

Norway's Foreign Politics during the Union with Sweden, 1814-1905: A Reconsideration

Roald Berg

To cite this article: Roald Berg (2020) Norway's Foreign Politics during the Union with Sweden, 1814-1905: A Reconsideration, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 31:1, 1-21, DOI: [10.1080/09592296.2020.1721051](https://doi.org/10.1080/09592296.2020.1721051)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592296.2020.1721051>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 17 Feb 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 378



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Norway's Foreign Politics during the Union with Sweden, 1814-1905: A Reconsideration

Roald Berg



Department of Cultural Studies and Languages, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

ABSTRACT

In the Norwegian-Swedish Union, Norway had home rule; the Swedish foreign minister conducted its foreign relations. This fact created the impression that Norway 'played second fiddle' in forging its relations with foreign Powers. This analysis contends that the organisation of the apparatus for policy-making secured Norwegian influence and interests in the Union's foreign politics. It uses 'concertmaster' as an alternative metaphor to sum up the role of the Norwegian government in the king's Norwegian foreign politics during the Union period. Whilst the king of Norway and Sweden's authority dwindled as politicians in both countries limited royal powers and strengthened those of the Parliaments, the impression of Norway as the foreign political loser increased. In the context of growing European nationalism in the 1890s, the impression of Norway playing second fiddle shored up the radical opposition against the unpopular Union and led to its dissolution in 1905.

In 1814, Norway's establishment as a constitutional kingdom occurred during a dramatic process. It started with the Kiel Treaty of 14 January by which Norway transferred from Danish to Swedish royal rule without consent of any Norwegian. This agreement triggered insurrection in Norway, resulting in the making of a constitution in May and, thereby, the establishment of a constitutional Norwegian kingdom with a Parliament as well as military forces. After Sweden invaded Norway to force through the Kiel Treaty, the Norwegian Parliament altered this constitution on 4 November to make it compatible to the inevitable connexion. The Parliament elected the Swedish king, Charles XIII, as king of Norway. His adopted son, King Charles XIV John, took over the throne in 1818; he was the *de facto* head of state even as crown prince from the establishment of the union in 1814.

The royal head of the two states ruled based on the two constitutions – the 4 November Constitution and the *Regeringsformen* of 6 June 1809 on the Swedish side¹ – that implied the Union was not an extension of Sweden, but a confederation of two states each with their own king in the same body. Despite the indisputable fact that Sweden was the stronger part in the 'The

CONTACT Roald Berg  roald.berg@uis.no  Department of Cultural Studies and Languages, University of Stavanger, P.O. Box 8600 Forus, Stavanger 4036, Norway

© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

United Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway' – the Union's official name² – the king ruled both his realms in accordance with their respective constitutions. According to both constitutions and in agreement with the general attitudes in international politics, the king was responsible for foreign relations, deciding on his policies after deliberating with parts of his government.³ The parliaments had some constitutional control, primarily by funding or refusing to fund both peaceful as well as belligerent relations with foreign Powers.⁴ For Charles John, as crown prince as well as king, foreign politics were 'mainly an affair between the king, the foreign minister and the chancellor of the court'.⁵ In practice, more or less, he acted as an autocrat as he formulated his foreign policies much on his own, based on his personal will and temperament and without consulting either foreign minister, let alone the Norwegian parliament.⁶

The most voluminous account of Norwegian foreign relations during the Union period claims that his autocracy 'hurt Norway hardest'.⁷ As indicated below, this general impression is hard to prove. On the contrary, Swedish historians have showed that Charles John's reign was characterised by a harsh power struggle between sovereign and the political elite in both his realms.⁸ The opposition in the Swedish Parliament demanded enhanced parliamentary control over foreign politics in the same manner as the Norwegians did. In both states, the power games between politicians and king dominated the first three decades of the Union.⁹ Norwegian historians conclude that Norway 'was re-established as a state [in 1814] with an autonomous position'¹⁰ with 'domestic and financial independence'.¹¹ The sole limitation on the country's sovereignty was that it had to adapt to 'royal Swedish supremacy in foreign affairs'.¹² The Norwegian Constitution guaranteed 'an almost un-infringed independence for Norway' after 1814.¹³ The survival of home rule is the reason why some historians characterise 1814 as the '*annus mirabilis*' in Norwegian history.¹⁴ However, the argument is that Norway, as well as Hungary in the Habsburg Empire after 1867, did not play more than 'second fiddle' in their respective dual states' foreign politics.¹⁵ They found themselves subordinated to their dominant union partners, respectively Sweden and Austria, in the forging of their foreign relations. In one view, the foreign political decision-making apparatus for the Nordic Union was 'almost sheer Swedish'.¹⁶

In general, Swedish historians have treated the Union's foreign relations as if they were identical to Swedish foreign policies.¹⁷ Such is definitely the case in the standard reference works on Sweden's foreign politics in the Union period – Torvald Höjer (1810–1844), Allan Jansson (1844–1872), and Folke Lindberg (1872–1914). None treats Norwegian foreign political needs or initiatives, but all start their extensive narratives with introductory sketches on issues they will address that deal more with Sweden than with the Union or Norway. For example, Höjer opens his narrative by painting the new

geopolitical map of 1814 in which the Norwegian *förening* – ‘unification’ – with Sweden reshaped Sweden as ‘an island-state like Britain’,¹⁸ and thus puts Norway at the same footing as Scotland. Jansson starts with a short chapter on the emotional Russophobia of Sweden’s King Oscar I (1844–1859) and the challenges that grew out of Danish neighbourliness with Germany.¹⁹ This perspective places Norway as the second fiddler or, rather, a spectator of Sweden’s foreign relations until the last Union monarch, Oscar II, took the throne in 1872. In Lindberg’s treatment of the grand finale of the Union, Norway is certainly more visible for the obvious reasons that Union problems dominated Oscar’s reign together with aligning Sweden towards Germany, contrary to Norway’s western orientation as a seafaring state.²⁰ The lack of interest in Norway’s role in the formative years of the Nordic region as a security bloc seems consummated in the latest thesis on Swedish foreign policy in the nineteenth century.²¹

Despite the general impression that the extant literature has failed to grasp Norway’s position, one striking exception exists: Helge Granfelt’s 1929–1930 examination of royal power in foreign policy-making that covers Norway’s role systematically and thoroughly.²² The modern dimension of Norway in the history of the Union’s foreign relations seems to be more of an oblivion of previous research than an expression of superficial archival studies. On the other side, the Norwegian political scientists, Torbjørn Knutsen, Halvard Leira, and Iver Neumann, have searched through the parliamentary records without finding the concept of ‘foreign policy’ in the Norwegian Parliament before in the 1860s. Thus, they conclude that it gives no meaning to discuss whether Norway even had a foreign policy during the nineteenth century as the state lacked a foreign political discourse.²³

This exegesis challenges suggestions that Norway lacked political interests and questions the general judgement of its experience in the foreign and political arena during the Union with Sweden. In particular, it confronts the notion that the Swedish-led foreign political apparatus represented Norway’s interests badly, and that foreign politics – the formal frames – as well as foreign policies – the political content – were more to the advantage of Sweden than to Norway. The time span, almost 100 years, necessitates obvious nuances, reflecting both the international frames and the varying political frames of the foreign political process – from the time of very strong royal power to that of parliamentary control of politics in Norway after 1884. The conclusion is that the traditionally negative picture of both the foreign political process and their politics is far too uneven and needs extensive qualifications, especially chronologically.

