight castles: 165 thousand m<sup>2</sup> "living space" with moveables. (2) Djurgården: One thousand hectares of land [=2500 acres] (700 hr park, 300 hr leased), one hundred properties (with 10 thousand m<sup>2</sup> of living space and 20 thousand m<sup>2</sup> premises, seven large villas, three of which are reserved for the children). (3) The cars of the Royal Stables. (4) The estate Stenhammar for a symbolic lease 1000 SEK per year. (5) Moose hunting rights on Sveaskog's land in Bergslagen. (6) Ground rent including hunting and fishing rights to the cottage in Forsavan for SEK 5000 per year. (7) 22 foundations for different purposes.<sup>13</sup>

Additional funds and foundations exist: Karl XIII's marriage capital fund, the Galliera Fund, funds distributed on marriage, funds for moveables so that valuables are not scattered. Nobody wanted Sibylla villa Hagaberg which was sold. Gustaf VI's "castle" Sofiero was taken over by the Municipality of Helsingborg and is now used as a showroom. The funds of moveables with furniture, jewellery & art have increased significantly in value over the years - 10 billion have been mentioned - but as entailed estates are locked as long as there is an heir.<sup>14</sup>

Some costs are not included in the appanage: The National Property Board pays for heating and major renovations. It is difficult to separate Carl Gustaf's expenditure from the cultural state. The operation and maintenance of the eight castles cost regardless of CG. If they're not heated, they'll mould. That said, the heating of CG's eight castles costs like 10 thousand normal villas - probably the reason why the castle owners' association "Historical buildings" never caught on. Culture costs. Often more than it tastes. Those interested are referred to Jan Holmberg's licentiate thesis on the heating of castles and the like.<sup>15</sup>

From 1975 Carl Gustaf pays personal income tax. The real difference was moderate as he already paid corporate tax for Stenhammar and Solliden. What was new was the state tax on the wealth and on the shares. However, he does not pay municipal taxes because the monkey is not a private income.

\*

---

<sup>13</sup> Bo Pettersson. AB Carl XVI Gustaf. En snåljåp på tronen. Månadens affärer, september 1995, ss. 51-62; De kungliga stiftelserna. <kungahuset.se> (2010-01-01).

<sup>14</sup> Lyrevik 2018; Michael Syrén. Kungens sanna förmögenhet avslöjad. Expressen.se, 2019-01-25.

<sup>15</sup> Holmberg 2001.

## Business

Marshal of the Realm Ingemar Eliasson stated in a TV program<sup>16</sup> 2006 that the Constitution must be interpreted as prohibiting Carl Gustaf from engaging in business as a head of state, it would be to exploit his official position for private purposes, but it was not prohibited for him to conduct business as a private person. Since Carl Gustaf in other contexts claimed to be in service around the clock, one should probably not take Eliasson too literally. Rather, since the Court is not an agency, but is in the gray area between public and private, common law applies. Anything that is not prohibited is permitted.

Carl Gustaf has not had any extensive "business". He has managed his fortune, managed the estate Stenhammar, raised entrance fees to the castle and Solliden and, beginning in 1983, sold souvenirs in the castle shops. In 2020, during the Corona pandemic, it emerged that the admission fees covered approximately half the cost of the palace state. More doubtful is that he was allowed to buy and lease cars and boats at reduced price because it was "good advertising" and that he was an attraction on a number of events where he himself went free while everyone else paid. "He never pays himself," says an old friend, only as a statement and not at all in anger."<sup>17</sup>

The criticism of Carl Gustaf's business has rather been that he has not been consistently businesslike, for example, charging market rents, sold off unprofitable parts of the castle estate and invested in something else or exploited the royal house's good name by charging for the title of court supplier, dinners, medals, broadcasting rights etc. An earlier "attempt in the genre" might have discouraged him. The Huseby affair was a much-publicized 1957 court case, in which Prince Carl Jr was involved.

