Nordic Studies in a Global Context

COOPERATION AND CONFRONTATION IN NORDIC CIVIL SOCIETIES SINCE 1800

Edited by
Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst

Cooperation and Confrontation in Nordic Civil Societies since 1800

This book examines Nordic civil societies from 1800 until today, by studying the roles of voluntary action and associations in the Nordic region and beyond.

Through its diverse and historically informed analyses of civil society, traditionally held to be a vital and integrated part of the democratic development of the region, this book actively engages in discourses addressing the development of *Norden*, the "Nordic Model" of society and the idea of a "Nordic exceptionalism". Focussing on the state-civil society nexus and transnational dimension, the book offers a comprehensive multidisciplinary discussion through twelve case studies, and analyses what – if anything – is particularly Nordic about civil society developments in the region, whether and how the Nordic countries stand out in terms of civil societies' roles and impact, and the blurred boundaries between civil society, the state and the market.

This book will be of key interest to scholars and students of Nordic or Scandinavian Studies, European Studies, Civil Society Studies, Political Science, History, Sociology and Literary studies.

Sunniva Engh is Professor of Modern History, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo, Norway.

Ruth Hemstad is Associate Research Professor at the Department of Research and Collections, National Library of Norway and Researcher at the Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo, Norway.

Mads Mordhorst is Associate Professor at the Department of Business Humanities and Law, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark.

Nordic Studies in a Global Context

This new book series aims to open up more empirical, critical and reflective perspectives on the Nordic cultures, institutions, legal frameworks and "models" in a global and comparative context and to create a bridge between humanistic Nordic studies and the comparative and IR-oriented social sciences and law programmes. It looks to encourage methodologically driven and critical reflection on the nature, construction and use of Nordic traditions, models, institutions, laws, discourses and images. The series welcomes submissions from a broad range of disciplines across the social sciences, law and humanities.

Series editors: *Haldor Byrkjeflot, University of Oslo, Norway; Eirinn Larsen, University of Oslo, Norway; and Cathie Jo Martin, Boston University, USA*

The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images
Edited by Haldor Byrkjeflot, Lars Mjøset, Mads Mordhorst and Klaus Petersen

Nordic Criminal Justice in a Global Context
Practices and Promotion of Exceptionalism
Edited by Mikkel Jarle Christensen, Kjersti Lohne and Magnus Hörnqvist

Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms
A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940
Edited by Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius

Associative Governance in Scandinavia
Organizing Societies by "Combining Together"
Edited by Anker Brink Lund, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Søren Christensen

Nordic Peace in Question
A Region *of* and *for* Peace
Edited by Christopher S. Browning, Marko Lehti and Johan Strang

Cooperation and Confrontation in Nordic Civil Societies since 1800
Edited by Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst

Cooperation and Confrontation in Nordic Civil Societies since 1800

Edited by Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2025
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2025 selection and editorial matter, Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

The Open Access version of this book, available at www.taylorfrancis.com, has been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives (CC-BY-NC-ND) 4.0 license.

Any third party material in this book is not included in the OA Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. Please direct any permissions enquiries to the original rightsholder.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-032-78516-5 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-78517-2 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-48828-6 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Newgen Publishing UK

Contents

List of Contributors *vii*
Acknowledgements *x*

1 Introduction: Experiences of Cooperation and Confrontation in Nordic Civil Societies 1
SUNNIVA ENGH, RUTH HEMSTAD AND MADS MORDHORST

PART I
Nordic Civil Society: Theoretical Perspectives **13**

2 Expansion and Incorporation: Nordic Civil Society in a Weberian Perspective 15
HALDOR BYRKJEFLOT

3 Nordic Civil Society through Changes of New Technologies and Knowledge Society: How is the Function of Civil Society Affected? 36
INGER-JOHANNE SAND

PART II
Civil Society, the State and the Market in a Nordic Context **57**

4 Ordering the Social—Socializing the Order: Navigating Trust between Civil Society and State in the Swedish Realm around 1800 59
ANDREAS ÖNNERFORS

5 Emerging Civil Society in Iceland: Enlightenment Ideas and Old Norse Heritage 79
MARGRÉT GUNNARSDÓTTIR

6 Military Sports in Northern Clothing: How Sharpshooting became Nordic Heritage 100
ODD ARVID STORSVEEN

7 Hybridity and Blurred Borders between Market and Civil Society: The Case of Danish Cooperatives, Savings Banks and Corporations 118
MADS MORDHORST, LOUISE KARLSKOV SKYGGEBJERG AND MATHIAS HEIN JESSEN

8 A Relationship Shaped by Interdependence: The Norwegian Refugee Council and the Norwegian State 138
MIKKEL WITT SYBERG

9 Sámi Art and Literature as Peaceful Pillar of Sámi Civil Society 154
SUZE VAN DER POLL

PART III
Civil Society and Transnational Encounters **173**

10 A Networked Scandinavia: Scandinavian Associations and Transnational Cooperation 175
RUTH HEMSTAD

11 State Civil Servants and Voluntary Nordic Cooperation: The Nordic Federation of Public Administration 1919–52 199
PETER STADIUS

12 From War Effort to Development Aid: The Scandinavian Red Cross Societies and Korea 217
SUNNIVA ENGH

13 Explosive Waste: Scandinavian Anti-Nuclear Movements' Campaign against the Reprocessing of Spent Nuclear Fuel 241
MELINA ANTONIA BUNS

14 Epilogue: What was "Nordic" about Nordic Civil Society? 260
MARY HILSON

Index *270*

Contributors

Melina Antonia Buns is Associate Professor of History at the University of Stavanger, Norway, where she is part of the Greenhouse Center for Environmental Humanities. Her research interests are located at the intersection of environmental, energy and international history. She is an expert of the history of Nordic environmental cooperation. Her current research explores the history of radioactive waste. She leads the NordForsk-project Energy Lives! Infrastructural Citizenship in Nordic Energy Transitions.

Haldor Byrkjeflot is Professor in the Department of Sociology and Human Geography at the University of Oslo. From 2015 to 2019, he was Academic Director of UiO:Nordic, a strategic priority area at the University of Oslo (UiO), and also in 2018–2019 Chair of the Board of the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW. He has led or initiated large research projects funded by the Research Council of Norway and the Nordic Council for Humanities (NOS-H), and has been visiting scholar at the Universities of Harvard and Stanford as well as Copenhagen Business School. He has published articles on the Nordic model of welfare and work, circulation of models across societies, comparative management and labor systems, the globalization of the MBA and changing knowledge regimes in universities as well as organizational dynamics in health and education.

Sunniva Engh is Professor of Modern History, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo. She was project leader of the UiO:Nordic project Nordic Civil Societies: Global, Regional and Transnational Encounters since 1800 (2020−2023) and part of the leadership group in the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW (2023−2024). Her research interests include Norwegian and Nordic foreign policy and international engagement, the idea of the "Nordic Model" in international politics, the international history of development aid, population policy and global health, India's foreign and security policy and Myanmar and great power relations in Asia.

Margrét Gunnarsdóttir is an archivist at the National Archive of Iceland and holds a doctoral degree in history from the University of Iceland. Her thesis is titled "Iceland under the sceptre of the Danish Crown in the North Atlantic.

Initiating free trade 1751–1791". Her main research interests are Icelandic-Danish economic and political history in the second half of the eighteenth century and first half of the nineteenth century. The Nordic (and Icelandic) medieval cultural tradition in the moulding of the civic sphere during the same period is also relevant to her studies.

Ruth Hemstad is Associate Research Professor at the Department of Research and Collections, National Library of Norway, Researcher at the Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo and part of the leadership group in the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW (2020-24). She was co-project leader of the UiO:Nordic project Nordic Civil Societies: Global, Regional and Transnational Encounters since 1800 (2020–2023) and is currently co-project leader of the UiO:Democracy project Experiencing American Democracy (ExAm). Country editor of *Scandinavian Journal of History*. Her research interests and publications include Nordic transnational and transatlantic history in the long nineteenth century, Scandinavianism, Nordic cooperation, book and media history and civil society.

Mary Hilson is Professor at the Department of History and Classical Studies, Aarhus University and part of the leadership group in the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW (2018-24). Her research interests include political, social and cultural history, focusing on the Nordic region during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She has published widely on the history of the cooperative movement in the Nordic region and transnationally.

Mathias Hein Jessen is Associate Professor at the Department of Business Humanities and Law at Copenhagen Business School. Most recently, he has published (with Benjamin Ask Popp-Madsen & Andreas Møller Mulvad), "The Spirits of Democratic Enterprise: Insights from the Case of Denmark", *Management & Organizational History* (2022), and "Civil Society in the Shadow of the Neoliberal State: Corporations as the Primary Subjects of (Neoliberal) Civil Society", *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* (2020). He is currently the Principal Investigator of the Carlsberg Foundation-funded research project Corporate Subjects: An Intellectual History of the Corporation.

Mads Mordhorst is Associate Professor at the Department of Business Humanities and Law, Copenhagen Business School (CBS) and part of the leadership group in the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW (2018–2024). He has published extensively on business history from a cultural historical perspective with weight on the construction of national and regional identity and how companies through history create identity internally and externally.

Inger-Johanne Sand is Professor Emerita in Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Oslo. Previous guest professor at Copenhagen Business School. Honorary Doctor at the Universities of Åbo, Gothenborg and Copenhagen. She has researched and published extensively within the areas of Norwegian, European and transnational administrative, regulatory, environmental and constitutional law as well as in legal theory and sociology of law.

Louise Karlskov Skyggebjerg is Post. Doc at the Department of Business Humanities and Law at Copenhagen Business School. Her current research project focuses on corporate philanthropy and CSR, especially connected to banking in the period from the 1980s onwards and to changing ideas about more-than-for-profit banking. Another part of her research is in environmental history and history of technology with a focus on everyday life and mundane artefacts.

Peter Stadius is Professor of Nordic Studies and Research Director, Centre for Nordic Studies, University of Helsinki. He is the project leader of the Nordic university excellence hub ReNEW (2018–24). Research interests and publications include Nordic and European north-south imagology, Arctic history, Nordic cooperation and pan-national movements.

Odd Arvid Storsveen, Professor Emeritus of History, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo. He was project leader of the RCN-funded project The Constitution of 1814 – Historical Impact and Social Significance (2011−2015) and has participated in many cross-disciplinary projects. Among his publications are *Norsk patriotisme før 1814 (*1997), *Bøkenes fotfolk. Norsk bokhandel 1940−2003* (2004), *En bedre vår. Henrik Wergeland og norsk nasjonalitet* (2004) and *Mig Selv. En biografi om Henrik Wergeland* (2008) and a number of articles concerning ideological, cultural and personal history.

Mikkel Witt Syberg is a Ph.D. fellow at the Department of Business Humanities and Law at Copenhagen Business School. His Ph.D. project is affiliated with the UiO:Nordic project Nordic Civil Societies: Global, Regional, and Transnational Encounters since 1800 (2020−2023). His research focuses on the relationship between civil society organizations and the state in twentieth-century Scandinavia, particularly how these organizations have influenced political decision-making through advocacy strategies.

Suze van der Poll is Assistant Professor at the Department of Scandinavian Studies at the University of Amsterdam. She has published on Scandinavian literature with a focus on modern Norwegian literature. Editor of the Dutch journal *Armada. Tijdschrift voor Wereldliteratuur.* Recent publications "På sporet av det tapte hjemmet. En utforskning av hjemmets betydning i Johan Harstads Max, Mischa & Tetoffensiven", *Edda* (2022) and*, Reconsidering National Plays in Europe*, co-ed. with Rob van der Zalm (2018).

Andreas Önnerfors is Professor of Intellectual History. With a profound background in eighteenth-century studies, he has researched transnational cultural encounters and identification in associational life, the press and the book market, mainly between Sweden and Germany. His dissertation (2003) was devoted to Swedish Pomerania 1720–1815 and he has over the last two decades extensively worked on fraternal orders and their history (of ideas) in Europe as well as with European press history. More recently, he has turned his attention towards conspiracy theories, their meaning, and consequences also in contemporary society. Önnerfors is the author of *Freemasonry – A Very Short Introduction* (2017) and numerous other publications.

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to thank UiO:Nordic (2016–2023) for funding the research project of which this is the concluding anthology, Nordic Civil Societies: Global, Regional and Transnational Encounters since 1800 (2020–23) at the University of Oslo,[1] and the NordForsk funded Nordic university excellence hub Reimagining Norden in an Evolving World (ReNEW 2018–24), for funding workshops and Open Access. The editors would also like to express our gratitude to participants at workshops and conferences in Copenhagen (2022), Oslo (2023) and Reykjavik (2024) and the reviewers for valuable comments in the editing process.

Note

1 The project was headed by Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Klaus Nathaus, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo.

1 Introduction

Experiences of Cooperation and Confrontation in Nordic Civil Societies

Sunniva Engh, Ruth Hemstad and Mads Mordhorst

Since the late 1980s, there has been a renaissance of civil society—as a concept, a normative idea and within scholarly research. The history and tradition of associational life and civil society—or civil societies—are, however, considerably older, and may be traced back at least to around 1800. The recent threats against the freedom of associations in several parts of the world have made civil society discussions and critical studies of its historical and current conditions even more relevant. In the Nordic countries—today's Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Iceland—associations and civil society initiatives have traditionally been held to be vital and integrated parts of the democratic development and seen as central elements in the so-called "Nordic Model". This volume seeks to analyse what—if anything—is particularly *Nordic* about civil society developments in the region, in other words, whether and how the Nordic countries stand out in terms of civil societies' roles and impact. We contribute to the discussion on civil society and Nordic particularity through twelve cases which address and empirically examine this topic from different geographical, theoretical and chronological perspectives.