The analytical focus is sharply limited to the Norwegian perspective. It will not try to grasp how Swedish politicians perceived it and, thus, discuss whether Swedish politicians tried to counteract Norwegian foreign political initiatives in detail, even if such questions doubtlessly would facilitate

a comparative evaluation about an anti-Norwegian foreign political tendency. Of course, such an examination deserves and needs much more space than a journal contribution. One indication that foreign politics during the Union were neither perceived as particularly hurtful for Sweden's interests nor that Norway's interests were subordinate to Sweden's is that no serious Swedish politician wanted to fight militarily against the dissolution of the Union in 1905.²⁴ Thus, Norwegian foreign politics had hardly strengthened Sweden; rather they weakened Sweden so that the time had come to get rid of the Union.

There is, surely, no doubt that the single issue that produced the collapse of the Union in 1905 was verbal, loud, and vehement dissatisfaction over both the organisation process and content of Norway's foreign relations. It is also a correct observation that Norwegian interests did not have a solid legally secured influence.²⁵ However, at a political level, Norwegian influence on the foreign policies of the Union seems to have existed without formal guarantees.

The only ministry for the external relations of Norway and Sweden was the Swedish Foreign Office, led by a Swedish foreign minister, a member of the king's Swedish government. Moreover, according to the Swedish Constitution of 1809, the king was required to seek advice in diplomatic questions from a 'Ministerial Cabinet' consisting of the foreign minister and lord chancellor, a forum closed to the Norwegian government for the first 20 years: until 1835.²⁶ One year later, consular matters moved from this body to the 'Combined [Swedish-Norwegian] Cabinet', in which Norway was represented by three ministers whilst the king was in Stockholm and, when the Cabinet met in Christiania, three ministers on behalf of Sweden.²⁷

Due to the traditional aristocratic dominance when recruiting diplomats, Norway received a raw deal as both the May and November constitutions prohibited the establishment of a new nobility in 1815 and abolished aristocratic privileges in 1821. In some cases, however, from the 1850s onwards, the Swedish-led Foreign Office disregarded the tacit rule of appointing aristocrats as diplomatic ministers as some Norwegians advanced from subordinate positions to chiefs of legation at posts like Washington, Brussels, Vienna, Den Hague, and even Berlin.²⁸ The main impression in Norway was, however, that the few Norwegians appointed as ministers – corresponding to 'ambassadors' – served at less attractive diplomatic stations.²⁹ This lack of diplomatic equality increasingly irritated the Norwegian public. For instance, the press in 1902 characterised it as a national insult that a Swedish, not a Norwegian, diplomat filled the vacant minister post in London: small Denmark and insignificant Spain were obviously 'the mightiest European Powers that are entrusted to Norwegian diplomats to represent the union'.³⁰ This critique was unfair as Spain was extremely important for Norwegian fish

exports, and Denmark became of first-rate Norwegian importance during the secession crisis that culminated in 1905.

The starting point for the question of whether the Union safeguarded or ignored Norway's foreign political interests was not diplomatic representation but security politics. On the question of war and peace in November 1814, negotiations between Norway's Parliament and Swedish authorities on royal prerogatives in the November Constitution concluded:

The Union between Norway and Sweden is to its grounds such that it cannot be presupposed, or the possibility assumed, that one of the kingdoms could be in a state of war, whilst the other stays at peace. On one and the same day, war or peace happens to both kingdoms.³¹

As a Norwegian historian has observed, the king was 'the only acknowledged representative for the entire Scandinavia peninsula'.³² After 1814, as signalled in its official name, the Scandinavian Union constituted 'the united states Norway and Sweden', regarded as one diplomatic entity in the European states system. That recognition implied, *per definitionem*, that Norway's security interests were as important as Sweden's, even more so as Charles John's interest in Norway in 1814 was first and foremost strategic: to secure Sweden's western border. The aim was to create a 'natural' geostrategic peninsula state in Scandinavia,³³ not, by the way, 'an island state like Britain', as Höjer imagined, in which Norway was an addendum to Sweden. Charles John exercised this security responsibility towards his two kingdoms through the single Swedish foreign minister. But even this unfair fact, from the Norwegian perspective, was close to an illusion for most of his reign. Until 1840, Charles John involved himself more or less personally in all political and administrative questions in his realms regardless of the 1809 and 1814 constitutions. Conversely, he and his successors of the Bernadotte dynasty discussed questions that affected Norway in the 'Combined Cabinet' during the entire Union period, so that the closed 'Ministerial Cabinet' was not the only arena in which the king sought advice in security and consular questions.

The three Norwegian ministers meeting in the 'Combined Cabinet' whilst the king resided in Stockholm served in the so-called 'minister section' in the Union capital.³⁴ The Norwegians interpreted the 'Combined Cabinet' as a board for foreign political deliberations,³⁵ to which, in practice, the king often acted accordingly. Thus, Norwegian ministers stationed in Stockholm received the same hearing as Swedish government officials on foreign policy questions for which the king – according to the two constitutions – was responsible.

The Norwegian 'minister section' in Stockholm consisted of the Norwegian premier and two alternating ministers. A governor as its first minister, established on Swedish demand in 1814, led the Norwegian government's headquarters in Christiania. During the first 15 years of the Union, Swedish

aristocrats staffed this post. The Swedish governors, however, slackened their meticulous control of the government after a few years, but kept authority over the armed forces until 1829.³⁶ Norwegians then managed the governor's post until 1856, when the last governor died. In 1873, a new government post replaced this persistently unpopular position: the prime minister of the Norwegian government, which supplemented the prime ministerial post at the Norwegian government's Stockholm section. The holder of that last-mentioned post continued to be the highest executive officer on Norwegian foreign questions and the direct link to the king.