\*

## Privileges

A distinction must be made between official and unofficial privileges. The official legal privileges have been progressively curtailed. Under the old constitution, the king was exempt from excise duties on cars, petrol, spirits and tobacco. A substitute for this is now incorporated in the appanage.<sup>18</sup> Nor did he pay VAT or customs duties on directly imported goods. Nor any charges to the telecommunications company. But TV license. Gustaf VI had the opportunity to make "high priority calls", i.e. to cancel the current call. There is no indication that CG has a similar privilege. The royal family pays inheritance tax but until 1975 at a lower rate from 1941 25 percent, then 36 percent. All that remains is legal impunity and certain practices. CG has used this for speeding, but the extent is unclear. He often travels in a motorcade where speed is a protective factor. For example, he may use the collective file. When CG is in company with acquaintances, they are said to have the same privileges as himself, unclear though in what way, there is no information.

Among the customs is that Carl Gustaf has the right to the royal waiting room at Stockholm Central and to free rail travel. However, he so rarely used these privileges that they were about to be revoked in 1983. The waiting room is located directly adjacent to the large station building, next to the central restaurant. A long marble trail leads directly to the platforms. The

---

<sup>16</sup> Kungens affärer. Kalla fakta, TV4, 2006-01-11.

<sup>17</sup> Bo Pettersson. AB Carl XVI Gustaf. En snåljåp på tronen. Månadens affärer, september 1995, s 51-62.

<sup>18</sup> SkU 1973:51.

premises are very beautifully decorated with paintings and have a separate room for the Queen. He also had until 1978 his own railway wagon with kitchenette and sleeper, the "blue wagon".<sup>19</sup> Like many other politicians he also had until 1978 free cards at Linjeflyg and SAS. Subsequently, he has used Marcus Wallenberg's private jet SE-DEL and Swedish state leadership's Fairchild Metro III, Saab 340 & Gulfstream IV.

The unofficial privileges are many, sometimes involuntary, a few examples:

BOSTON, SPRING 2001. EF billionaire Bertil Hult turns 60 and parties three days for 80 million SEK. After one of the sessions, an after-party event is held in a restaurant in Boston's World Trade Center. The king cautiously hints that "a schnapps would taste good" to the beef hash, but the harsh American alcohol laws make it impossible to continue drinking at this late hour. When it dawns on the zealous restaurant staff who they are dealing with, however, the special treatment machinery is set in motion. The waiter asks the steward who asks the restaurant manager who calls the landlord who calls the head of World Trade Center who calls and raises the mayor who then issues a temporary permit and the evening can continue.<sup>20</sup>

Court reporter Lundgren tells a true story:

- The Queen once told us in an interview that it can sometimes be a bit embarrassing when she goes shopping. Cashiers do not know whether to charge the full price of the Queen of Sweden. But the Queen wants to pay for herself like everyone else, so she thinks that sometimes her situation becomes hard to handle.<sup>21</sup>

Another episode is that Silvia had forgotten her silver shoes when she was about to take the flight to England from Arlanda [1981]. The police fetched them for her breaking all possible speed limits in the process. JO was notified but without any measure taken.<sup>22</sup>

The royal children have received free booze from restaurateurs and free brand clothing from luxury shops. It is regarded by the shops as a good advertising.<sup>23</sup>

Even Prince Bertil had many unofficial privileges which then ceased: "[Prince Bertil's housekeeper] Aina [Nellberg] thinks that the Swedish people are a little silly with their royal fawning. Bertil and Lilian were showered with gifts, food and drink, flowers and treats. Even cooperative KF sent large cartons of coffee."<sup>24</sup>

\*

## Corruption

CG and his family have received gifts, many of which were valuable, but the expected quid pro quo was unclear. For example, CG received a tennis court at Solliden as 10-year present from the Swedish Tennis Association. Silvia was given a swimming pool for 300 thousand

<sup>19</sup> Dagens Industri, 1983-02-18; Svensk Damtidning, 1989:3; Svenska Dagbladet, 1992-06-06.

<sup>20</sup> Fredrik Wilkingsson & Filip Hammar. Kungen. Magasinet Bon, 2002:1, s 131-138.

<sup>21</sup> Gabriella Lahta. Kungen gör det inte med sig själv. Newsglobe.com, 2009-12-17.

<sup>22</sup> TT, 1981-09-16.

<sup>23</sup> Daniel Nyhlén. De shopper vilt - gratis. Aftonbladet, 2004-10-13.