We understand civil society as a space of social self-organization between the state, the market and the private domain, although the boundaries between these entities may be more porous and blurred than often perceived and the categories overlapping in practice, as will be demonstrated in this volume. Civil society traditionally denotes a social sphere where individuals associate around common interests, purposes and values, forming clubs and societies, cooperatives and foundations, local, national and regional voluntary associations and professional, non-governmental national and international organizations (NGOs/INGOs).[1] Civil society actors thus voice the diversity of interests and opinions within a nation, but they also transgress national boundaries.

While many studies of associations still stem from within specific organizations and movements and lack a wider national, transnational and international contextualization, the Nordic region offers ample possibilities to go beyond the particular and the national, thereby broadening our understanding of this important part of society. The Nordic civil society traditions may, moreover, represent an alternative

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-1
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

point of departure than the dominant Anglo-American perspective, particularly in understanding the state–civil society relationship, a key issue in much of the research literature on the topic.

Through its diverse and historically informed analyses of civil society, we in this book actively engage in discourses addressing the development of *Norden*, the "Nordic Model" of society and "Nordic exceptionalism". To illuminate the intricate processes of nation-building spanning from the nineteenth century to the present day, as well as the genesis of the Nordic welfare state in the twentieth century, the various chapters in this study focus on a pair of interconnected tensions. The first tension pertains to the cooperation but also competition between civil society and the state in the Nordic countries, while the second tension is found between national boundaries imposed by states and transnational civil societies of various kinds, stretching across the borders. The larger puzzle to be addressed is thus whether these tensions have, in the Nordic region, been navigated in a distinct way. Has the organization of associational life in the region, as it is traditionally perceived, worked in close interaction with the state at least since the late nineteenth century? And does the transnational intra-Nordic dimension, with its comprehensive web of civil society cooperation, represent a distinct aspect of Nordic particularity, as it is often held by civil society practitioners, scholars, external observers and politicians alike?

In a newly published book on *Associative Governance*, Christensen et al. draw attention to the importance of the association as the governance structure in the Nordic countries.[2] We agree on the associative perspective of governance but find it important to add a transnational and global perspective on civil society development in the region. Thus, this book examines Nordic experiences of civil society and associative governance from 1800 until today seen in a wider transnational and international context, from the occurrences of associational life in ever broader segments of the society to more recent challenges facing civil society.

The nexus between state and civil society has, it will be argued in this volume, played a constitutive role in the Nordic countries at decisive points in time with consequences for the "Nordic Model" of society itself, regional Nordic cooperation and the countries' global engagement.[3] While this approach will be discussed from several angles in this book, both theoretically and empirically, this history is not solely one of harmonious cooperation—whether within the national societies or across the region—but also of tensions and conflicts. The volume further examines how voluntary action and associations, and their transnational and international encounters, have shaped the Nordic region and conceptions of *Norden*. In a historical perspective, wars have for centuries been the norm rather than the exception, and Nordic cooperation has always included tensions and conflicts, in spite of claimed Nordic similarities, and hence necessitated negotiations of national diversity. The Nordic region's recent branding of being the "most sustainable and integrated region in the world", at least by 2030, rests on an assumption of close transnational cooperation on civil society and official levels.[4] From historical and academic perspectives, we qualify and discuss in this book this positive image of Nordic integration.

By focusing on civil societies, this book goes beyond a seemingly self-contained and harmonious *Norden* and acknowledges the multiplicity of voices at home and the complexities of transnational entanglements. This means that we think about *Norden* and the "Nordic Model" not as unique, but rather investigate how global processes and transnational encounters have shaped such ideas and practices in myriads of ways and changing over time.

The temporal dimension becomes particularly interesting concerning the Nordic region's changing global interactions, and the outcomes of these in relation to the "Nordic Model" of society and civil societies' parts in this model. The Nordic countries, being small states with relatively open economies, have arguably been particularly receptive to many international influences. Over time, ideas pertaining to the roles and functions of civil societies have developed and changed, providing civil society organizations ever-changing room for manoeuvre, varying also according to the national and international contexts, as well as politicians' and administrators' practical use for civil society organizations efforts.

Given that the Nordic countries have a high rate of membership in voluntary associations and that voluntarism is widely accepted as a foundational value of Nordic societies, *Norden* appears furthermore to be an ideal case for looking closer at the role of civil societies in democratic governance structures. According to Putnam, a rich and diverse third sector is paramount to functioning democracies, and this book's investigation of the normative idea of civil society lends itself to critical engagement with Putman's approach.[5] While the chapters in the book provide case studies which rest on a non-value-based foundation and have critical perspectives on the Nordic states as well as the civil society, the book as a whole can be seen as a contribution to this discussion. We find that, in retrospect, and from an overarching perspective, the development of a strong and diverse civil society has been central in creating the "Nordic Model" and its democratic structure of governance. The chapters of the book do, however, reveal that this process has been full of contradictions and has never been a planned development.

In doing this, the book combines the two dominant understandings of the civil society research field. A normative approach is primarily interested in civil society as a space where "civil" conduct prevails. In this view, civil society actors learn to solve conflicts in a non-violent manner and experience and tolerate diversity. Civil societies thus establish realms for democratic power which can have a positive effect on the state's development. This definition traces the origins of civil society back to the bourgeois public sphere and identifies discursive rationality as its core.[6] Research that attributes to voluntary associations positive effects on democracy is often based on this normative and positive understanding of civil society.[7] Other scholars operate with a sectoral definition of civil society that places civil society as the third sector beside the market, the state and the private sphere, to get all forms of voluntary action into view, regardless of their value-orientation and their potential impact on what may be considered the common good.[8] Research that takes this approach has shed light on the "dark sides" of civil society.[9] It also makes a case for studying civil society in a relational perspective rather than looking for core values that allegedly guided it. The sectoral perspective does not perceive civil society as

something constant but looks at voluntary organizations in their changing relation to state, market and the private sphere.[10]

A pragmatic concept that combines the normative and the sectoral definition is flexible enough to get the diversity of civil society associations into perspective while also keeping the central concern with civil society's effects on governance in sight. It avoids reifying the narrative of civil society and the state as antagonists, which has been developed in view of Western European examples in the nineteenth century but is at odds with Nordic corporatism and experiences in general.[11] Understanding the values of civil society in the context of its position as a sector also allows for critical reflection on some of Nordic associational life's core tenets—its "democratic", inclusive and conformist nature.[12]

This volume seeks to understand the changing role of civil society in relation to Nordic countries' regional and international interaction and engagement. To this end, the chapters analyse a set of interrelated, core perspectives on Nordic civil societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which, as we have argued, are essential for understanding the "Nordic Model" of society and its transnational and global interconnectedness, and the cultural, political and historical project of *Norden*: 1) the state–civil society nexus at the national level, 2) transnational civic cooperation at the regional level, and 3) foreign influences and Nordic engagement at the global level. Studying civil societies at national, regional and global levels, thus combining interrelated fields usually studied separately, necessitates transnational perspectives. The study of civil societies in the Nordic countries will thus benefit from insights as well as perspectives developed in the study of other national cases.

State and Civil Society in the Nordic Countries

Research on civil society has been largely informed by the Western European and North American experience as a model. Focusing on Enlightenment origins and nineteenth-century developments, classical thinkers of civil society from Alexis de Tocqueville to Max Weber to Jürgen Habermas have described the relationship between civil society and the state as antagonistic. The view that an increasingly self-conscious bourgeoisie demanded a say in the *res publica* from reluctant, autocratic rulers, thus pushing for democracy, has inspired and informed historical and social-scientific research on the topic,[13] especially in studies that focus on the long nineteenth century,[14] and on social movements.[15] As we move forward in time and shift the focus from the West to the North, this narrative does not seem to capture the main tenets of civil society development. In the Nordic countries, the welfare state is held to be a factor of reform and progress; the relationship between state and society was perceived as a partnership based on high levels of consensus and trust; hierarchies were regarded as flat; boundaries between state and society were experienced as permeable; and the function of voluntary associations appears to have shifted increasingly "from voice to service".[16]

In public imaginary and scholarly debate, encounters between civil societies and the nation state have shaped fundamental traits of Nordic societies and state

formation. This is often identified as a crucial, formative element, setting the Nordic region apart from other regions. Esping-Andersen's welfare state typology, influential during the 1980s and 1990s, finds corporatism a hallmark of the Nordic welfare state model, while in other regions the distinction between state and civil society is much more clearly defined.[17] Today, we are frequently reminded that the "Nordic Model" is marked by cooperation and collaboration, with the state historically taking over tasks previously carried out by civil society actors. Civil society, in other words, has often been portrayed as the state's collaborator towards common goals, through its roles in the organizing, financing and provision of welfare in the Nordic countries. Taking a closer look at the state–civil society relationship, we aim to examine critically civil society and governance practices and the changes in their mutual relationship over time.

Across and Beyond the Region

Civil society is often conceived of as being bound to national territories.[18] Research on civil societies in the Nordic region in the nineteenth century has thus mainly focused on national preconditions and experiences, to a certain extent in a comparative, Nordic perspective.[19] Recent research has broadened the perspective and examined transnational and international dimensions and different aspects on Nordic cooperation.[20] From the beginning of the "age of associations" in the mid-nineteenth century, prevalent in the Western World as well as in the Nordic countries,[21] Nordic experiences illustrate the importance of going beyond national frames of investigation. Along with the adaption of international models of organization, a distinct feature of Nordic civil societies is their transnational and macro-regional character. The emergence and growth of Nordic cooperation has been an integral part of civil society development from the 1840s.[22] The high density of transnational ties at civil society level, with voluntary associations playing a key role,[23] has influenced nation- and region-building processes in the region in different ways. This transnational dimension, which in certain periods has included pan-national elements, has shaped the idea of a Nordic identity and model. At the same time, it has led to tensions and conflicts of various kinds within and between the different Nordic nations.

Not only transnational but also international encounters have influenced the development of civil societies in the Nordic region from the early nineteenth century onwards, and research on internationalism and transnational political activism has highlighted the interconnectedness of Nordic popular movements across and beyond national borders.[24] From nineteenth-century missions' activities to today's NGO participation in official development cooperation, civil society associations have played large and influential parts in Nordic engagement abroad. Research on the international, mainly Western, circulation or impact of the "Nordic Model" of society is well under way.[25] Literature on Nordic colonial experiences, missionary activities, and joint development aid efforts also exists,[26] and there is a growing literature on individual Nordic countries' interactions with the Global South.[27]

The transnational and international perspectives applied in this volume is in line with the recent research on the development of the "Nordic Model" which argues that the idea of the "Nordic Model" is constructed in transnational processes of circulation between stakeholders in the Nordic region and international observers.[28] A related recent line of research discusses to what degree the "Nordic Model"—and as part of this the civil society today—has been transformed into a brand that is mobilized internationally as a rhetorical tool, and a tool with which to strengthen the Nordic countries' soft power, or international standing.[29]

Outline of the Book

The chapters in this volume start with an introductory and more theoretical part, followed by two thematically–chronologically organized parts, focusing on civil society, the state and the market, and civil society and transnational encounters respectively, and end with an epilogue. They cover two hundred years, from the post-revolutionary era until today. In Part I, Nordic civil society development is discussed through theoretical perspectives. In his contribution, Haldor Byrkjeflot argues that Weber's work on the world religions and the Protestant ethic, as well as his distinction between sect and church, is also a contribution to the analysis of civil society in the Nordic region, and he draws attention to how Protestantism in the Nordic countries was integrated in the official churches. It thus got a peculiar associative form where it developed as part of state bureaucracy rather than in opposition to the state. Byrkjeflot argues that it is possible to identify characteristics that constitute a Nordic Model of civil society, and notes that although the conditions for voluntarism in the region are changing today, the main question is not how strong the civil society will be in the Nordic region in the future, but rather what kind of civil society will exist.

In the following chapter, Inger-Johanne Sand focuses on the function and role of civil societies in the present, although seen in an historical perspective, and she asks if the role of civil society has changed in knowledge and risk societies. Sand defines, with Cohen and Arato, civil society as the common public sphere and the social interaction and communication between the various institutions in society. From a perspective inspired by Luhman, she discusses whether the sectoral perspective, with sharp distinctions between state, market and civil society, hinders us from seeing that it is overlapping and hybrid forms that characterize Nordic societies today.

In Part II, the proximity but also tensions between civil society and the state in the Nordic region are examined in six chapters, spanning the whole period of the volume from 1800 until today. Andreas Önnerfors emphasizes in his chapter the role of the fraternal orders in Sweden around 1800. They emerged as early forms of associations in the eighteenth century, but from the beginning of the nineteenth century, the state took action to control and regulate them. This was done by the King through a legislation inspired by similar regulations in Prussia and Britain, illustrating the transnational context of Nordic developments. In this chapter, civil society is understood as social space for the creation of nodes among citizens in

modern society and the negotiation of key concepts in political language, such as “welfare”.

Early civic formation in organized sociability is also examined by Margrét Gunnarsdottir, focusing on the situation in a more remote part of the Nordic region, in Iceland at the turn of the nineteenth century. In her chapter, she shows that the Islandic Society, established in 1796, and reflecting cosmopolitan Enlightenment ideas, was also a part of a national uprising against the Danish Crown and the Danish absolute state. Based on archival material, she discusses this early instance of civil society compared with the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, established in Copenhagen in 1825, which also had roots in Iceland and Icelandic and Nordic cultural heritage. The chapter examines how these two associations advocated different ideological strategies for building civil society in Iceland, and also illustrates the complicated Dano-Icelandic state–civil society development.