The Norwegian government's Stockholm section had an administrative staff of three civil servants³⁷; a military officer served there as specifically qualified for executive work on Norwegian defence questions.³⁸ These four men, plus the three ministers, deliberated daily on foreign political as well as questions of common Union interest. Compared with the total number of civil servants in Norwegian governmental offices at the beginning of the Union period – 59 in 1815³⁹ – the staff that held the first line in the communication with the king represented more than ten percent of the Norwegian governmental administration during the first and formative years of the Union. The political relevance of the Stockholm section increased during the Union's lifetime, influencing Norway's security interests. Towards the end of the Union, the Stockholm section even developed into 'a regular diplomatic post of political observation and report'. In 1905, the reports on political and military strategies in Stockholm remained highly important for the separatist government in Christiania.⁴⁰

From the start, however, the Stockholm section of the Norwegian administration had regular contact with the king on all political questions that touched Norway's interests, including the country's relations with foreign Powers. This informal as well as official contact between sovereign and ministers – and even between sovereign and military servants – corresponded to the monarch's communication to his foreign minister, a member of His Majesty's Ministerial Cabinet established in 1790 as an office for the autocratic king. Not before 1840, the Foreign Office, in which the foreign minister became the leader, was organised as part of a modernising departmental reform in Sweden.⁴¹ In 1846, the king decided to establish a Norwegian department for the interior. This 'Inner Department' became the office in the central administration that handled Norwegian commercial questions; it included external relations that grew in importance for every European country during the nineteenth century. From the 1880s onwards, this huge department divided several times and, in 1902, was re-baptised 'The Department for Foreign Questions, Commerce, Shipping, and Industry'.⁴² From an administrative point of view, the establishment of the Norwegian Department for Foreign Affairs in 1905 was the last element in a specialisation process of the Inner Department – not of the fiercely verbal dissatisfaction in the 1890s of the Foreign Office's apparent lack of respect for Norway's foreign interests.⁴³

Logically enough, the last Norwegian prime minister in Stockholm, Jørgen Løvland, became the first foreign minister in 1905.⁴⁴ His personal transformation from premier to foreign minister illustrates that during the Union, Norway was represented at all venues for political decision-making, including the semi-official Norwegian foreign department – the Inner Department, led by Løvland in the late 1890s. The main organisational novelty after 1905 was that responsibility for state security and commerce amalgamated and came into the hands of one foreign minister, whilst previously the executive work of these two fields of external affairs divided between the Foreign Office in Stockholm and the Inner Department in Christiania. In general, the prime minister in Stockholm served as ‘some kind of Norwegian foreign minister’ during formal meetings in the Swedish government, where he represented Norway.⁴⁵ One prime minister, Georg Sibbern (1858–1871), has even been characterised as the informal deputy foreign minister of the Union states.⁴⁶ Even during Charles John’s reign, when the sovereign routinely disregarded his constitutional obligations and ruled on his own, the Norwegian government had and used its Stockholm section to secure Norway’s interests. From 1847, it even had a new governmental office, the Inner Department, for the handling of Norway’s most important external relations, namely foreign trade.

The key to understanding Norwegian influence in foreign policy was that His Majesty, according to the 1814 Constitution, controlled Norway’s foreign relations. He implemented this constitutional duty after seeking advice from his Norwegian government, represented by the prime minister in Stockholm, his staff, and the foreign minister. Although Norway constitutionally lacked access on the same footing as Sweden in the inner circles of the foreign political decision-making apparatus, it seems hard to find political cases that were harmful to Norway during the reign of Charles John and his two successors, Oscar I (1844–1859) and Charles XV (1859–1872) – with one dark exception: the so-called Bodø affair. On the contrary, the first Norwegian encounter with Charles John and his foreign minister was positive as the sovereign obeyed his Norwegian advisors’ requirement for the demarcation of Norway’s frontier with Russia.

The boundary between Norway and Sweden was delimited in a Danish-Swedish border treaty in 1751 after the conclusion of war. In the northernmost parts of Norway, the borderlands were fluid, known as the ‘common areas’ in which Russian, Danish, and Swedish authorities collected taxes from the population. After Norway’s establishment as a state, the Parliament, government, and king inaugurated commercial as well as naval enterprises to interweave these districts closer to the realm. The navy despatched expeditions to demonstrate Norwegian rule along the northern coasts;⁴⁷ and in 1816, the government proposed to the king that he should start negotiations with the Russian tsar. Crown prince Charles John did address the tsar on this matter.⁴⁸

The crown prince had the very best relations with Tsar Alexander I after their meeting in Finland in 1812 at which he accepted the Swedish loss of Finland to Russia in 1809 in return for Russian support for the future Swedish acquisition of Norway.⁴⁹ But the huge Russian Empire had no immediate need for solving an unclear border question on its periphery. When the Norwegian Parliament and Ministry of Finance in 1824 reiterated the proposition of demarcating the border between the two states, the foreign minister in Stockholm reminded Russia about the question by instructing the Swedish-Norwegian envoy in St. Petersburg to address the Russian Foreign Ministry and even the tsar. All of them accepted the Norwegian proposal that the Pasvik River was a reasonable borderline from inland to the Barents Sea.⁵⁰ The death of Alexander in 1825 complicated the matter. Whilst the new tsar, Nicholas I, lacked a personal friendship with Charles John, he was a strong supporter of the nineteenth century popular idea of 'natural borders'. Thus, he accepted the Pasvik River line in the border treaty of 1826.⁵¹

The particularity of the Norwegian border treaty with Russia was that it resulted from peaceful negotiations, started on Norway's political initiative and not from a preceding war or threats of violence between the two parties.⁵² This example of peaceful border regulation is something like an anomaly, difficult to explain if one disregards the importance of amiable relations between decision-makers. The 1826 treaty thereby gives support to the post-Cold War 'soft diplomacy' theories in international politics. Norway's peaceful relationship to its Great Power neighbour is emphasised by the American political scientist, Joseph Nye, the originator of the 'soft power' theory, in his discussions on the Cold War era.⁵³ As is now clear, the relationship between Norwegian and Russian regional authorities in the border area were traditionally friendly even before 1826.⁵⁴ The new factor in that year seems to be the good relations between the two sovereigns, and that Charles John listened to and acted on Norwegian politicians' demands. Hence, Norwegian authorities were far from playing second fiddle in the foreign policies of Charles John. On the contrary, they led the way for a foreign policy beneficial for Norway.

The 1826 treaty concluded the international demarcation on Norway on land. The announcement in 1830 of the maritime territorial border devolved from a royal decree in Copenhagen in 1812.⁵⁵ According to that proclamation, the belt between the coast with its reefs and the borderline was four nautical miles, and this maritime zone was Norwegian territory with prohibitions for fishing by foreigners. However, as this four-mile border remained unaccepted in dominating international law, technological development of fishing vessels in the 1860s resulted in international challenges against it.

In 1868, there occurred a denial of a French fishing vessel to participate in the richest fishery grounds in Northern Norway. The French ambassador at

Stockholm protested. The Swedish[-Norwegian] foreign minister replied by reading a diplomatic note written in Christiania by the first minister in the Norwegian government. It maintained that the fishing grounds along the Norwegian coast had been the precondition for human survival in a harsh environment for generations. Therefore, the four-mile border was necessary. A few years later, the Norwegian government, in the form of a royal decree, reiterated this argument, this time provoked by Swedish fishermen who had appeared on the Norwegian fishing grounds. During that incident, the French repeated their protest.⁵⁶ This diplomatic conflict with Sweden's historically closest political friend – Charles John was originally French, and even under his successors, Oscar I and Charles XV, Sweden gravitated to France politically⁵⁷ – ended as Franco-German diplomatic crises escalated to war in 1870. From a Norwegian point of view, the end result demonstrated how the Swedish-led Foreign Office and its diplomatic staff executed Christiania's policy of closing the border for intruding fishermen from the leading western Great Powers as well as Sweden. Even when Norwegian-Swedish interests collided, and even if it could lead to conflict with one or even several Great Powers, the Foreign Office in Stockholm represented Norway loyally as late as the 1860s.