<sup>24</sup> Henry Sidoli. Hushållerska på Villa Solbacken. Hänt i Veckan, 1987:22



on her 50th birthday to be placed on the inner courtyard of Drottningholm Castle. This gift was originally supposed to have come from the government, which was hesitant about the unclear legal situation. Instead, it was financed by the Wallenbergs. The building permit was a long time coming because Drottningholm Castle was K-marked. On CG's 50th birthday, the government and parliament contributed to the Solliden Park Facility. Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson and Speaker Ingemund Bengtsson presented the plans for the extension of the park. Various foundations and funds contributed a mirror pond and fountains. Peder Bonde, Stig Ramel, Anders Wall and Sven H Salén brought a model of the fountain. The big gift was a new bath house.

Further questionable elements have been that court functionaries (at least in the past) have received well-paid board positions in Wallenberg controlled companies, that Prince Bertil at his 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary received a fanciful motorboat and a pier to put it at and most recently the businessman Bertil Hult's gifts to Crown Princess Victoria, valued to millions. King Gustaf VI was very sensitive to this. For example, in 1968 he ordered Princess Christina to return a white mink fur that she had received as a gift from the Swedish fur breeders' union. Christina replaced it with a black topal fur coat, which was even more expensive but not as spectacular.

CG is less sensitive and has allowed children to use their position for advertising purposes. All attempts to prosecute the gifts as bribes have foundered on the royal house's special legal status and on the fact that the royal house has no power under the constitution to abuse. In fact, the gifts seem to be a thank you for the fact that the royal house has spread a little lustre over the donors and thus given them a competitive advantage.

Lyrevik (2018) considers himself to have evidence of a veritable system corruption, so-called "grand corruption", where the Swedish power elite in exchange for services rendered supports & enriches the royal house. However, it has not been possible to verify this.

\*

### Nepotism

Nepotism means favouring family and friends. Since monarchy by its very nature favours family - a Marxist would call monarchy the highest stage of nepotism - there are plenty of examples, but in the small. Carl Gustaf's family and friends receive Orders & medals, rent his apartments & attend his parties. When possible, they return in kind.

## Referenser

- +Adolphson, Yngve & Carlsson, Gottfrid. (red.) (1952.) Festskrift till Gottfrid Carlsson 18.12.1952. Lund.
- \*Ahlqvist, Ulla, Karlsson, Tony, Nyberg, Staffan, Robertsson, Fredrik & Simonsson, Magnus. (2018.) Monarkins verkliga kostnader. Republikanska föreningen, 2018-05-22.
- \*Andersson, Axel, m fl. (1980.) Motion om utredning rörande rätten till Guadeloupemedlen. Motion 1980/81:498.
- \*Holmberg, Jan G. (2001.) Environment Control in Historical Buildings. Kungliga tekniska högskolan: Institutionen för byggvetenskap.
- \*Lyrevik, Håkan. (2018.) Den kungliga kleptokratins makt, manipulation, berikning. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Korpen.
- \*Roslund, Bengt. (1972.) Till kungen fram: en film på 90-årsdagen. SVT1, 1972-11-11.
- \*RUT. (1964.) PM. ang. Kungahusets årliga inkomster. Riksdagens utredningstjänst (RUT), Dnr 1964:201.
- \*RUT. (1980.) Anslagsäskandena för Kungl. Hovstaten. Riksdagens upplysningstjänst (RUT). Dnr 1980:9.
- \*Sjöberg, Sten. (1978.) En furstlig svindel. Stockholm:Tiden. [Förord av Vilhelm Moberg.]
- \*SkU 1973:51. Skatteutskottets betänkande i anledning av motion om översyn av tullbestämmelser och skatteregler för kungahusets medlemmar. [Svar på motion 1973:888.] <data.riksdag.se> (2018-01-01).
- \*Veblen, Thorstein. (1899.) The Theory of the Leisure Class. <gutenberg.org> (1997-03-01).
- \*Wadén, Ingel Per Johan. (1957.) Utredning angående rätten till ersättning för ön Guadeloupe. I: Statsutskottets utlåtande, 1957:177, bilaga B. Stockholm.
- \*Waller, Sture. (1952.) Karl Johan och rätten till Guadelouperäntan. I: Adolphson & Carlsson red. 1952: ss. 377-398.