Moving forward to the last half of the nineteenth century, and eastwards to Norway, Odd Arvid Storsveen discusses how the military-like sport of sharp-shooting has played a significant role in the development of sports and sportsman-ship in the Nordic societies, otherwise often associated with a mostly non-violent culture. In his chapter, he explores the organizing of the sharpshooters and the integration of them into sport associations, although this did not have the inten-tion of a higher purpose. This broad and popular movement, Storsveen argues, has turned out to be a national as well as a transnational, Nordic social meeting place. Although all modern shooting sports are products of a war culture, they are also, Storsveen emphasizes, a middle zone *between* this culture and a civil society cul-ture, enabling the Nordic states with their comprehensive sharpshooting traditions to check and regulate the use of arms within the framework of modern civil society.

In the following chapter, Mads Mordhorst, Louise Karlskov Skyggebjerg, and Mathias Hein Jessen problematize, as in Inger-Johanne Sand’s contribution, the sectoral view of civil society. Instead of focusing on the relation between state and civil society, they draw attention to the distinction between market actors and civil societies and show that organizations like cooperatives are hybrids. Through a historical comparative analysis of cooperatives, saving banks and companies from 1870 to the present, they show that they become still more hybrid in bal-ancing between being civil society and market actors. Cooperatives and saving banks are organized as civil society associations, but their purpose is to compete in markets, which become still more prominent over time. Companies, on the other side, established with the purpose of making profit, increasingly narrate them-selves as associations with higher purposes through policies like Corporate Social Responsibility.

Moving forward to the post-war period and Norwegian experiences of state–civil society relations, Mikkel Witt Syberg examines the close collaboration between the Norwegian Refugee Council and the Norwegian state in the 1950s. In his chapter, using the Neo-Hegelian conception of the state–civil society relationship and seeing it as not one-directional, he shows how the collaboration contributed to strengthening the legitimacy of both the state and the refugee council. The chapter

thus demonstrates how the Scandinavian context, where applicable, enabled a reciprocal nature of dependency between state and civil society actors.

In the last chapter of Part II, Suze van der Poll in her contribution draws attention to the Sámi people's fight for acceptance and rights today against the backdrop of former marginalization and assimilation in the Swedish and Norwegian states. Although the Sámi are no longer seen as inferior, insignificant or peripheral, Sámi people still experience discrimination by the majority population, and exploitation of natural resources in Sápmi, the areas where Sámi people have traditionally lived, continues in Norway, Sweden and Finland. Van der Poll shows in her chapter how literature and culture is a core element of Sámi identity and form an important constituent of Sámi civil society, and she underlines the importance of the increased international reception and interest in works created by Sámi artists and writers. She further emphasizes the significance of a global context for small and diversified civil societies, like the Sámi, to assert their rights and influence politics, both on a national and transnational level.

In Part III, transnational, Nordic and international perspectives are central in discussing the emergence and expansion of civil society in the Nordic region and beyond during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Ruth Hemstad in her chapter gives empirical evidence for how widespread transnational cooperation among voluntary associations across the Nordic region has been, starting in the late eighteenth century and expanding throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. She furthermore shows how these associations have had a key role in developing the region and the Nordic idea and practice of transnational cooperation. Moreover, she argues that the history of Nordic cooperation, including on a civil society level, is a complex and not linear one, consisting of both future visions and grand failures, of high-minded rhetoric and serious shortcomings, influenced both by pan-Scandinavian ideas and national reactions. First and foremost, however, the broader development of transnational associational ties is characterized by pragmatic and practical solutions.

Nordic civil society cooperation after the First World War, when business interests, a general popular sense of kinship and other traditions from nineteenth-century Scandinavianism reappeared as a regional cooperation idea between sovereign states, is the topic of Peter Stadius' chapter, where he also follows the line up to the consolidation of an official intergovernmental Nordic cooperation body through the founding of the Nordic Council in 1952. More specifically, he examines how civil servants of higher rank formed the Nordic Federation of Public Administration in 1919. Stadius shows how civil servants used this association as a lobby organization and to exchange information that fertilized Nordic corporation, and he points to the importance of trust between state and civil societies as a key element.

In the following chapter, on Scandinavian development aid experiences, Sunniva Engh gives an example of how global perspectives may be used in historical investigations of civil societies' roles in international engagements. The chapter examines how Danish, Norwegian and Swedish civil society actors worked together during the 1951–53 Korean War to establish field hospitals, and, following

the end of the war, how they collaborated over a joint aid effort to Korea, lasting until 1971. Engh thus shows how civil society actors played key roles in making possible early Scandinavian support of the UN effort to South Korea, as well as in establishing the first joint Scandinavian aid initiative, the National Medical Centre in Seoul, South Korea.

Transnational cooperation and confrontation during the post-war period are further exemplified by Melina Antonia Buns' analyses of the conflicts between the Nordic nations in the 1970s and 1980s after Sweden and Finland placed nuclear plants close to the borders to Denmark and Norway. This created conflicts among the states but also a collaboration between anti-nuclear organizations and movements in the different states. In her chapter, Buns discusses tensions between nuclear waste and reprocessing technologies: between disarmament and anti-nuclear movements, between non-proliferation and energy policies, between the local and the international and between different Scandinavian countries, but also the opportunities for cooperation these tensions presented.

In a concluding epilogue, Mary Hilson asks, summing up the main aspects of this volume, "What was 'Nordic' about Nordic civil society?" She argues that the partnership between civil society and the state, although of importance in the region, should not be overstated and emphasizes the role of different historical legacies and geographical conditions. She furthermore underlines the importance of transnational contacts, exchange and cooperation within Nordic civil society and the role of civil society associations in mediating contacts between Norden and the wider world.

Taken together, the chapters in this book, written by a multidisciplinary and international team of scholars, discuss relevant and paradigmatic examples drawn from Swedish, Icelandic, Finnish, Norwegian, Danish and Sámi, as well as transnational and international civil society experiences and practices. The different chapters illustrate broader Nordic traits and challenges, and/or transnational interaction and particular aspects of Nordic cooperation, both within and beyond the region. The specific cases study a comprehensive range of associational life, from early enlightenment and antiquarian societies, Masonic lodges and fraternal orders, sharpshooting societies, pan-Scandinavian associations and transnational Nordic organizations to foundations, saving banks and cooperations and further to civil servants, refugee relief and development organizations and anti-nuclear movements and Sámi civil society experiences. They are all part of the multifaceted, interconnected and changing history of civil societies in, across and beyond the Nordic region over the last two hundred years—of importance also for understanding Nordic societies and the challenges of today.

Notes

1 Kocka, "Zivilgesellschaft als historisches Problem und Versprechen," 21.
2 Christensen et al., *Associative Governance*.
3 See also Götz et al., *Humanitarianism in the Modern World*; Engelstad et al., eds, *Institutional Change in the Public Sphere*.

4 www.norden.org/no/deklarasjon/var-visjon-2030.
5 Putnam, *Bowling Alone*.
6 Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*.
7 Putnam, *Bowling Alone*.
8 Alapuro and Stenius, eds, *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*.
9 Berman, "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic," 401−29.
10 Nathaus and Merziger, "Entsprang den private Zwecken ein gemeiner Nutzen?"
11 Götz, "Civil Society in the Nordics," Christensen et al., *Associative Governance in Scandinavia*.
12 Strang, ed., *Nordic Cooperation*.
13 Zimmer, *Vereine – Zivilgesellschaft konkret*.
14 Hoffmann, *The Politics of Sociability*.
15 Berger and Nehring, eds, *The History of Social Movements*.
16 Wijkström and Zimmer, eds, *Nordic Civil Society at a Cross-Roads*.
17 Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*.
18 Götz, Haggrén and Hilson, "Nordic Cooperation in the Voluntary Sector."
19 Jansson, *Adertonhundratalets associationer*, Jansson, "The Age of Associations," Try, *Assosiasjonsånd og foreningsvekst*, Stenius, *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt*, Clemmensen, *Associationer og foreningsdannelse*.
20 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, Götz and Haggrén, eds, *Regional Cooperation*, Petersen, "Transnationale perspektiver," Alapuro and Stenius, eds, *Nordic Associations*, Hilson, *The International Co-operative Alliance*, Strang, *Nordic Cooperation*, Stadius, "Hundra år av Nordism," Hemstad and Stadius, eds, *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms*.
21 Velde and Janse, eds, *Organizing Democracy*.
22 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*.
23 Strang, ed., *Nordic Cooperation*.
24 Vik, "Indigenous Internationalism."
25 Andersson and Hilson, "Images of Sweden and the Nordic Countries," Muszial, "Reconstructing Nordic Significance."
26 Brimnes, Olsen and Gulløv, eds, *Danmark og kolonierne*, Engh and Pharo, "Nordic Cooperation in Providing Development Aid."
27 Bach et al., *Idealer og realiteter*, Engh, "The Conscience of the World?," 65−82, Pharo et al., *Saints and Sinners*, Ekengren and Götz, "The One Per Cent Country," Engh and Brimnes, "Scandinavian Entry Points to Social Medicine and Postcolonial Health."
28 Byrkjeflot, Mordhorst and Petersen, eds, *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models*.
29 Marjanen, Strang and Hilson, eds, *Contesting Nordicness*.

Bibliography

Alapuro, Risto. "Voluntary Associations and the State: Comparative Perspectives." In *People, Citizen, Nation*, edited by Lars-Folke Landgrén and Pirkko Hautamäki, 12–26. Helsinki: Renvall Institute, 2005.

Alapuro, Risto and Henrik Stenius, eds. *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2010.

Andersson, Jenny and Mary Hilson. "Images of Sweden and the Nordic Countries." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 34(3) (2009): 219–28.

Bach, Christian Friis, Thorsten Borring Olesen, Sune Kaur-Pedersen and Klaus Pedersen. *Idealer og realiteter: Dansk udviklingspolitiks historie 1945−2005*. København: Gyldendal, 2008.

Berger, Stefan and Holger Nehring, eds. *The History of Social Movements in Global Perspective: A Survey*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
Berman, S. “Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic.” *World Politics* 49 (1997): 401−29.
Brimnes, Niels, Johan P. Olsen and Hans Christian Gulløv, eds. *Danmark og kolonierne*. København: Gads Forlag, 2017.
Byrkjeflot, Haldor, Mads Mordhorst and Klaus Petersen, eds. *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images*. London: Routledge, 2021.
Carvalho, Benjamin de and Iver B. Neumann, eds. *Small States and Status Seeking: Norway’s Quest for International Standing*. London: Routledge, 2015.
Christensen, Søren, Anker Brink Lund, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Benjamin Ask Popp Madsen. *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by Combining Together*. London: Routledge, 2023.
Clemmensen, Niels. *Associationer og foreningsdannelse i Danmark 1780−1880*. Øvre Ervik: Alvheim & Eide, 1987.
Cohen, Jean L. and Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
Egholm, Liv and Lars Bo Kaspersen. *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*. London: Routledge, 2021.
Ekengren Ann-Marie and Norbert Götz. “The One Per Cent Country: Sweden’s Internalisation of the Aid Norm.” In *Saints and Sinners: Official Development Aid and Its Dynamics in a Historical and Comparative Perspective*, edited by Helge Pharo, Torsten Borring Olesen and Kristian Paaskesen, 21–49. Oslo: Akademika Forlag, 2013.
Engelstad, Fredrik et al., eds. *Institutional Change in the Public Sphere: Views on the Nordic Model*. Warsaw: De Gruyter, 2017.
Engh, Sunniva. “The Conscience of the World? Swedish and Norwegian Provision of Development Aid.” *Itinerario* 33(2) (2009): 65−82.
Engh, Sunniva and Helge Pharo. “Nordic Cooperation in Providing Development Aid.” In *Regional Cooperation and International Organizations: The Nordic Model in Transnational Alignment*, edited by Norbert Götz and Heidi Haggrén, 112–30. London: Routledge, 2009.
Engh, Sunniva and Niels Brimnes. “Scandinavian Entry Points to Social Medicine and Postcolonial Health: Karl Evang and Halfdan Mahler in India.” *Medical History* 67(1) (2023): 1–4.
Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
Götz, Norbert. “Civil Society in the Nordics.” 2019. www.nordics.info (accessed 3 July 2024).
Götz, Norbert, Georgina Brewis and Steffen Werther. *Humanitarianism in the Modern World: The Moral Economy of Famine Relief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
Götz, Norbert and Heidi Haggrén, eds. *Regional Cooperation and International Organizations*: *The Nordic Model in Transnational Alignment*. London: Routledge, 2009.
Götz, Norbert, Heidi Haggrén and Mary Hilson, “Nordic Cooperation in the Voluntary Sector.” In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang, 49–68. London: Routledge, 2016.
Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian summer til nordisk vinter*. Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008.

Hemstad, Ruth and Peter Stadius, eds. *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840−1940*. London: Routledge, 2023.

Hilson, Mary. *The International Co-Operative Alliance and the Consumer Co-Operative Movement in Northern Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018.

Hoffmann, Stefan-Ludwig. *The Politics of Sociability: Freemasonry and German Civil Society, 1840−1918*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007.

Jansson, Torkel. *Adertonhundratalets associationer*. Uppsala: Studia Historica Upsaliensis, 1985.

Jansson, Torkel. “The Age of Associations: Principles and Forms of Organization Between Corporations and Mass Organizations, a Comparative Nordic Survey from a Swedish Viewpoint.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 13(4) (1988): 321–43.

Kocka, Jürgen. “Zivilgesellschaft als historisches Problem und Versprechen.” In *Europäische Zivilgesellschaft in Ost und West: Begriff, Geschichte, Chancen*, edited by Manfred Hildermeier et al., 13−39. Frankfurt/Main: Campus, 2000.

Marjanen, Jani, Johan Strang and Mary Hilson, eds. *Contesting Nordicness: From Scandinavianism to the Nordic Brand*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2022.

Muszial, K., “Reconstructing Nordic Significance in Europe on the Threshold of the 21st Century.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 34(3) (2009): 286–306.