Sweden was even to some extent Norway's protector in dangerous waters. For the merchant fleet, this was a literal fact as it sailed under Sweden's flag to avoid the pirate states along the North African coast. Due to the poverty of the Norwegian exchequer, Sweden paid tribute to these states to avoid pirate raids and received reimbursement by minor Norwegian contributions to the 'convoy commissariat'.⁵⁸ The Norwegian Parliament certainly saw this arrangement as a national humiliation after 1821, having made flying the Norwegian commercial flag mandatory in all sea-lanes but the pirate-ridden areas south of Cape Finisterre.⁵⁹ After France militarily pacified the pirate states and solved the piracy problem in 1837, Parliament demanded abandoning the Swedish flag. The king acquiesced. A royal resolution of 11 April 1838 cancelling deployment of the Swedish flag in pirate waters witnessed prompt celebration as 'the liberation of the flag' [from Sweden].⁶⁰

Flags are amongst the central symbolic core of the construction of 'imagined communities' like nations.⁶¹ Thus, the celebration was necessary as a function of 'status seeking', a central value in the foreign policy objectives for small states like Norway.⁶² Nevertheless, the flag celebration was primarily an expression of the growing 'norwegianisation' of Christiania's foreign policies at a time when both the land territory and the sea belt became nationalised – towards Russia in 1826 and the western Great Powers, represented by France, in 1868.⁶³ The flag "liberation" in 1838 was even followed by Oscar I's admittance of complete equality between his two realms in 1844 by introducing a Union mark on both flags. However, both Norwegians and Swedes dismissed the royal attempt of creating symbolic equality. On

Norway's side, the flag with the mark became a growing source of distrust towards the Union and alleged Swedish ill will. It culminated in the anti-Swedish campaign in the 1890s for a 'clean' Norwegian flag, approved by the Parliament in 1899 despite the king's protest.⁶⁴ In hindsight, at least, 1905 seems to be the inevitable next step.

Yet, the first omen that the Union might be doomed manifested itself long before – in the northern waters with the arrest of some British smugglers and, afterwards, their support from London to shirk punishment. Here lay the core of the so-called Bodø affair. It started as a minor criminal case in 1818. Arrested in the Bodø area, just north of the Arctic Circle, the smugglers managed to mobilise the British Foreign Office to speak for them. Their case developed into a major diplomatic issue between London and Stockholm. The Swedish foreign minister was less than enthusiastic about such a minor triviality, as he interpreted the case. The outcome of the subsequent poor diplomatic handling by Stockholm was that the Norwegian government, after drawn out negotiations with British diplomats and solicitors, had to compensate the smugglers financially. That humiliation did not close the case. As late as in 1894, parallel to the 'clean' flag campaign, the historian Yngvar Nielsen published a thesis on the Bodø affair. History became the symbolic proof on how noxious it was for Norway not to have its own foreign minister.⁶⁵ Financially, the Bodø affair substantially damaged Norway, as compensation to the smugglers was so generous that it hurt the Norwegian treasury.

Worse, both financially and psychologically, the Bodø affair weakened Norway during negotiations with Denmark on the size of Norway's part of the Dano-Norwegian state debt as of 1814. After years of discussions in this first, great foreign political question after 1814, Norwegian negotiators managed to reduce the debt substantially,⁶⁶ but Christiania did not pay it until Charles John threatened the Parliament that the European Great Powers would interfere militarily if it went unpaid. One view is that the struggle over the state debt was about Norway's independence.⁶⁷ An alternative interpretation is that Charles John shored up the Parliament's self-confidence by forcing it to pay the bill for the previous union with Denmark without any financial help from Sweden. That course proved to Norwegians that Norway could and did manage to behave like an independent state – an experience that became an inextinguishable source for the popular demand for complete independence. Charles John's role was thereby more of the contributor of – rather than the suppressor of – the anti-unionism that killed the Union three generations later.⁶⁸ The Bodø affair definitely harmed Norway and thus became the lasting triumph for the political theory that the Union was the main obstacle for honour and independence.

Thus, the consequences of these three examples of official treaties that Charles John either by demand from Norway or against Norwegian protests varied. The border treaty with Russia was a national victory. The Danish debt

agreement was hard to swallow when presented, but a national triumph in hindsight. The Bodø affair became a devastating blow to the legitimacy of the Union's foreign political organisation and diplomacy as well as the Union itself. But all were, like diplomatic treaties in general, tests of recognition of state sovereignty in international law as in each case Norway appeared 'in the meaning of international law [as an] independent state'.⁶⁹ Even the worst of them, the Bodø affair, did not find any similar example of anti-Norwegian acts by Sweden.

That said, the two states in the Union often had diverting foreign political and commercial interests. Such dissimilarities were normal in discussions on the geographical allocations of the consular service. Norway's growing shipping interests required priorities of diplomatic and consular stations in overseas coastal states, whilst Swedish forest- and mineral-exporting interests pointed more in the direction of inland posts. Normally, support for Swedish interests often won. Furthermore, Sweden as well as the Great Powers preferred that Norway not conclude commercial treaties on its own; thus, Britain refused 'to make an arrangement of that nature with *one party only* of His Swedish Majesty's Dominions'.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, Norway did start its co-existence with Sweden in 1814 with at least one commercial treaty – from 1670 – and in the 1820s, Norway – and Sweden – entered into bilateral commercial treaties with foreign Powers. There was even an Anglo-Norwegian extradition treaty from 1823.⁷¹ When there were clashing interests between the two Union partners, Swedish interests did not always win.⁷² On the contrary, from the beginning to the end of the Union, Christiania successfully pursued its own commercial treaty policy in many cases and in increasing degree. Moreover, questions about locations for diplomatic and consular representation often emerged in the political sphere as proof about the necessity of a national foreign ministry or, at least, Norway's own consular service. The latter alleged need became the triggering factor behind Norwegian elimination of the Union in 1905.

Confronted with economic development, the Union's assumed harm to Norway seems to be much of a myth. The Norwegian merchant fleet advanced from insignificance to the third largest in the world during the nineteenth century. The peremptory stepping-stone was the annulment of the *British Navigation Act* in 1849, which opened up the global British-controlled maritime freight market. Norway's development towards the status of a shipping Great Power started in the 1820s when Norwegians got access to the Swedish timber exports as the dual states became a free trade association.⁷³ The growth led, however, to the economic division of the two Union states: Norway's maritime interests led to a mounting western political orientation, whilst the development of Swedish iron ore and timber exports stimulated an increasing southern orientation with an informal alliance with Germany during Oscar II's reign. In 1895, therefore, Sweden's Parliament

annulled the free trade convention of the 1820s, which abolished the pecuniary *raison d'être* for even the most passionate supporters of the Union.⁷⁴ From a strictly commercial point of view, Norwegian demand for a separate consular service thereafter seemed reasonable.⁷⁵ More interesting than internal issues, wider implications of the rupture of the Unionist economic community by 1895 was that Norway's commercial fleet was more contingent on friendly relations to the ruler of the oceans – Britain. The two Union states developed opposing security interests after German unification at the same time as the economic benefits of the Union diminished.⁷⁶

One expression of the tendencies for splitting the Union was that during its last 30 years, Norway often appeared as a state and not just part of the Union. The initiative for this tendency towards independent branding came from the Norwegian government and Parliament. The Inner Department led the way. In all the world exhibitions between 1851 and 1900 – at London, Paris, Vienna, and so on – the Department funded Norwegian representatives and appointed organising committees for the international marketing of Norway.⁷⁷ Furthermore, in 1875, Norway signed the Paris convention on standardised measure and weight and became the first state to ratify the convention. From 1879 to 1889, a Norwegian served as the secretary general for the *Bureau International des Poids et Mesures* in Sèvres, near Paris.⁷⁸

In the 1890s, Norway also negotiated and signed a growing number of separate commercial treaties that included clauses on regulations for resolving conflicting interests by arbitration.⁷⁹ The international arbitration movement of which Norwegian politicians were a part, and the parliamentary peace movement connected to the arbitration question, met scepticism in Sweden, as national honour and a strong military defence were historically superior to a belief in international law for a country that still worshipped its seventeenth century Great Power past.⁸⁰ For Norwegian politicians in the 1890s, neutrality, peace, and arbitration politics became slogans for national independence. International congresses to discuss and strengthen peace became venues for branding Norway as an independent voice in global politics both within the Union – against Sweden – and towards the Great Powers.⁸¹ The Norwegian foreign political profile became identified in terms of international peace and neutrality – and neutrality ideology developed in the rising new Great Power, the United States, for the same reasons.⁸²

In reality, the Nordic Union states were not neutral after the Crimean War. In November 1855, the leading western Great Powers signed the November treaty with the King of Norway and Sweden. Herein Britain and France obliged themselves to defend the dual states against Russian attacks or claims.⁸³ Hence, Norway – and Sweden – allied with the major western Powers. The history of the November treaty remains muddled. It was, first, the meagre outcome of Oscar I's unsuccessful plans to participate in the Crimean war to recapture Finland from Russia. Second, an alliance of

Norwegian and Swedish politicians and officers ended these plans.⁸⁴ Finally, the November treaty and its origins was the last foreign political case the king could pursue on his own without consulting his Swedish and Norwegian ministers.⁸⁵ From then on, the politicians, as a rule, decided whilst the king ratified their documents – although often holding hard feelings and strong views, he did retain some influence on many questions.

The only lasting result of the political elimination of the royal dreams about recapturing Finland in the 1850s, the November treaty was not discussed with either Norwegian or Swedish authorities before it was signed – not even the foreign minister.⁸⁶ When informed of it, the Norwegian and Swedish parliaments nevertheless contentedly accepted it. General European Russophobia, originally a result of Napoleonic propaganda in connexion with the invasion of Russia in 1812,⁸⁷ had spread to Norway. Although no historian has found traces of any Russian military plans against Norway,⁸⁸ Norwegian Russophobia asserted that Russia needed and planned to seize an ice-free harbour at the Atlantic coast; thereby Russia threatened Norway as an autonomous state on its own and not as a junior partner in the Union.⁸⁹ Thus, the November treaty became a nation-building stone in Norway, a source for legitimising the rationality for the anti-Union movement. Its main political implication, however, held that a coalition of Norwegian and Swedish politicians halted the alternative – full engagement in the Crimean war. That was the first victory for the politicisation of the foreign policy in the Union. The next came in 1863–1864, when Charles XV's Norwegian and Swedish ministers annulled his promises to help the Danish king against Prussia.⁹⁰ That action terminated royal control of war and peace in both Sweden and Norway.

One implication of the 'parliamentarisation of the foreign politics'⁹¹ – this new tendency for political rule – was the expanding importance of nationalism and status seeking in international politics. In Norway, this tendency materialised in the concept and politics of 'Arctic imperialism', initiated by the Swedish foreign minister in the Union's Foreign Office. French intrusion into Norwegian fishing fields in 1868 demonstrated both technological and political changes in Europe that affected Norway and the North Atlantic towards the 1870s. After German unification, some Norwegian newspapers in 1873 reported that a German fleet of ten whalers were expected to hunt in the Finnmark fjords, Greenland, and Spitsbergen, and that the Germans were planning to establish a guano factory in a Norwegian fjord close to the Russian border.⁹² The Northern Ocean, the sea space touching Norway, Scotland, Iceland, and the Barents Sea, was attracting international interest due to its huge resources. A couple of years later, in 1876, a Norwegian hydrological expedition in the Northern Ocean re-baptised this colossal area as 'the Norwegian Sea'.⁹³ This endeavour was part of a nation building process in which place names as well as the language and cultural life in

Norway proper was norwegianised.⁹⁴ The naming of the ocean had, however, one particular feature as it affected areas beyond Norway's state borders. It even implied an implicit will for political expansionism into the Arctic. The first target was the Spitsbergen Islands, regarded as *terra nullius* or 'no man's lands', according to international law.

In 1867, 25 Norwegians applied unsuccessfully to the Inner Department for public support to establish a new home at Spitsbergen.⁹⁵ Four years later, the foreign minister of the Union states enquired of the Norwegian premier, Sibbern, if Christiania wanted him to start a diplomatic campaign to seize the sovereignty of Spitsbergen for Norway. Sibbern discussed the offer with the Norwegian government, which concluded that Norway had no wish for such action as that could imply responsibility for law and order and thus the risk for potential conflicts with Great Powers. Another reason for declining the offer was that it originated with some Swedish industrialists, represented by the polar scientist, A.E. Nordenskiöld, who applied to their government for support for investing in guano production as a basis for scientific activities. The Norwegian government saw no reason for supporting a foreign commercial enterprise,⁹⁶ especially just a few years after the fishing conflict with France, one of the security guarantees of the November treaty.⁹⁷ Dismissal of the Swedish offer over Spitsbergen was, on the other hand, not categorical. The government concluded that if any country should have sovereignty over the stateless islands, it must be Norway.⁹⁸ But any further reasoning became unnecessary as the Swedish foreign minister, parallel to Norwegian deliberations, sounded the possibilities for Norwegian sovereignty from the Great Powers and received unanimous rejection.⁹⁹

After anti-Unionist politicians had taken over the government, the Inner Department minister in 1892 claimed that the foreign minister in Stockholm started the diplomacy to seize Spitsbergen for Norway. This time the Swedish government saw no reason to reward the potential separatists' politics of confrontation. The Swedish initiative 20 years before was nevertheless not futile. After dissolution of the Union, the Norwegian foreign minister had a programme for seizing Spitsbergen, more or less based on the 1870s paradigm. The 1920 Spitsbergen treaty, in which Norway achieved sovereignty of these Arctic islands, was in the end a fulfilment of the initiative from Sweden in the Union.