Nathaus, Klaus and Patrick Merziger. “Entsprang den private Zwecken ein gemeiner Nutzen?” In *Freiwilligenarbeit und gemeinnützige Organisationen im Wandel*, edited by Nicole Kramer and Christine G. Krüger, 183−220. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019.

“Our Vision 2030”, www.norden.org/no/deklarasjon/var-visjon-2030 (accessed 3 July 2024).

Petersen, Klaus. “Transnationale perspektiver på den nordiske velfærdsmodels tilblivelseshistorie.” In *Transnational Historie*, edited by Anne Magnussen, Sissel Bjerrum Fossat, Klaus Petersen and Nils Arne Sørensen, 163–80. Odense: Syddansk Universitet, 2009.

Pharo, Helge, Torsten Borring Olesen and Kristian Paaskesen. *Saints and Sinners: Official Development Aid and Its Dynamics in a Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Oslo: Akademika Forlag, 2013.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.

Stadius, Peter. “Hundra år av Nordism.” In *Meningen med Föreningen*, edited by Henrik Wilén, 9–72. Stockholm: Letterstedtska föreningen, 2019.

Stenius, Henrik. *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt: Föreningsväsendets utveckling i Finland fram till 1900-talets början med speciell hänsyn till massorganisationsprincipens genombrott*. Helsinki: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, 1987.

Strang, Johan. *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Try, Hans. *Assosiasjonsånd og foreningsvekst i Norge*. Øvre Ervik: Alvheim & Eide, 1985.

Velde, Henk te and Maartje Janse, eds. *Organizing Democracy: Reflections on the Rise of Political Organizations in the Nineteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Vik, Hanne Hagtvet. “Indigenous Internationalism.” In *Internationalisms: A Twentieth-Century History*, edited by Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin, 315−39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Wijkström, F. and A. Zimmer, eds. *Nordic Civil Society at a Cross-Roads*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2011.

Zimmer, A. *Vereine – Zivilgesellschaft konkret*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2007.

Part I

Nordic Civil Society

Theoretical Perspectives

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

2 Expansion and Incorporation

Nordic Civil Society in a Weberian Perspective

Haldor Byrkjeflot

Introduction

In this chapter I explore how Nordic civil society emerged as a consequence of transnational religious movements and people's movements from the mid-1800s. There was a parallel movement of expansion of civil society from below and incorporation from above. The aim is to outline certain common characteristics among the Nordic nation-states in the kind of movements that developed and in the relationship between voluntary associations and states. Over time, such movements and relationships developed into what is today labelled as a Nordic or Scandinavian model of civil society.[1] I will use a Weberian perspective to investigate how the development associated with this model may differ from other parts of Europe and the United States.

I ask, first, what are the implications of a Weberian perspective for how we understand the relationship between state, bureaucracy, and civil society in the Nordic countries? Secondly, how do national and transnational ideas and movements contribute to the making of Nordic civil society? Thirdly, I will identify some characteristics of a Nordic model of civil society based on current scholarship and discuss how it may have been constituted.

The Protestant Ethic

Probably one of the most well-known contributions from Max Weber (1864–1920) is his *The Protestant Ethic and Capitalism*, which was one among a series of publications related to the comparative analysis of the world religions. The more specific motivation behind writing the essays that was later published as *The Protestant Ethic* was his dissatisfaction with the situation in Germany. In contrast to England and many other European states, Germany had not developed a party-centered and competitive pattern of politics. The extensive executive powers retained by both emperor and chancellor tended to undermine the parliament (Reichstag) and "talented men" were encouraged to enter the bureaucracy, the army, or business rather than party politics.[2]

In order to develop the same standing as England and America in the world, Weber argued, German rulers had to understand the unfortunate legacy of their

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-3
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

variety of Lutheranism and be aware of, perhaps even appreciate, the alternative posed by the Calvinistic calling. The religion and associated styles of life in Germany did not cultivate the kind of politics and life conduct that could deal with challenges associated with political leadership. Lutheranism in the German version was essentially conservative and politically not up to the task.[3]

Weber had started work on the text of *The Protestant Ethic* in 1904, the same year that he visited the U.S.[4] This visit made a strong impact on him and seems to have strengthened his conviction about the impact of Calvinism. In scholarship taking its inspiration from Weber, the relationship between religion and capitalism has been a central theme, while there has been much less analysis of how religion has affected the relationship between civil society and state bureaucracy.[5] An exception is Thomas Ertman and Philip Gorski who have both argued that there is a relationship between Protestantism and the degree of and kind of bureaucracy, and implicitly what kind of personality types are recruited and cultivated into bureaucracy as well.[6]

The Balance between Bureaucracy and Politics

Many scholars both in the social sciences and the humanities now argue that bureaucracy is an unescapable and beneficent infrastructure in modern democratic societies. Francis Fukuyama speaks of "getting to Denmark" and one of the main reasons for Danish success is its reputation for a reliable and uncorrupt bureaucracy.[7] Bo Rothstein has found that there is a strong correlation between the historical dominance of bureaucratic values and impartial, non-corrupt government, and the population's trust in government.[8] Some even praise bureaucracy due to its efforts to install an ethics of office,[9] or competence in dealing with epidemics and large-scale disasters,[10] or in attaining socialism.[11]

Weber took an interest in the characteristics of modern bureaucracy in relation to other historical forms.[12] In a broad sense, Weber defined bureaucracy as a general principle of organization, not just government agencies or managerial staff—"a Janus-faced organization, looking two ways at once. On the one side, it was administration based on expertise; while on the other, it was administration based on discipline."[13]

For several decades, there has been a debate between those who celebrated bureaucracy's technical advantages and those who critiqued its human consequences—embodying the enduring split between "rational" and "natural" system views in organizational theory.[14] These two views represent the two sides of Weber's pessimistic ambivalence: bureaucracy, Weber argued, is an "iron cage"[15] that affords a level of rationality that modern society cannot do without, but it achieves this efficiency only at the terrible price of alienation.[16]

Regarding the balance between bureaucracy and politics, we have already noted that Weber's discussion of this relationship was colored by his experience from Germany where he found that a bureaucratic public administration had been developed "to its fullest degree". The problem was that it had become too powerful,

since Germany had not developed a competitive set of political parties and there was thus an absence of politics of vocation in the German political class.[17] The situation in the Nordic region was different from Germany, however.

Bureaucracy and Religion in the Nordic Region

Robert H. Nelson argues that Nordic social democracy has built welfare states based on Lutheran values, and that it is necessary to distinguish between Nordic and German Lutheranism as well as Lutheranism and Calvinism in an analysis of the impact of religion in the development of bureaucracy and personality models.[18] Luther had given inspiration to the Reformation and the establishment of state churches throughout Europe. In the northern part of Europe, the outcome was typically a state church headed by a holder of state authority, like a king or a prince. In other parts of Europe, Catholicism or a mix between Catholicism and Lutheranism was the predominant pattern, e.g. "pillarism", with a divide between different religious groups so typical of the Netherlands. Stein Rokkan, as well as Max Weber, looked at religion as one of the most central cleavages in European history and politics.[19]

While Lutheranism was predominant in Scandinavia and some areas of Germany, Calvinism had a large impact in England, Scotland, France, the Netherlands, North America, parts of Germany, and central Europe. Calvinists typically rebelled against state authority and there was a lot of bloodshed and violence as Protestantism and Catholicism were facing each other in various parts of Europe. The Reformation in Scandinavia was rather peaceful, however, as it opened up cooperation between the bureaucracy and clerical power under the leadership of the king. The Nordic Lutheran church was accepting of state authority, and it was partly for this reason that these societies became rather homogenously centered around Protestant values and administrative traditions. According to Knudsen:

> More than anything else, that is why we can talk about a Nordic model—for it had long-term effects for the state building, for the nation building, for literacy and for the decentralization of public administration.[20]

The implication of this is that we need a comparative and historical perspective in order to understand the development of a common Nordic model of civil society and bureaucracy.

The situation in Germany, with a strong Lutheran heritage in competition with an equally strong Catholic tradition, was different from the Nordic region. The outcome was therefore a more pluralistic church which meant that the Lutheran impact was both weaker and different from the Nordic region. As noted by Nelson, historians may not have included the Nordic region in their studies due to the small population in the Nordic region and its peripheral status in Europe.[21] One of the lessons he draws is that due to their Lutheran heritage, the Nordic countries have been more willing to accept strong state management of society and a more developed Weberian bureaucracy.[22]

Almost all the criteria listed by Weber for bureaucracy were introduced in Nordic state administration in the period from 1660 to 1900.[23] Reasons for this may be found in the demands for gathering taxes to fund the many wars from 1600–1860. Offices were still sold to fund the Great Nordic War 1700–20, but there was also an oath of office pledged by public administrators which indicates that loyalty to the state and its religion was important. The first ranks of office and honorary titles were introduced in 1671–80 in Sweden and Denmark/Norway. The banning of bribery and the setting of standards for official penalties were introduced in 1676–80, and legal exams became a requirement in public service from 1821 in Denmark. Inspections of public offices started in 1803 and pension and retirement age for civil servants was introduced in 1861.[24]

This chronicle of the bureaucratization of state office in the Nordic region shows the importance of some of the preconditions for bureaucratization also outlined by Weber. However, as noted, he was critical of the outcome of the bureaucratization process in Lutheran Germany, and he contrasted this outcome with the situation in other European countries. Just as in Weber's Protestant ethic, it is Calvin and his followers who are emphasized by Gorski in his account of bureaucratization processes in Europe.[25] The Calvinists were central in creating an infrastructure of religious governance and social control,[26] which also served as a model for developing bureaucratic infrastructures in the rest of Europe and the world.[27]

Gorski does not include the Nordic societies in his more systematic account of the influence of religion on bureaucratic states, although he mentions the different impacts of religion in the development of welfare states.[28] His main interest was to study the impact of Calvinism in early modern continental Europe and how it contributed to the development of state bureaucracy. As in Weber's Protestant ethic, the Nordic developments are not discussed, however. So, we might ask whether an inclusion of the Nordic nation-states in the comparison would have affected Weber's conclusions as well. We do not know the answer, of course, but we can at least use a Weberian perspective in order to reflect on the Nordic cases.

A scholar who has included the Nordic region in his analysis of the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy is Thomas Ertman, who has argued that imitation of organization models, as well as associational infrastructures, also played a key role. His first example is the early Prussian bureaucratic reforms, for which he thinks that Sweden may have served as a model. This model was spread and developed further, first throughout Germany and then back to Sweden(with Finland) and Denmark-Norway.[29] Secondly, he suggests that variations in the relationship between associational life and political parties may explain different outcomes. Associations were structured along many different conflict lines or divisions, among them religion, class, gender, language, etc., and the timing of the development of associations in relation to political parties was important in order to explain the variations in democratic developments.[30] Furthermore, both the ideas needed to institutionalize bureaucracy and religious movements were imported from other regions and translated into the Nordic context.

Sect-like and Church-like Societies

Taking our departures from Ertman's thoughts on the role of religion and political parties in democratization processes, let us now move on to Sung Ho Kim who in his 2004 book has outlined a Weberian perspective on civil society.[31]

It is Weber's essays on "Kirchen and Sekten in Nordamerika" and *The Protestant Ethic* that provide the backbone of Kim's outline of a Weberian perspective on civil society. He argues that these essays show that Weber finds the organizational aspects of religion to be the most interesting thing about the United States. He contrasts the moral situation in the U.S. to the situation in Germany and it is perhaps this discovery and comparison that is behind his view of the critical role of associations and, in particular, religious associations or so-called sects.[32]

What Weber provides in *The Protestant Ethic* is a comparison of German Lutheranism and ascetic Protestantism (Calvinism, Methodism, Puritanism, Baptists).[33] He argues that the German version is more organized as an institutionalized church (*Anstalt*), whereas religion in the U.S. had developed into a more sect-like but also more organized religion.

Weber's, and later Troeltsch's distinction between church and sect has been important in the sociology of religion but has also been criticized for ethnocentrism and for providing an unduly narrow classification for religious movements.[34] However, the distinction may still be useful in a historical-comparative perspective, in this case to develop further the distinction between sect-like and church-like societies.[35]

As churches were formalized as infrastructure and modes of governance at local level, they were becoming institutionalized "*Anstalts*" into which people were born, but still open for membership, whereas sects were "a voluntary community [*freie Gemeinschaft*] of individuals purely on the basis of their religious qualification".[36] Membership in the church was obtained primarily at birth by ascription, while the sect was a voluntary, more democratic, exclusive organization whose members were recruited through individual admission.

The American sect shapes a personality or a *Berufsmensch* (a human being with a vocation or calling), according to Weber, whereas the German state churches do not have the same disciplinary and socializing quality.[37] The American "sect" type of association posed a grave problem for the uniquely German framework of *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft* (community versus society).[38] Whereas community is associated with traditional action in Tönnies' original theory, Weber suggested modifying the theory since he did not regard American sects as a traditional phenomenon in the same way as Tönnies' distinction indicated. The sect type of organization combines individualism and community, associative and communal action in an altogether modern way, according to Weber.