The Union was formative for Norwegian foreign politics after 1905, primarily as a training institute for diplomacy and, especially during the last decades of the Union, a venue marked for talented young Norwegians. In 1905, the Union's dissolution resulted in a minor personnel pinch in the Swedish Foreign Service as four of 12 ambassadors and 17 of 27 consuls of the dual state were Norwegians and needed replacement by Swedes. Even the administrative leader in the foreign department was a Norwegian at that

moment; he left Stockholm and built the Norwegian foreign department in Christiania in 1905.¹⁰⁰

One characterisation of the Union holds it as an ‘educational project’, ‘aimed at turning peasants into citizens’.¹⁰¹ In Norwegian foreign political discourse, the Union was a school for forging a sovereign state. The politicians were the students. From 1814 until 1905, the curriculum was continuous discussion and compromise seeking with the king and the Swedish foreign minister on Norway’s foreign political interests relative to the stronger neighbour. Of course, to Norway’s benefit, the power of the weak must not be underrated in international politics.¹⁰²

Another lesson learnt from the Union is that the nineteenth century was a period of struggle chiefly between the king and his political advisors – both Swedish and Norwegian – on the predominant authority over foreign as well as internal politics. The professional politicians won that struggle in both Scandinavian states. The turning point for foreign relations was the prelude to the 1855 November treaty and the political veto in 1863–1864, when a coalition of Swedish and Norwegian politicians and military officers halted the activism of the heirs of Charles John to engage their realms in war – the Crimean war and the Danish-German war of 1863–1864.¹⁰³ That united front of professionalised resistance to royal rule shows that Norway mattered in the foreign political decision-making process. Furthermore, that struggle was probably bound to end with the Union’s dissolution as the weakest part of it during the age of growing and highly emotional nationalism, Norway, lacked the last symbol of state sovereignty – or state ‘status’¹⁰⁴: a foreign minister for Norway only. Most important, the Union as a school for compromise seeking must take the main honour for the peaceful dissolution of 1905. The lesson from that experience, seen from the extraordinary internally peaceful Scandinavian corner during the – otherwise – violent twentieth century is: ‘[O]ne should probably not undervalue the significance of being able to talk together’.¹⁰⁵ That is what the Union was about, not a question on first or second fiddle.

A Swedish analysis claims that the only real change in Norway after 1905 was the new king and exclusively Norwegian foreign minister as it had been an internally self-ruled kingdom from the beginning, in 1814.¹⁰⁶ The break with the Union past might be paraphrased as the Norwegian king becoming the conductor of Norway’s foreign policies and his foreign minister the concertmaster – the one who communicated the formulation of Norway’s foreign interests – in the king’s foreign political orchestra, just as the prime minister in Stockholm had the concertmaster’s function in the Union. This metaphorical, however, is misleading as the new Norwegian king was promptly informed by the politicians that he had no political influence whatsoever. These politicians had made their political careers during the never-ending battles against royal influence in both domestic and foreign politics together

with Swedish politicians. The ‘lesson’ for the separatists in 1905 was to limit royal rule and govern themselves whilst the head of state in the royal castle stood as the highest state symbol. During the Union period, the core of the problem was that royal power existed as a political fact in general, not only in the sphere of foreign politics. As politicians gradually took political power during the nineteenth century, that shift complicated Norway’s role in the symbolic foreign political orchestra of the king. At last, in the 1890s, the Norwegians lost that power struggle, at least in the Spitsbergen question, because their nationalism had an opposite number in Sweden. Both nationalisms were as emotionally status seeking as anywhere in Europe in the 1890s. Consequently, the Union’s dissolution maybe more an expression of collective Norwegian insistence of being seen as good as other nations in an age – the nineteenth century with its nationalism and democratic tendencies – which gradually acknowledged equality of all members within states as well as within the international states system.¹⁰⁷

The main conclusion is that whether the foreign political decision-making process was politically- or royal-led, Norwegian representatives managed to formulate their national interests. As a rule, these interests found incorporation, not neglect, in the formulation of royal Norwegian foreign politics – both security policies like establishment of borders at land and sea, and commercial ones or even the symbolic status seeking policies at the world exhibitions. The rest was symbolic and emotionally demonstrative quarrels supported by reiterations that Norway lacked influence in its foreign politics and therefore must have its own foreign minister or at least its own merchant consuls. It was essentially status seeking. Hence, on the other hand, it was as much *Realpolitik* as most other international disputes in an explosive international atmosphere during the decades that culminated in 1914 with the Great War. As one Swedish historian states: ‘The *impression* of the lack of Norwegian influence caused the foreign political sector to become the major symbolic issue that ignited the dissolution of the union, as the symbols are parts of power politics and thus political realities’.¹⁰⁸

Notes

1. Incorporated in Swedish constitutional law in the *Rikssakten* of 1815, the 4 November Constitution passed in the Swedish Parliament as law and the Norwegian Parliament as constitution.
2. Bo Stråth, *Union och demokrati. De Förenade rikena Sverige-Norge 1814–1905* (Stockholm, 2005).
3. Olav Riste, *Norway’s Foreign Relations. A History*, 2nd ed (Oslo, 2005), 52ff.
4. The Norwegian Parliament had to be consulted before the king started an offensive war. Furthermore, parts of the Norwegian army had responsibility for defence within Norwegian borders. See Roald Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, Volume II: *Profesjon-union-nasjon 1814–1905* (Bergen, 2001), 26ff; and Stråth, *Union och demokrati*, Chapter 2. For a thorough discussion on the constitutional foundation of the foreign political

decision-making process in Norway and Sweden during the Union and the funding competence of Sweden's Parliament, see Helge Granfelt, *Om Konungens makt över utrikespolitiken i Sverige 1809–1909*, Volume I: *Hur rättsläget fixerades* (Stockholm, 1929), 75–84, 99. The November Constitution was formalised as a Norwegian-Swedish treaty in the 'Riksakt' of 1815.

5. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, Volume II: *Den ministeriella konseljen och dess omorganisation*, 71.
6. Alf Kaartvedt, "Del III. Unionen med Sverige," in *Norsk Utenrikspolitikks Historie*, ed. Narve Bjørge, Øystein Rian, and Alf Kaartvedt, vol. 1. (Oslo, 1995), 265; and Torvald Höjer, *Carl XIV Johan*, Volume II: *Kronprinstiden* (Stockholm, 1943), 398–401.
7. Kaartvedt, "Del III," 244, 265.
8. Gunnar Heckscher, *Konung och statsråd i 1809 års författning. Regeringsmaktens inre gestaltning under det nya statsskickets första halvsekel* (Uppsala, 1933), 38–40.
9. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, II, 71.
10. Ruth Hemstad, "Scandinavianism. Mapping the Rise of a New Concept," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 13, no. 1 (2018): 9.
11. Bård Frydenlund, "The Case of Norway: Domestic Development and External Influence in the Periphery of Napoleonic Europe," in *Napoleon's Empire. European Politics in Global Perspective*, ed. Ute Planert, (NY, 2016), 206.
12. Ibid.
13. István M. Szijártó, "Playing Second Fiddle. The Role of Hungary and Norway in the Foreign Policy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the Swedish-Norwegian Union: A Comparison," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 19, no. 2 (1994): 145.
14. Ståle Dyrvik, *Året 1814* (Oslo, 2005), 7. On similar characterisations, see Knut Mykland, ed., *Omkring 1814* (Oslo, 1967); Leiv Mjeldheim, ed., *Norsk historie 1814–1905* (Oslo, 1975); and William H. Hubbard et al., eds., *Making a Historical Culture. Historiography in Norway* (Oslo, 1995). See, however, Frydenlund, "The Case of Norway," 199–212, 212n25 for a nuanced challenge of this summing up.
15. Szijártó, "Playing Second Fiddle," 163.
16. Kaartvedt, 'Del III', 239.
17. Ibid.
18. Sten Carlsson and Torvald Höjer, *Den Svenska Utrikespolitikens Historia*, Volume III, Parts 1–2 (Stockholm, 1954), 230ff.
19. Allan Jansson, *Den svenska utrikespolitikens historia*. Volume III: Part 3 (Stockholm, 1961), 9–24.
20. Folke Lindberg, *Den svenska utrikespolitikens historia*. Volume III: Part 4 (Stockholm, 1958), 164–206.
21. Martin Björk, *Kampen om den svenska utrikespolitiken. Hur den svenska utrikespolitiken definieras och fastställs mellan åren 1867–1905 till följd av den rådande politiska maktindelningen* (MA Thesis, Uppsala University, 2016).
22. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, I-II.
23. Torbjørn L. Knutsen, Halvard Leira, and Iver B. Neumann, *Norsk utenrikspolitisk idéhistorie 1890–1940* (Oslo, 2016), 80, 85; Halvard Leira, *The Emergence of Foreign Policy: Knowledge, Discourse, History* (PhD Dissertation, University of Oslo, 2011), 242. Idem., "Utenrikspolitikk – en begrepshistorie," *Internasjonal politikk* 76, no. 1 (2018): 1–23 emphasises that a foreign policy discourse gradually developed after the 1860s, implying that Norway had a sort of foreign policy during the last part of the nineteenth century.
24. Lindberg, *Den Svenska Utrikespolitikens Historia*, 170; and Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 280.
25. Szijártó, "Playing Second Fiddle," 149.

26. Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations*, 53.
27. In addition, the king was obliged to consult a Union Cabinet when declaring war: Kaartvedt, "Del III," 238.
28. *Ibid.*, 292.
29. Stråth, *Union och demokrati*, 117.
30. *Ibid.*, 118.
31. Jakob Maliks, "Corsairs and Constitutions. Civil ensigns in the Union of Norway and Sweden, 1814–1821," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 42, no. 2 (2017): 127.
32. *Ibid.*
33. See Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, passim.
34. Completion of the royal castle in Christiania occurred in 1848. But even afterwards, the royal headquarter was Stockholm Castle; see Terje Bratberg and Stephan Tschudi-Madsen, 'Slottet', *Store Norske Leksikon* (2014): <https://snl.no/Slottet>.
35. Stråth, *Union och demokrati*, 109.
36. Roald Berg, "Embetsmannsstat, rettsstat eller generalguvernement 1814–1829," *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 20, no. 1 (2003): 73–82.
37. Ole Kolsrud, *Maktens korridorer. Regjeringskontorene 1814–1940* (Oslo, 2001), 74.
38. Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 31.
39. Berg, "Embetsmannsstat," 75. In addition, ten men originally served in the office of the Swedish governor in Christiania, but this staff was slimmed to one man after 1816: *Ibid.*
40. Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 221.
41. Örjan Romefors, "Förvaltningen av och arkiven efter sjøfartskonsulaten," in *I fämmande hamn. Den svenska och svensk-norska konsulstjänsten 1700–1985*, ed. Aryo Makko and Leos Müller, (Malmö, 2015), 70.
42. Kaartvedt, "Del III," 359.
43. Roald Berg, *Norsk utenrikspolitikk historie*, Volume II: *Norge på egen hånd 1905–1920* (Oslo, 1995), 54.
44. *Ibid.*, 53; and Per Eivind Hem, *Jørgen Løvland. Vår første utanriksminister* (Oslo, 2005), 298–310.
45. Kaartvedt, "Del III," 358.
46. *Ibid.*, 234. For a close examination of the prime minister-function towards the end of the Union, see Per Jostein Ringsby, *Det norske statsministerembetet i Stockholm: En analyse av Otto Blehr og Ole Anto Qvams statsministerperioder i Stockholm mellom 1898 og 1903* (MA Thesis, University of Oslo, 2004).
47. Berg, *Profesjon-nasjon-union*, 79.
48. Jens Petter Nielsen, ed., *Russland kommer nærmere. Norge og Russland 1814–1917* (Oslo, 2014), 41.
49. Nils Erik Villstrand, "Three kisses, two encounters and an unrequited love. The meeting between Emperor Alexander I and Crown Prince Karl Johan in 1812 from a popular perspective," in *Vänskap över gränser En festskrift till Eva Österberg*, ed. Kenneth Johansson and Marie Lindstedt Cronberg, (Lund, 2007), 315–22.
50. Nielsen, *Russland kommer nærmere*, 47f.
51. Roald Berg, *Norsk utenrikspolitikk etter 1814* (Oslo, 2016), 27–30; on the 'natural borders'-concept, see *idem.*, "The 19th Century Norwegian-Swedish Border. 'Imagined Community' or 'pluralist Security System'," *Journal of Northern Studies* 1, (2009): 91–103.
52. Einar Niemi, "'Fortroliged og venskab'. Grenseoverskridende transaksjon, soft diplomacy og mat på Nordkalotten i tidlig nytid," *Tidsskrift for kulturforskning* 13, no. 1–3 (2014): 32.
53. Joseph Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (NY, 2004).
54. Niemi, "'Fortroliged og venskab'".
55. Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 81.