As voluntary associations of qualified people, sects maintain discipline and socialize their members, and are for this reason likely to have the greatest educative influence. Weber found that sect membership worked in the United States as "a certificate of moral qualification", proof of one's reputation, honesty, and trustworthiness.[39]

Kim finds a critique of civil society in Weber's comparison of the sect-like associational life in the U.S. and the also rich but more conformist associational situation in Germany. Not all kinds of civil society associations are normatively desirable; moreover, some forms of associational life are active accomplices in facilitating "passive democratization" by the bureaucracy. Hence, Weber provided a critique of a particular combination of civil society and bureaucracy, based on his experience from Germany.[40] As explained by Ertman,[41] Germany possessed one of the world's densest associational landscapes before 1933, and yet national socialism won a substantial popular following there. Moreover, recent scholarship on Weimar Germany has detailed the crucial role that local associational networks played in promoting the rapid spread of support for the Nazis, thereby permitting the latter's spectacular electoral gains of September 1930 and July 1932.[42]

"For, in the end," Kim argues, "Weber's civil society is a purposefully formative site in which certain moral characters and civic virtues are cultivated through ethical discipline in everyday life".[43] What was the problem with German civil society, then, was not so much a lack of "the numerical proliferation of institutions of socialization" but rather that it did not provide "civic education". Thus, Weber laments, "the quantitative distribution of the voluntary associational life does not always go hand in hand with qualitative significance".[44] Weber's suspicion was that German civil society bred mostly passive and conformist personalities, whereas the American sects had both educative and qualifying qualities for leadership.[45]

Another element, which was more explicitly discussed by Ertman, is the critical relationship between political parties and civil society organizations. Where parties and party competition were a central part of political life before 1914 and there was also a strong associational landscape (like in Britain, France, Scandinavia, the Netherlands), democratization and durable democracies would be the outcome.[46] If associations were well developed but political parties were not competitive or strong (as in Germany and Italy), there would be fragmentation and democratic decline.[47]

Whether Scandinavia or the Nordic region fits with either the Anglo-Saxon or the German categorization of relationship between bureaucracy, religion, and civil society will be discussed in the following. I will argue that there are some similarities with American sects in the development of Nordic civil society and discuss some of the implications of this.

Revivalist Movements and Civil Society in the Nordic Region

The Nordic countries also developed Protestant state churches, but in parallel there were also strong revivalist movements which, although ending up getting integrated into churches, clearly maintained some sect-like characteristics. In some cases, as in the Norwegian Hauge movement and religious movements in Sweden and Denmark (e.g. Baptists and Methodists in Sweden, as well as Grundtvig and the inner mission in Denmark), the impact of the revivalist's activities were rather similar to those effects Weber referred to as uniquely associated with the

Calvinists.[48] The ascetic Protestants practiced self-discipline and methodical control, but they also took active part in community affairs and economic entrepreneurialism as expressions of their faith. They may have had a similar motivation to act in the world as the Calvinists, although their view of and relation to state and bureaucracy may have been different and they also did not have the same belief in predestination.

The Hauge movement in Norway, named after its leader Hans Nielsen Hauge (1771–1824), had a lasting influence on Norwegian culture and history. It was already argued by the Norwegian sociologist Christen C. Jonassen in 1947 that Hauge's influence in Norway was as great as that of Luther in Germany or Calvin in England and America.[49] "What Hauge did", he argues, "was to take some concepts of Lutheran religion, give them new meaning, value, and vitality, thus transforming Lutheranism into a religion that achieved exactly the same behavioristic results from slightly different premises as Calvinism did". As is commonly done in Norwegian historical scholarship, he referred to Hauge as a successful religious organizer as well as an economic entrepreneur. Hauge was imprisoned multiple times as he broke with the conventicle act, which forbade lay preachers from holding religious services. After this first period of confrontation, however, many of his followers became central in local and national politics, a development that fits with the common pattern during the 1800s where many of the central organizers in the so-called people's movements became incorporated into local and national politics.[50]

His followers presented themselves as a "community of equals, reading the Bible, discussing the Lord's message—and designing new economic enterprises".[51] Recent research explains further the impact of the new gospel and the friendly societies created by Hauge. The work ethic differed from the Lutheran tradition, as depicted by Weber, with Hauge advocating a view allowing for ordinary people to preach and develop their own individual faith as well as to take part in cooperative business associations.[52]

Hanne Sanders, who has done extensive studies among the revivalist movements in Sweden and Denmark during the first half of the 1800s has come to a similar conclusion:

> Similar to Weber's idea of the Protestant ethic to capitalism, my research indicates that these people acted not in order to be saved but, rather, in order to show that they belonged to the people of God, to the Blessed.[53]

There were parallel movements to the Hauge movement in Finland and Denmark, although not as influential, but with similar agenda.[54] In the case of Denmark, of course, the main attention has been centered around Nicolai F. Grundtvig. There is a massive literature on H.N. Hauge and the Hauge movement in Norway, and even more so on Grundtvig in Denmark. Grundtvig was a very different person than Hauge, as he was a priest, author, and politician, while Hauge was first and foremost a farmer, lay-preacher, and entrepreneur. However, just like Hauge, Grundtvig was arguing for the people to associate around self-governing institutions, but he

was also more than prepared to allow for "progress from above".[55] As argued by Kaspersen and Sevelsted:

> Of special importance in the Danish case is the fact that the revivalist movement mostly stayed within the national church. In this way, Grundtvig's "romanticist liberalism" came to influence Danish national identity, including the idealization of "free" associations—especially churches and primary and secondary schools within the broader national framework.[56]

The early development of the Nordic people's movements after 1850 may also be seen as taking place in an environment where conflict as well as cooperation between church and sects were of primary importance. The Hauge movement, for instance,

> did not break with the codex of Lutheran Christianity; rather, it energized it with ideas of social emancipation through education. It proposed a … mixture of reform and revolution that let Lutheranism remain the imaginary centre that held the community together.[57]

Accordingly, while the Calvinists were in opposition to the state, the Nordic revivalists, e.g. the Hauge movement in Norway or the Grundtvigians in Denmark, developed a more collaborative attitude to state officials and state agencies.

There was a parallel expansion of state bureaucracy and people's movements, although both the early revivalists and farmer movements were critical of state and church expansion. The "spirit" of association was spreading, gradually becoming underpinned by the development of more durable bureaucratic structures in both the sphere of state agencies and the voluntary associations.

A pattern of cumulative development and path dependency has been noted as there were similarities in how the movements developed at different stages in the Nordic countries, first with farmers in parallel with public servants and thereafter workers, professions, health services, development, humanitarian aid, and leisure activities.[58] For instance, the missionary and worker's movements could not have progressed the way they did without the early development of revivalist and temperance associations. The missionary societies became important providers of training in organizational democracy. The Christian lay movement was of utmost importance as "the clergy's speech monopoly was broken, ordinary people could preach, hundreds of prayer houses became practice rooms".[59] The revivalist movements, particularly in Norway, became incorporated into the national church at the same time as they expanded. This movement of expansion and incorporation was in alignment with the more general trend of interpenetration between state and civil society, "as seen for instance in poor relief, social services, health, and education, mediated by the caring occupations".[60]

The organizational models and symbols developed by the early movements were taken up and made use of by the later movements, not least the labor movement.[61] What has been less studied is the transfer of ideas within the Nordic

region, but since the ideas used in mobilization and the organizational forms developed were rather similar, one may assume that there have been a lot of transnational influences.

We may, however, observe some variations among the Nordic countries in the level of incorporation of sects into churches. The revivalist movements in the Nordic countries were the first "modern" social movement where people first learned how to organize independently of the church and the local community.[62] It is thus of interest to understand how Nordic sect-like societies developed under the umbrella of the state church and local governance. Sevelstad argues that these early movements were most easily incorporated into the Danish *folkekirke*, while the Swedish situation was most different since there was a more important schism between the state church and the so-called free churches movement (*frikyrkorörelsen*). The Norwegian situation was somewhere in between Sweden and Denmark as the sect-like organizations were for the most part, but not entirely, coopted into the state church. It may nonetheless be concluded that the revivalist movements in all three countries "paved the way for the style of compromise-oriented incorporation of organized groups".[63]

The more recent research related to civil society in the Nordic countries has emphasized the state-friendliness of Nordic associations,[64] as well as the strong involvement of associations at the local level.[65] The particular compromise that developed between church and sects had a lasting effect, as there was a rapid expansion of religious and other kinds of overlapping associations.

Later on, the relationship between state and associations got regulated and organized according to a set of principles referred to in recent literature as associational governance,[66] which combines a strong society with a strong state and the simultaneous incorporation of movements and interest groups from above and mobilization from below.[67] The Norwegian social anthropologist Halvard Vike has described some of the aspects of this governance structure:

> In analytical terms what we are aiming at here is reciprocity: forms of decision-making and institutional governance that do not emerge from command, but through negotiations and exchange between actors with diverse interests.[68]

Such patterns of reciprocity depend on the existence of relatively autonomous agents, however, and Vike argues that it was the movements and associations of the late 1800s and early 1900s that fostered such an abundance of autonomous actors, but also that the welfare state from the mid-1900s provided further preconditions for reciprocity in governance of Nordic societies.[69] The Nordic associational landscape was rather formalized and standardized with a multitude of movements related to strong values of universalism and equality, in combination with nationalism.[70] There was a typical development from confrontation to cooperation in many spheres of society. The Haugean movement in Norway was first met with fierce resistance by the established church but was later becoming integrated into organized religion and local politics. The same pattern, from conflict to cooperation, was found later in the labor movement and the women's movement.[71] The

timing of the movements may have been different in the respective nation-states but the similarities in outcomes may be understood as a consequence of transfer of ideas, primarily within the Nordic region.

Nordic Civil Society: Conflict and Cooperation

If there is indeed something like an institutionalized virtuous circle of conflict giving rise to cooperation and vice versa in the Nordic countries, one may ask what the role of civil society is in all this. Here it is argued that civil society plays a central role, and we will now introduce possible preconditions for such a state of affairs. First, the role of vertical and horizontal integration among organizations and the state will be addressed, as well as the membership model and the people's movements. Thereafter, we will again consider the role of bureaucracy and the transnational associations and arenas.

Firstly, there is a tradition for *vertical integration among voluntary organizations* from the local via the regional to the national level. While other nation-states developed a two-tiered civil society with one kind of organization at the local and another kind at central level, the Nordic membership-based organizations elected representatives and established governance units at the local, regional, and central levels. For instance, the three-tiered structure of the Norwegian Women's Public Health Association reflected a decentralized and participatory approach to advancing public health and women's rights in Norway. While the national boards offered leadership and resources, the association's main impact was achieved through local branches and the volunteers, as women were empowered to take initiatives related to health and well-being at the local level.

Secondly, there is also *horizontal integration* with civic organizations interacting with local, regional, and national authorities, as is seen for example in the tradition of "dutch treat" (*spleiselag*), where organizations and local and regional governments share costs related to the development of hospitals or other local welfare state infrastructures. Since the Nordic municipalities were of a generalist kind, with a broad scope of activity, the boundaries between them and voluntary associations were blurred.[72] The Nordic welfare states developed from below but, by being incorporated from above, most of the tasks related to welfare are still delegated to the local level.[73] At the central level there is a high degree of contact and interaction both across organizations and between governmental agencies and organization. The coordination takes place in so-called umbrella organizations, which we will explore further below, as well as in government commissions where civil society organizations are represented.[74]

Thirdly, *the membership model of organization* has been the predominant organizational form, with an annual general assembly and a governance unit in charge of daily activities. Representatives are either nominated or elected to represent the local organization at a regional or national level. It has been pointed out that a fair share of those who sign up as members do not take active part in organizational activities. For those favoring a more activist model of organizing or those who maintain that face-to-face activities are needed in order to create social

capital this may be seen as a problem. This view has been challenged by Wollebæk and Selle who have found that passive members, particularly those with overlapping memberships, also have higher trust in others than non-members and are important sources of social capital as well.[75] What is indicated by "passive membership" is not necessarily a particular "passive" personality-type, but rather that time is limited for committed activists who may have signed up for many causes and associations. Neither does it necessarily mean that associations with many passive members are less influential. As argued by Per Selle, among others, the turn towards nationwide associations with advanced representative structures means that the periphery has gained access to the center of politics. Accordingly, membership is important for political influence regardless of how active the members are, and Vike et al. speak of a "moral economy of membership".[76] However, there might be a slight change in such dynamics as states increasingly prefer to delegate tasks of funding and coordination to national umbrella organizations, with the development of a strata of voluntary bureaucrats that members have not elected or identify with.

State agencies have developed formal policies related to the voluntary sphere since the 1980s and incorporated associations from policy fields like sport, music, and the arts or more traditional fields like healthcare and social care in state governance. An important instrument for both parties (states and associations) are so-called umbrella associations or meta-organizations which have only associations as members, for instance the Norwegian Confederation of Sports with more than 2 million members, 12,000 sports clubs in 19 regional confederations, and 54 national federations.[77] Such umbrella associations are frequently delegated responsibility by public agencies or ministries or municipalities to provide services or distribute governmental funds. Clearly, this has contributed to a development of a new administrative strata both in the state and in the associations, sometimes along with an increased conflict level in the organizations. Partly as a consequence of this, but perhaps even more so due to the new generation's preferred ways of organizing, it has been hard to hang on to the three-tiered democratic structures in many organizations. Accordingly, there have been signs of breakdown of the hierarchical structures linking local chapters to nationwide representation and coordination, with the emergence of associations only organized at the local level or as interest groups at the national level.

Fourthly, as we have discussed, *the people's movements* following in the wake of the early evangelical mobilization developed around issues like alcohol, moral issues related to governance of the private sphere, women's rights, language, farmer's interests, and later also workers' movements and unions. Such movements were central to Rokkan's argument about how longstanding social and political divisions in Western European societies developed and were maintained. Some of the movements developed into countercultures as they dealt with overlapping issues and gathered overlapping memberships, e.g. related to religion, temperance, center-periphery, and language. There is also an established tradition in Nordic historical scholarship for talking about "the age of associations" and how the people's movements have been central in developing the current socio-economic Nordic

model. The people's movements were broad and relatively inclusive in terms of social class. Their organizational structures were uniform and locally based, but oriented towards seeking political influence.[78]

A Further Development towards Bureaucratization of Voluntarism

The new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s were critical of the "old" people's movements, which they argued had developed an extensive bureaucracy. For these movements, it was an aim to develop flatter and more spontaneous organization structures. Also, a new kind of memberless voluntary organization emerged, with some of them of the more activist kind whereas others were developing into think tanks or so-called NGOs.[79] An example of this is the Norwegian environmental organization Bellona which started out as an activist group and moved on later to become a hybrid between a think tank and a consultancy. Many organizations with their origins in the 1960s or 1970s preferred to call themselves networks, and more recently such networks are even less organized as they only exist as Facebook groups and present themselves as relying on web-based coordination. This increased variation in organizing means that it is too simplistic to speak of a general process towards bureaucratization. At least there is a need to distinguish between the more classical processes of bureaucratization and the new kinds of bureaucratization. Classic bureaucracy used to be associated with representation and expertise, with emphasis on a set of formal rules, such as specifying the rights of workers to be represented in boards and having an impact on organizational affairs or the rights of professions to govern their own affairs. More recently, bureaucracy is associated with control systems, like auditing, algorithms, digital monitoring, and responding to multiple accountability relations. A general trend seems to be that voluntary organizations have to rely more on project funding and therefore have to develop expertise in applying for funds and project organizing and relating to control systems.

The expansion of and integration of civil society associations at three levels, as argued to be "typical Nordic" above, clearly requires a development of a parallel administrative strata at several levels and thus a hierarchy of offices as outlined in Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy. As there is a tradition in the Nordic countries for recruitment from civil society organizations into politics and bureaucracy, one may ask what kind of promotional system was developed, and what impact such a promotional system had on the kind of personality types that were recruited. Were they leaders who "stand for something" or personalities placing emphasis on loyalty and discipline? Several accounts of the political development in the Nordic region refer to strong civil servant states, in combination with the powerful impact of associations during the last half of the 1800s, while there is a stronger alliance between political and associational leadership during the first half of the 1900s.[80]

If there is a period of decline in the influence of associational leadership where more "neutral" bureaucrats have gained in power relative to politicians, it seems to be the period after 1980s. Political parties may seem to be in control, but they

often lack both a future-oriented political program and the kind of organizational support from the grassroots that people's movements provided earlier. The socializing effect of sect-like organizing in the voluntary field is also more difficult to generalize about, since organizations are much less durable and many of them have no members at all. Nonetheless, given the continuously high organizational density in the Nordic civil society sphere, along with the historical legacy of people's movements, it may be argued that the Nordic societies are still more "sect-like" than many other societies. The historically relevant sect-like organizational units are important in an explanation for the current status of the Nordic model, and the similarities in the development in the respective nation-states cannot be explained without pointing to the transfer of ideas related to associations and religion within the Nordic region.

A Few Concluding Words

I have departed from the following questions: what are the implications of a Weberian perspective for how we understand the relationship between state, bureaucracy, and civil society in the Nordic countries; and how have national and transnational ideas and movements interacted in the making of Nordic civil society and if there is such a model how has it been constituted?

The background was Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy and socialization processes within and into various spheres of society, particularly from voluntary organizations into politics and bureaucracy. Weber's fear was that bureaucratization, as in Germany at that time, would undermine political leadership and possibilities for democracy. He found the source of the lack of leadership in German civil society and German Lutheranism, whereas he had much more confidence in the sect-like Calvinist organizations in the U.S. It was this comparison between the Calvinist sect-like organizations in the U.S. and the more church-like Lutheran organizations in Germany that provided the background for my discussion of Nordic Protestantism and civil society.

Although the Nordics were not Calvinists, many of the elements which Max Weber associates with "ascetic Protestantism" and "sect-like societies" fit rather well with the Nordic development. While the Calvinists were in opposition to the state, the Nordic revivalists, such as the Hauge movement in Norway or the Grundtvigians in Denmark, developed a more collaborative attitude to state and local government officials. There was a corresponding expansion of state bureaucracy and people's movements, although both the early revivalists and farmers' movements were critical of state and church expansion. This parallel movement of expansion of civil society from below and incorporation from above is characteristic of the Nordic development. The "spirit" of association was spreading, supported by the development of more durable bureaucratic structures in both the sphere of state agencies and the voluntary associations.

As well, there was a close relationship between political parties and people's movements. Nordic Lutheran Christianity gave impetus to a particular way of organizing relations between sects/civil society and local and central

governments. As noted above, it was Weber's view that it was not the number of associations in a society that mattered most for democracy but rather the quality of associational life. Although the German civil society was among the most advanced in quantitative terms, it bred mostly passive and conformist personalities, whereas the American sects had both educative and qualifying qualities according to Weber.

Secondly, what is the impact of regional and international influences? I have discussed how the current shape of Nordic civil societies may be understood in light of nation building, but also transnational and regional developments related to religion and people's movements. I have made use of Max Weber's argument related to the Protestant ethic and his distinction between church-like and sect-like societies as a point of departure to identify relevant transnational ideas and historical continuities. The important ideas in the case of the Nordic region are related to Lutheranism and ascetic Protestantism, which were carried forward by the state churches and local priests in combination with movements associated with Hans Nielsen Hauge in Norway and N.F.S. Grundtvig in Denmark. There was a flow of ideas from Grundtvig's followers in Denmark to Norway as well as examples of ideas flowing in the opposite direction. Hanne Sanders has shown how Danish and Swedish revivalist movements influenced each other.

Thirdly, these ideas have had a similar effect on behavior, as the Calvinist ideas contribute to the development of strong Nordic civil societies as well as more sect-like organizational forms than in the case of Germany. The big difference to Calvinism, however, is the state-friendliness of the Nordic associations and their simultaneous embeddedness at the local, regional, and national levels. Another characteristic is the widespread use of the membership model with overlapping memberships in several organizations without high expectation for the members to take an active part in organizational activities.

However, the purpose has been not only to identify such characteristics, but also to map development processes in the Nordic region and in particular the relationship between political parties, bureaucracy, and organizations associated with civil society. The expansion of associations in the Nordic countries seems to have been underpinned by a rather well-developed bureaucratic infrastructure and an emerging balance, first between associational and bureaucratic leadership and later a more balanced relationship between politics and associations. One may still ask whether and under what circumstances bureaucratization in associational life and in state affairs may have produced a "leaderless democracy", where the definition of purpose is to a larger degree left to "passive" bureaucrats as in Weber's Germany. As an alternative, we may perhaps argue that the Nordic people's movement and civil servant tradition opened up a more distributed model of politics and leadership which make a better fit with democratic and liberal ideals than the German case. After all, it may rather be these distributed infrastructures of governance associated with Nordic civil society that have made it possible for the Nordic nation-states to avoid the same kind of democratic decline as seen in many other parts of the world, so far at least. Future research may have to address some of the challenges emerging from more recent developments.

Topics for Future Research

In a Weberian perspective we have asked what was and is the impact of changing organizational structures on the personality structures and promotion patterns in and from voluntary organizations. Several research topics follow from this perspective. To what extent do we see the rise of a new civil society elite with stronger ties to other societal elites, and less representative of and less oriented towards their own grassroots?[81] To what extent does modern associational life facilitate the kind of ethics we associate with vocation of office versus the more self-interested behavior imagined in the public-choice kind of analysis, for instance?

Nordic voluntarism faces new challenges from digitalization and a decline in the number of associations with a membership structure and which are organized beyond the local level. There is currently a strong impact of right-wing populism in the Nordic countries as well. In some areas, like Swedish schools, there has been a strong trend towards outsourcing to for-profits rather than non-profits and "free schools", as is more common in Denmark. In some spheres, we see increased criticism of voluntary organizations and cooperatives for having become too top-heavy and bureaucratic. Governments are also accused of not respecting the logic of voluntarism as they are asking voluntary organizations to participate in competitive bidding or as they intervene even more directly in the voluntary sphere with the aim of transforming it rather than cooperating with it.[82]

The strength of a Weberian perspective is that it opens both critical and affirmative perspectives on the ongoing bureaucratization of civil society and the changing roles of associations. In a critical perspective, it is the weakening of members' influence and active participation in organizational affairs, goal displacement, mission drift, etc. that is highlighted. In a more affirmative perspective, it is the idea of an administrative and coordinating strata as a precondition for associational autonomy and influence that is accentuated. Furthermore, whereas it has been commonplace for international scholars to assume that civil society is in continuous opposition to states and bureaucracy, scholars in the Nordic region have been more keen to underline the mutual beneficial relationship between state bureaucracy and voluntary associations.[83]

According to the Swedish sociologist Gøran Ahrne, "The notion of civil society cannot be grasped inside any special type of organization—only in the interaction between a multitude of organizational forms".[84] In the Nordic countries there have been many studies of such relationships and particularly the relationship of associations to the state. The term neo-corporatism or corporate pluralism has been used to characterize the interaction between civil-society organizations and states.[85]

However, there is also a need to explore further the impact of different combinations of organizational forms, and the historical impact of religion on such relations and forms. Weber's distinction between sect-like and church-like organizations is perhaps less relevant in assumedly secularized societies. Other governance modes and organizational forms related to civil society, like associative governance, cooperatives, housing associations, unions, and collegial and craft leadership may warrant further investigation. The main question is not how strong

the civil society will be in the Nordic region in the future, but rather what kind of civil society will exist.

Notes

1 Engelstad and Larsen, "Nordic Civil Spheres," Enjolras and Strømsnes, "The Transformation of the Scandinavian Voluntary Sector."
2 Ertman, "Democracy and Dictatorship."
3 Weber, *Gesammelte aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, 84–85.
4 Scaff, *Weber in America*.
5 There is literature on religion and welfare states, however. It may be argued that Weberian bureaucracy was an important precondition for welfare states, particularly in the universalist variant. Kersbergen et al., *Religion, Class Coalitions*, find that reformed Protestantism delayed the development of welfare states, while Lutheranism contributed to their early development.
6 Ertman, "Democracy and Dictatorship," Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*.
7 Fukuyama, *Political Order and Political Decay*.
8 Rothstein, *Quality of Government*.
9 Du Gay, *In Praise of Bureaucracy*.
10 Drechsler, "Good Bureaucracy."
11 Adler, *The 99% Economy*.
12 Kalberg, *Max Weber's Sociology of Civilizations*, 356, Weber, *Economy and Society*, 991.
13 Gouldner, *Patterns*, 2.
14 Scott and Davis, *Organizations*.
15 "Iron cage" was in translation by Talcott Parsons. In Weber's original formulation the term was *stahlhartes Gehäuse* (steel-hard casing), which indicates that bureaucracy is a burden that is difficult to escape from, rather than a cage where you are trapped forever.
16 Weber, "Politics as Vocation."
17 Weber, "Politics as Vocation."
18 Nelson, *Lutheranism*.
19 Rokkan, *Citizens*.
20 Knudsen, *Fra Enevælde*, 52.
21 Nelson, *Lutheranism*, 20.
22 Nelson, *Lutheranism*, 46.
23 Jensen, "The Building of the Scandinavian States."
24 Jensen, "The Building of the Scandinavian States."
25 Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*.
26 For a discussion of the reasons Weber may have had for contrasting the role of religion in modern Germany and in UK and the USA, see Gawthrop, "Lutheran Pietism," who finds his contrasting of Calvinism and Protestantism inadequate (p. 245). The contrast between the behavior of different kinds of Protestants in the two countries should not only depend on whether they subscribed to the idea of predestination or not. As well, there were contextual reasons why British Protestants would become capitalist entrepreneurs whereas the Germans with similar beliefs would be more oriented towards state service.
27 Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*.
28 Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 163.
29 Ertman, *Birth of the Leviathan*, 61.
30 Ertman, "Democracy and Dictatorship."

31 Kim, *Politics*.
32 Kim, *Politics*.
33 As pointed out by Nelson, *Lutheranism*, 133, Weber has confused the matter by using the word Protestantism in order to describe both the Calvinist and the Lutheran ethic. After all, Weber's distinction between Calvinism and Lutheranism is based mainly on a comparison of German Lutheranism and Calvinism.
34 Furset, *Religious Movements*, 40–44.
35 Dawson, "Church-Sect-Cult."
36 Kim, *Politics*, 75. Weber, *Gesammelte aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, 211.
37 Kim, *Politics*.
38 Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft*, 1887/1963.
39 Kim, *Politics*, 68.
40 Kim, *Politics*.
41 Ertman, *Leviathan*, 27.
42 For a similar argument see recent debates referring to "uncivil civil society", Berman "Revisiting Civil Society".
43 Kim, *Politics*, 93.
44 Weber, *Soziologie und Socialpolitik*, 442.
45 Kim, *Politics*, 153.
46 Ertman, "Democracy and Dictatorship."
47 For texts including Italy, see Berman, *The primacy of politics* and Riley, "Civic Associations." Another example of civil society movements in support of authoritarianism is Bolsonarism in Brasil, see McKenna "Taxes and Tithes."
48 Jonassen, "The Protestant Ethic," Dørum and Sødal, "Hans Nielsen Hauge," 156, Sanders, *Bondevækkelse*.
49 Jonassen, "The Protestant Ethic," 30.
50 "The Haugians emerged as politicians, entrepreneurs and religious leaders with strong emphasis on the connection between faith and works." (Dørum and Sødal, "Hans Nielsen Hauge," 156.)
51 Witoszek and Sørensen, "Nordic Humanism," 40.
52 Dørum and Sødal, "Hans Nielsen Hauge," 156, Gundersen, *Haugianerne*.
53 Sanders, *Bondevekkelse*, 97.
54 Elstad, "Trygve Riiser Gundersen."
55 Hall and Korsgaard, "Introduction."
56 Kaspersen and Sevelsted, "The 'Long History'," 59.
57 Witoszek and Sørensen, "Nordic Humanism," 41.
58 Raaum, "Frivillige organisasjoner."
59 Johansen, *Komme til orde*, 598.
60 Thue, "Lutheranism from Above," 543.
61 Furseth, *A Comparative Study*, 432.
62 Sevelsted, "Governing Morality," 85.
63 Sevelsted, "Governing Morality," 85.
64 Engelstad and Larsen, "Nordic Civil Spheres."
65 Vike et al., "Reconceptualizing States."
66 Byrkjeflot, "A Nordic Model of Associative Governance."
67 Jepperson, "Political Modernities;" Rokkan, "The Growth and Structuring of Mass Politics."
68 Vike et al., "Reconceptualizing States," 16.