56. Berg, *Norsk utanrikspolitik*, 41ff.
57. Jansson, *Den svenska utrikspolitikens historia*, 279.
58. Kaartvedt, “Del III,” 241.
59. *Ibid.*, 242ff.
60. *Ibid.*, 270.
61. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1991).
62. Benjamin de Carvalho and Iver B. Neumann, eds., *Small State Status Seeking. Norway’s Quest for International Standing* (London, NY, 2015).
63. On the norwegianisation concept, see Roald Berg, “Fornorskning av Arktis og forforskning av Nord-Norge 1820–1920,” in *Inn i riket. Svalbard, Nord-Norge og Norge*, ed. Hallvard Tjelmeland and Ketil Zachariassen, (Tromsø, 2003), 28–30; and Berg, *Norsk utenrikspolitikks historie*, passim on the concept as an analytical tool.
64. On the flag battles during the nineteenth century, see Ole Kristian Grimnes, *Det norske flaggets historie* (Oslo, 2014).
65. Roald Berg, “Norwegian attitudes towards Britain, 1814–1914,” in *Britain and Norway. Special relationships*, ed. Helge Pharo and Patrick Salmon, (Oslo, 2012), 29ff.
66. Claus Bjørn and Carsten Due-Nielsen, *Dansk udenrigspolitik historie*, Volume III: *Fra helstat til nationalstat* (København, 2003), 41; and Kaartvedt, “Del III,” 247–51.
67. *Ibid.*, 251.
68. Roald Berg, “Stortinget og unionen 1814–1905,” in *Stortinget og unionen med Sverige. Dokumenter fra Stortingets arkiver*, ed. Bjørn R. Rønning, (Oslo, 2005), 20.
69. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, II, 51.
70. Kaartvedt, “Del III,” 258ff.
71. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, II, 52.
72. See Kaartvedt, “Del III,” 266f.
73. Francis Sejersted, “Den svensk-norske unions betydning for den økonomiske utvikling, spesielt i Norge,” in *Dialog. Unionstiden 1814–1905*, ed. Grethe Værnøe, (Stockholm, 1987), 65ff.
74. *Ibid.*, 57ff.
75. Espen Storli, “Hva ville egentlig Venstre med konsulatsaken?” *Historisk tidsskrift* 86, no. 2 (2007): 225–48.
76. Jens Arup Seip, *Utsikt over Norges historie. Annen del* (Oslo, 1981), 22–25.
77. Brita Staxrud Brenna, *Verden som ting og forestilling. Verdensutstillinger og den norske deltakelsen 1851–1900* (Oslo, 2002).
78. Jens Arup Seip, *Ole Jacob Broch og hans samtid* (Oslo, 1971), 664, 673.
79. Kaartvedt, “Del III,” 310–12, 339–46.
80. Bert Mårald, *Den svenska freds- och neutralitetsrörelsens uppkomst. Ideologi, propaganda och politiska yttringar från kriget till den svensk-norska unionens upplösning* (Göteborg, 1974), passim.
81. Per Jostein Ringsby, *40 års kamp for fred. Tre fredsforeninger i Skandinavia 1882–1922* (Oslo, 2011).
82. On the American arbitration and peace impulses in the development of international law, see Benjamin Coates, *Legalist Empire. International Law and American Foreign Relations in the Early Twentieth Century* (NY, 2016); on political and ideological connexion points and networks between the United States and Norway, see Roald Berg, “Norway, Spitsbergen, and America, 1905–1920,” *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 28, no. 1 (2017): 30 and passim.
83. See Jens Petter Nielsen, “Novembertraktaten (1855–1907) – Norges første stormaktsgaranti,” in *Selvstendig og beskyttet. Det stormaktsgaranterte Norge fra Krim-krigen til NATO*, ed. Roald Berg, (Bergen, 2008).

84. Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 155–58.
85. Granfelt, *Konungens makt*, II, 84.
86. *Ibid.*, 79n2.
87. Nielsen, "Novembertraktaten," 19ff. Cf. J. H. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain. A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion* (Cambridge, 1950).
88. Jens Petter Nielsen, "Ønsket tsaren en isfri havn i Nord?" *Historisk tidsskrift* 70, no. 3 (1991): 604–21.
89. Roald Berg, "Russofobiens røtter 1820–1855," in *Det farefulle nord. Trusler og trusseloppfatninger knyttet til Nord-Norge gjennom tusen år*, ed. Fredrik Fagertun, et al., (Tromsø: 2001), 53–66.
90. Kaartvedt, "Del III," 299–301; and Jansson, *Den svenska utrikspolitikkens historia*, 196–201.
91. Kaartvedt, "Del III," 364.
92. *Finmarkens Amtstidende* (5 February 1873).
93. Vidar Bjørnsen, *Naturvitenskap og politikk. Den norske Nordhavsekspedisjonen 1876–78* (MA Thesis, University of Tromsø, 2003).
94. Berg, *Norsk utanrikspolitikk*, passim.
95. Roald Berg, "Spitsbergen-saken 1870–1925," in *Norsk polarpolitikkens historie*, ed. Stian Bones and Harald Dag Jølle, (Oslo, forthcoming).
96. *Ibid.*
97. Berg, *Norsk utanrikspolitikk*, 41f, 45.
98. Berg, "Spitsbergen-saken".
99. *Ibid.*
100. Berg, *Norsk utenrikspolitikkens historie*, 59.
101. Mary Hilson, *The Nordic Model. Scandinavia since 1945* (London, 2008), 33.
102. See Erling Bjøl, "The Power of the Weak," *Cooperation and Conflict* 3, no. 2 (1968): 157–68.
103. See especially Berg, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 155–58 on the military part of that coalition; Kaartvedt, "Del III," 299–301; and Jansson, *Den svenska utrikspolitikkens historia*, 196–201.
104. de Carvalho and Neumann, *Small State Status Seeking*, passim.
105. Francis Sejersted, *The Age of Social Democracy. Norway and Sweden in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 2011), 202.
106. Göran B. Nilsson, "Edvard Grieg och den svensk-norska unionens underliga historia," *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 2, (1994): 131.
107. Francis Fukuyama, *Identity. Contemporary Identity Politics and the Struggle for Recognition* (London, 2018), Chapter 2; and Berg, *Norsk utanrikspolitikk*, 175ff.
108. Stråth, *Union och demokrati*, 581.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on parts of my book, *Norsk utanrikspolitikk etter 1814* (2016), supplemented by further archival and literature studies. Its main thesis was presented at the conferences, "Dual Statehood in Modern Europe: The Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 in comparative perspective", 13–15 September 2017, University of Salzburg, and at the Third Nordic Challenges Conference, 6–8 March 2019, Copenhagen Business School. I am grateful for insightful comments from the participants at these conferences as well as from anonymous reviewers, the editor of *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, and Associate Professor Eva Jakobsson, who generously commented on my ideas.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Roald Berg is professor in modern history at University of Stavanger. His research interests are Nordic and Arctic history after Napoleon. His publications include *Norsk utanrikspolitikk etter 1814* (2016) and 'New Borders, invented identities: Norwegian officers during Danish, Swedish and corps identity construction processes, 1814–1830', in Michael Broers and Ambrogio Caiani eds., *A History of the European Restorations*, Volume 1 (2020). He is editor of *Selvstendig og beskyttet. Det stormaktsgaranterte Norge fra Krimkrigen til NATO* (2008).