69 Berggren and Trägårdh, *The Swedish Theory of Love*, have argued that the rise of the welfare state in Sweden was providing support for "statist individualism" in the Nordic countries.
70 Nielsen, *Bonde, Stat*.
71 Brink-Lund, Byrkjeflot, and Sørensen, *Associative Governance*.
72 Stenius, *Nordic Associational Life*.
73 Grønlie, "Fra velferdskommune til velferdsstat"
74 Arnesen, "Nonprofit Advocacy Reconfigured?"
75 Wollebæk and Selle, "Participation and Social Capital Formation."
76 Vike et al., "Reconceptualizing States."
77 Arnesen, "Nonprofit Advocacy Reconfigured?" Ahrne and Brunsson, *Meta-organizations*.
78 Vike et al., "Reconceptualizing States," 13.
79 Papakostas, *Civilizing the Public Sphere*.
80 Seip, *Utsikt over Norges historie*, Slagstad, *De nasjonale strateger*, Knudsen, *Fra Enevælde*.
81 Scaramuzzino, "Peception of Societal Influence."
82 Brandsen et al., "The State and the Reconstruction."
83 See also Sand's contribution to this volume.
84 Ahrne, "Civil Society," 120.
85 Streeck and Kenworthy, "Neocorporatism", Rokkan, "Norway: Numerical Democracy."

Bibliography

Adler, Paul S. *The 99% Economy: How Democratic Socialism Can Overcome the Crises of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Ahrne, Gøran. "Civil Society and Civil Organizations." *Organization* 3(1) (1996): 109–20.

Ahrne, Gøran, and Nils Brunsson. *Meta-Organizations*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2008.

Arnesen, Daniel. "Nonprofit Advocacy Reconfigured? Resource Mobilization, Political Opportunity and Organizational Change." PhD dissertation, University of Oslo, 2019.

Berggren, Henrik, and Trägårdh, Lars. *The Swedish Theory of Love: Individualism and Social Trust in Modern Sweden*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2022.

Berman, Sheri. "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic." *World Politics* 49(3) (1997): 401−29.

———. "Re-Integrating the Study of Civil Society and the State." In *Is Democracy Exportable?*, edited by Zoltan Barany and Robert G. Moser, 37−56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. *The Primacy of Politics: Social Democracy and the Making of Europe's Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

———. "Revisiting Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic." *Histphil* (13 May 2021) https://histphil.org/2021/05/13/revisiting-civil-society-and-the-collapse-of-the-weimar-republic/ (accessed 1 July 2024).

Brandsen, Taco, Willem Trommel, and Bram Verschuere. "The State and the Reconstruction of Civil Society." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83(4) (2017): 676−93.

Brink-Lund, Anker, Haldor Byrkjeflot, and Søren Christensen, eds. *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by Combining Together*. London: Routledge, 2024.

Byrkjeflot, Haldor. "A Nordic Model of Associative Governance." In *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by Combining Together*, edited by Anker Brink-Lund, Haldor Byrkjeflot, and Søren Christensen, 23−56. London: Routledge, 2024.

Dawson, Lorne L. “Church-Sect-Cult: Constructing Typologies of Religious Groups.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by P. B. Clarke, 525–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dørum, Knut, and Helje K. Sødal. “Hans Nielsen Hauge som samfunnsfornyer: Teologiske begrunnelser.” *Historisk tidsskrift* 2 (2023): 143−57.

Drechsler, Wolfgang. “Good Bureaucracy: Max Weber and Public Administration Today.” *Max Weber Studies* 20(2) (2020): 219−24.

du Gay, Paul. *In Praise of Bureaucracy: Weber, Organisation, Ethics*. London: Sage, 2000.

Elstad, Hallgeir. “Trygve Riiser Gundersen: Haugianerne. Enevelde og undergrunn.” *Kirke og Kultur* 127(4) (2022): 390−94.

Engelstad, Fredrik, and Håkon Larsen. “Nordic Civil Spheres and Pro-Civil States.” In *The Nordic Civil Sphere*, edited by J. C. Alexander, A. Lund, and A. Voyer, 39−63. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2020.

Enjolras, Bernard, and Kristin Strømsnes. “The Transformation of the Scandinavian Voluntary Sector.” In *Scandinavian Civil Society and Social Transformations*, edited by Bernard Enjolras and Kristin Strømsnes, 1−24. Cham: Springer, 2018.

Ertman, Thomas. *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. “Democracy and Dictatorship in Interwar Western Europe Revisited.” *World Politics* 50(3) (1998): 475−505.

Fukuyama, Francis. *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. New York: Macmillan, 2014.

Furseth, Inger. *A Comparative Study of Social and Religious Movements in Norway, 1780s–1905*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

Gawthrop, Richard L. “Lutheran Pietism and the Weber Thesis.” *German Studies Review* 12(2) (1989): 237−47.

Gorski, Philip. *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1954.

Grønlie, Tore. “Fra velferdskommune til velferdsstat–hundre års velferdsvekst fra lokalisme til statsdominans.” *Historisk tidsskrift* 83(4) (2004): 633–49.

Gundersen, Trygve R. *Haugianerne: Enevelde og undergrunn. I: 1795–1799*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2022.

Hall, John, and Ove Korsgaard. “Introduction.” In *Building the Nation: NFS Grundtvig and Danish National Identity*, edited by John Hall, Ove Korsgaard, and O. K. Pedersen, 3–28. Montréal: McGill-Queen’s Press-MQUP, 2015.

Jensen, Mette. F. “The Building of the Scandinavian States: Establishing Weberian Bureaucracy and Curbing Corruption from the Mid-Seventeenth to the end of the Nineteenth Century.” In *Bureaucracy and Society in Transition*, edited by H. Byrkjeflot and F. Engelstad, 179−203. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited, 2018.

Jepperson, Roald. L. “Political Modernities: Disentangling Two Underlying Dimensions of Institutional Differentiation.” *Sociological Theory* 20(1) (2002): 61−85.

Johansen, Anders. *Komme til orde: Politisk kommunikasjon 1814−1913*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2019.

Jonassen, Christen C. “The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism in Norway.” *American Sociological Review* 12(6) (1947): 676−86.

Kalberg, Stephen. *Max Weber’s Sociology of Civilizations: A Reconstruction*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Kaspersen, Lars Bo, and Anders Sevelsted. "The 'Long History' of Civil Society in Denmark and Western Europe: Civil Society – In the Shadow of the State (Eighteenth to the Twenty-First Century)." In *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*, edited by Liv Egholm and Lars Bo Kaspersen, 48−69. London: Routledge, 2020.

Kersbergen, Kees Van, and Philip Manow, eds. *Religion, Class Coalitions, and Welfare States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Kim, Sung Ho. "'In Affirming Them, He Affirms Himself:' Max Weber's Politics of Civil Society." *Political Theory* 28(2) (2000): 197−229.

———. "Max Weber and Civil Society: An Introduction to Max Weber on Voluntary Associational Life (Vereinswesen)." *Max Weber Studies* 2(2) (2002): 186−98.

———. *Max Weber's Politics of Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Knudsen, Tim. *Fra enevælde til folkestyre. Dansk demokratihistorie indtil 1973*. København: Akademisk Forlag, 2006.

———. *Fra folkestyre til markedsdemokrati*. København: Lindhardt og Ringhof, 2013.

McKenna, Liz. "Taxes and Tithes: The Organizational Foundations of Bolsonarismo." *International Sociology* 35(6) (2020): 610−31.

Nelson, Robert H. *Lutheranism and the Nordic Spirit of Social Democracy: A Different Protestant Ethic*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2017.

Nielsen, Nils K. *Bonde, stat og hjem: nordisk demokrati og nationalisme − fra pietismen til 2. verdenskrig*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2009.

Papakostas, Apostolis. *Civilizing the Public Sphere: Distrust, Trust and Corruption*. London: Springer, 2016.

Raaum, Johan. "De frivillige organisasjonenes framvekst og utvikling i Norge." *Frivillige organisasjoner NOU 1988:17*, 239−355. Oslo: Statens trykningskontor, 1988.

Riley, Dylan. "Civic Associations and Authoritarian Regimes in Interwar Europe: Italy and Spain in Comparative Perspective." *American Sociological Review* 70(2) (2005): 288–310.

Rokkan, Stein. "Norway: Numerical Democracy and Corporate Pluralism." In *Political Opposition in Western Democracies*, edited by Robert A. Dahl, 70−115. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

———. *Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of the Processes of Development*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1970.

———. "The Growth and Structuring of Mass Politics." In *Nordic Democracy*, edited by E. Allardt et al., 53−79. Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab, 1981.

Rothstein, Bo. *The Quality of Government: Corruption, Social Trust, and Inequality in International Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Sanders, Hanne. *Bondevekkelse og sekularisering: En protestantisk folkelig kultur i Danmark og Sverige 1820−1850*. Stockholm: Museum Tusculanum, 1995.

———. "Religious Revivalism in Sweden and Denmark." In *Building the Nation: NFS Grundtvig and Danish National Identity*, edited by J. A. Hall, O. Korsgaard, and O. K. Pedersen, 97−100. Montréal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2014.

Scaff, Lawrence A. *Max Weber in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Scaramuzzino, Roberto. "Perception of Societal Influence among Civil Society Leaders – An Elite Perspective." *Journal of Civil Society* 16(2) (2020): 174−90.

Scott, W. Richard, and Gerald F. Davis. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2015.

Seip, Jens Arup. *Utsikt over Norges historie*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1997.

Sevelsted, Anders. "Governing Morality: The Role of Intermediary Elites in Associative Governance of Religious Revivals in Scandinavia." In *Associative Governance in*

Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by Combining Together, edited by Anker Brink Lund, H. Byrkjeflot, and S. Christensen, 57−89. London: Routledge, 2024.

Slagstad, Rune. *De nasjonale strateger*. Oslo: Pax, 1998.

Streeck, Wolfgang, and Lane Kenworthy. "Theories and Practices of Neocorporatism." In *The Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert R. Alford, Alexander M. Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz, 441–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Thue, Fredrik W. "Lutheranism from Above and from Below: Pastoral Professionals and Trust Within the Nordic State/Society Nexus." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 33 (2020): 530–45.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der Reine Soziologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1887/1963.

Vike, Halvard, Annette Fagertun, and Heidi Haukelien. "Reconceptualizing States and Welfare in the North of Europe and Beyond." *Nordic Journal of Wellbeing and Sustainable Welfare Development* 1(1) (2022): 6−20.

Weber, Max. *Gesammelte aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* (Vol. 1). Tübingen: Mohr, 1920.

———. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik*, edited by Marianne Weber. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1924.

———. "Politics as Vocation." In *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited and translated by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77−128. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

———. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Weber, Max, and C. Loader, "'Churches' and 'Sects' in North America: An Ecclesiastical Socio-Political Sketch." *Sociological Theory* 3(1) (1985): 7−13.

Witoszek, Nina, and Øystein Sørensen. "Nordic Humanism as a Driver of the Welfare Society." In *Sustainable Modernity: The Nordic Model and Beyond*, edited by Nina Witoszek and Atle Midttun, 36−58. London: Taylor & Francis, 2018.

Wollebæk, Dag, and Per Selle. "Participation and Social Capital Formation: Norway in a Comparative Perspective." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 26(1) (2003): 67−91.

3 Nordic Civil Society through Changes of New Technologies and Knowledge Society

How is the Function of Civil Society Affected?

Inger-Johanne Sand

Introduction: Has the Role of Civil Society changed in Knowledge and Risk Society?

Modern democratic constitutional and welfare states depend not only on how each sector or each function or service in society is organized specifically, but equally important is the general constitutional organization and the interaction, communication and mutual dependencies between the different sectors and functions in society. That is: between state, market, and civil society actors and citizens, and how these functions are defined. State authorities and economic markets are more specifically and precisely defined in terms of their functions. With its more flexible and changeable tasks and structures, civil society institutions may be particularly sensitive to interaction with other institutions. Civil society has over time emerged in different formations in different states and regions. The most general definition of civil society in modern society may be that it is the *common public sphere and the social interaction and communication between the various institutions in society*.[1] This would include the open and free communication in society by citizens and the existence of voluntary and autonomous organizations between and outside of state authorities and markets. Civil society is on many dimensions crucial for both the conditions and the core of democratic communication. It will be argued here that it is vital for the continuous evolution of new knowledge, technologies, and innovation. The critical and pluralistic qualities of freedom of expression may be significant for risk analysis and ethical assessments of new technologies.[2]

Civil society institutions may be organized primarily as autonomous activities, or they may be closely interacting with state, municipal, or corporate institutions. They may be voluntary organizations or professionally based. Over the last two hundred years modern society has changed comprehensively and systematically, including socially, politically, economically, culturally, and technologically with significant consequences for how civil society as well as state and market institutions are organized, as well as how they function, including how their values

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-4
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

and ethical codes are affected. Questions need to be asked as to what effects these changes have had on the functions and the role of civil society, and on the standing of the values it represents.[3] On the one hand, the open public sphere and its free communication as the core of civil society are still seen to have a strong position in society. On the other hand, several activities which are crucial parts of the practices of civil society have been significantly affected by changes such as the increasing specialization of knowledge, new information and digital technologies governing our communication, standards for more economically effective markets, a professionalization of politics, and more instrumental forms of government. Several societal infrastructures and public and social services, which can be described as boundary institutions between public authorities and civil society, are increasingly specialized and professionalized. Questions may arise if this means that they are tentatively moving away from the civil society boundary sphere and becoming increasingly influenced by the more systematic and instrumentally organized sectors of state and markets.

State authorities and market-based organizations have generally been seen as having stronger and more specific logics and organizational forms. Civil society functions are historically expressed in more variable forms, with softer logics and more diverse functions. It has been defined theoretically in different ways. On the one hand, civil society can be seen as having the function of being the sphere for an open interaction and communication in society without preconceived goals and instrumental standards. The open function of civil society has been seen as vital for the further evolution of modern society. On the other hand, civil society can be seen as primarily having a critical and ethically evaluating function towards state and market authorities. State authorities and market organizations can be seen as more instrumental, whereas civil society organizations can be viewed as more social and communicative. A third view would be to emphasize the necessity of combining the two.

In Nordic societies there has been a strong tradition of civil society institutions as part of society and interacting with state and market institutions. Historically, social and health services have been vital parts of civil society organizations in the Nordic region.[4] Taking care of the poorest, of those who are unable to take care of themselves, and of persons with serious health problems has been performed by a variety of different actors in the Nordic region including families, voluntary organizations, foundations, local communities, local and regional authorities, private corporations, etc. Social and health services for those who need them have arguably been seen as a general responsibility in society including civil society organizations.[5] Social welfare and some forms of social equality have been a relatively high priority in the Nordic states during the age of modernity, even if there are many exceptions. It has been seen as part of the preconditions of the realization of democratic and participatory values and institutions by several political and civil society actors. Comparisons with other European states and regions are, however, difficult to make due to a number of socio-economic and cultural differences.

In the following, there will first be a section on various theories and definitions of civil society in international and Nordic political and sociological theory and

then short comments on some examples of the potential changes of societal infrastructures of modern society which may be associated with civil society, as well as with state authorities and market organizations in the case of Norway. The hypothesis will be that it may have become more difficult to distinguish between civil society, state authorities, and market institutions in some areas, and that their close interaction may challenge the autonomy of the values of civil society and thus the protection of its core. Obviously, such analysis is complex and depends on our interpretation of both historical and current institutions and the concepts used to describe them. There may be different interpretations of such institutions and their functions. The main point in this analysis will be to raise some questions regarding the status of civil society at various stages of modernity, and what the consequences may be of an increasing specialization and professionalization of vital societal infrastructures, and of an increasing interaction between state, markets, and civil society institutions, to the possible detriment of more autonomous civil society institutions. It will be suggested that Niklas Luhmann's theories of social and functional differentiation may be better suited to analyzing parts of this institutional change, rather than focusing on the trias of state, markets, and civil society.[6]

Political Theories of the Trias of Civil Society, State and Markets

The trias of "state, market, and civil society" has been used for the main categories or ideal types of the organization of modern society.[7] They are key characteristics of the combination of evolution, dynamics, and stabilization of modern societies through the organization of society. The concepts may have been used previously, but in this context, the focus is on the organization of modern society post-1800. "Civil society" has been defined variously by different authors and has referred to a variety of institutional and social formations in different contexts in space and time. In a paradigmatic book, *Civil Society and Political Theory* (1992), Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato give a comprehensive overview and in-depth analysis of political theories of civil society in modernity and in particular on its democratic effects and consequences.[8] Cohen and Arato refer to civil society as "the space for free communication and social interaction" by a variety of actors between the institutions of state and market which are more formalized organizations with specific logics.[9] Generally, civil society is associated with the social space where the freedom of expression, assembly, and organization is secured for the citizens and the various associations they create, and which is not the state authorities or commercial markets. Civil society include social movements, voluntary associations, and various forms of political communication, etc. Cohen and Arato define civil society as "a sphere of social interaction" which is not market based and not part of state authorities' practices.[10] It consists of a variety of different actors and their institutions. Civil society institutions and their practices are obviously vital as underlying social preconditions for the functioning of both formal and more informal democratic institutions and procedures. Critique and open political

discussions in formal and informal fora are hugely influential regarding the actual functioning of formal and informal democratic procedures.

The particular position of political communication in civil society is referred to as unconstrained, open, and informal and as being in contrast to the role of communication in political parties when participating in constitutional elections and in parliaments and government which are part of state authorities. Political communication in modern societies can thus at the same time be: (1) open, informal communication, (2) political communication closely linked to state authorities, and (3) critique of state authorities. All three are vital functions in modern society. The dilemmas of the differences between the various functions of social and political communication referred to above is a vital part of the discussions of what the function of civil society is in current society, and how different institutions can be placed in relation to state, markets, and civil society. Theoretically there is also a juxtaposition between emphasizing the autonomous qualities of civil society with its protection of freedom of rights, and on the other hand of seeing civil society as a more open and interactive public sphere with linkage institutions to state and market-based organizations. It is further proposed that some institutions and organizations can be defined as societal infrastructures and thus as boundary institutions between the main social sectors.[11]

The differentiation of and distinction between state, markets, and civil society and their respective institutions is a vital part of the definition of modernity. The interaction between the three with mutual influences, irritations, and conflicts may be the most characteristic and decisive parts of the dynamics of modern society. Some theories may emphasize the "strong" logics of markets and state authorities, and how these may be more dominant than some of the more flexible and vaguer dynamics of civil society.[12] Others may emphasize the comprehensive communicative and social differentiation of all sectors of modern societies and the diversity of civil society institutions which may include strong internal logics of some of the sub-sectors, such as science and mass media, for example. Political communication can be part of both civil society and state institutions, and thus connected to both very informal and formal institutions. Cohen and Arato argue that political parties which are part of parliamentary processes are too involved in the power politics of state authorities to be part of civil society. They should rather be seen as part of a separate political sphere between the state and civil society.[13] Civil society should be kept for the more open and unconstrained political processes without direct access to state authorities. Cohen and Arato further argue that civil society is only a part of the wider category of the social. Civil society should be distinguished from what could be called the sociocultural lifeworld, which is more informal and constantly changing. Civil society, in their view, includes the more organized and structured parts of civil society with associations and organized forms of communication and activities. The authors underline that modern society consists of a variety of institutions which supplement each other, rather than competing in an antagonistic mode.[14] The different communicative functions and democratic procedures contribute with different qualities which interact and are combined and

are thus important for the quality of all. The different institutions of civil society contribute with their qualities to variations of modern societies. Concepts such as plurality, publicity, legality, privacy, and associations have been part of the traditional language of the description of civil society. Categories connected to social movements as parts of civil society were added in the nineteenth century.

Cohen and Arato go on to discuss the different types of critical perspectives of the general theories of civil society: Arendt's theories of public spheres as political, Habermas' theories of the bifurcation of the public, Foucault's genealogy of modern power, and Luhmann's theories of communicative differentiation. In the following, it will be Luhmann's theories on social and communicative differentiation which will mainly be used in the analysis of the evolution of civil society in the Nordic region.

In the article "Models of Public Space", Seyla Benhabib discusses three models or theoretical conceptions of public space within the classical tradition of civil society theory.[15] The first model is focused on an *agonistic or republican* concept of public space as represented by Hanna Arendt. Here the emphasis is on the political exchange of ideas under an umbrella of political universalism among citizens and where citizens participate on an egalitarian and competitive level. This was seen as close to a procedural concept of public space. The political is here distinguished from the social in the meaning of the exchange of self-interest and all economic activities. The second model was the *liberal* with a focus on liberal rights and legitimacy as preconditions for political culture and public space. Arendt refers to Bruce Ackerman as representative of the liberal model.[16] The emphasis here is not only on a substantive notion of politics but also on a procedural model which include legitimacy for the citizens as a necessary part. Even if there may be disagreement about the common good, it is required that the procedures must be reasonable. The problem with this model, in Benhabib's view, might be that it comes too close to define itself by juridical rights and justice, thus being associated with state authority, and less by political ideas and new challenges which would be closer to civil society institutions. In Benhabib's opinion, politics must be open to new situations and challenges in society and to new ideas including renegotiation of existing distributions which would be within the qualities of civil society dynamics.[17] The third model is the Habermasian-inspired *discursive* model.[18] Habermas' starting point may be the liberal model, but the dynamics and complexity of modern society requires a more open mind and an indeterminacy. It is an acceptance that what the common good might be is not straightforward. Citizens will have to apply reflexive and critical modes in order to operate a deliberate form of discursion. Deliberation, creativity, and originality are seen as necessary means to deal with new challenges. These are qualities more associated with civil society actors than by formal state procedures. Participation and democratization are defined in a wide sense to include not only political and formal arenas, but also social and cultural civil society in order to grasp the complexity of modern society.[19] Benhabib argues that democratization is expressed through the growth of autonomous public spheres with participation of citizens.

European Theories on Civil Society and Boundary Institutions

The sectoral theory of society with the trias of state, markets, and civil society implies a status quo and a lack of theoretical instruments to address the consequences for the organization of society of societal and institutional change. From Marx, Weber, and onwards, sociological, political, and institutional theories have emerged with more differentiating and reflective approaches in order to analyze the institutional changes across the societal sectors of state, markets, and civil society, and their interaction. Some of the foremost are Michel Foucault's theories on governance, knowledge, and power, and Niklas Luhmann's theories of social and communicative differentiation which both cut across the traditional boundaries of the social sectors.[20] They both focus on generalized media in modern society such as knowledge/science, power, politics, law, money, education, art, etc., which are functions with substantive contributions in all three social sectors. Science, markets, politics, and law are all societal functions which are applied generally in society across all sectoral and institutional boundaries. They are applied by institutions with both instrumental and non-instrumental purposes.

It will be argued in the following that the core function of civil society as being the free and autonomous communication, which is not part of and disciplined by state authorities or economic markets, can be expressed through both open and non-institutional dynamics and by more organized institutions in civil society and boundary institutions. A general argument to be made here is that boundary institutions between the different social sectors have become increasingly vital parts of society and for the interaction between its different parts. The evolution of new institutions in boundary areas may be seen as part of the processes of social and communicative differentiation in modern society as referred to and developed in Niklas Luhmann's system theory but also related to Foucault's theories on power, genealogy, and governmentality and Bourdieu's theories on fields and different types of capital.[21] There may be different views on the use of the term boundary institutions, and whether they can be best described by their own specific codes, or as being part of or associated with civil society. In this context education, knowledge and science, social movements and political parties, and welfare services will be used as examples and analyzed further.

It will further be argued that focusing on such boundary institutions as part of what civil society is, are particularly important for civil society in the Nordic region and can be used to illustrate vital aspects of its evolution.

Nordic Perspectives on Civil Society

Nordic historians and social scientists have analyzed the evolution and the significance of civil society in the Nordic region in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[22] Several of the qualities which have often been associated with "the Nordic model" are also often referred to in analysis of civil society. Liv Egholm and Lars Bo Kaspersen have edited the book *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds* (2021), where they have emphasized the problems with the combination

of empirical and normative methodology which is often applied to the analysis of civil society, but which also points to the complexity of analyzing social phenomena which are characterized through normative concepts.[23] They have labelled their approach "a processual-relational approach". They explicitly want to avoid using a priori definition of civil society and to be conscious of the impact of the normative concepts on the empirical analysis by infusing the empirical data with normative assumptions. They emphasize a historical perspective and thus the continuous change of institutions and processes of civil society. Civil society public-sphere institutions were vital in the emerging modernity in the nineteenth century but, with increasingly systematic economic, political, and social activities, more specialized organizations have emerged such as social movements, the labour movement, health and welfare institutions, and political parties. They have more specific purposes and more systematic organizations.

Since the 1980s, the interest in civil society has resurfaced in Europe and in the Nordic region.[24] Some of the reasons behind this may be that there have been several structural changes in the organization of modern society, in particular in the use of economic standards and organization, in the increasingly inter- and transnational political and legal cooperation, and in the expansion of the use of new technologies, such as digital and information technologies. There has been an increasing specialization in the different sectors. This includes both public and private sectors and has created new types of institutions and interaction between civil society, state, and markets. Politics, parliamentary legislation, and administrative control are generalized systems and decisions, and they thematize most areas of society. There are increasing numbers of administrative regulations and directorates. The same standards of efficiency and economic theories are applied across borders of highly specialized social and economic areas. Knowledge and technologies as generalized logics are used in all social sectors and across social border lines even if they emerge in highly specialized discourses or technical lingo.

Egholm and Kaspersen argue that the traditional concepts on civil society have been caught in a double bind of, on the one hand, describing an autonomous sector of free communication in society vis-à-vis the state, and the other hand, referring to it as the central social space for ethical communication and critique of the state and its public decisions which implies a normativity.[25] Civil society is given functional tasks of free and autonomous communication, as well as being the location for good values and virtues in society, but outside of the instrumental forms of state and economic power. They argue that this double bind for civil society with the inclusion of normative purposes for taking care of "the good society" conceals a realistic analysis of the effects of social change on the institutions and practices of civil society. The traditional status quo lingo of civil society and its a priori definition as a separate sphere with core functions of free and autonomous communication cannot fully express the institutional changes of civil society and the factual interaction over time between civil society and state institutions. In some of the literature on the Nordic model, these two aspects of an organized modern society are, however, seen as mutually enabling rather than primarily a tension.[26]

It has been argued by the Swedish historian Bo Stråth that civil society institutions have had and still have both a strong role and particular qualities in the Nordic region, and that this has had an influence on the general normative patterns of the organization of society.[27] In the Nordic states, the interaction between state authorities, markets, and civil society may be described as overlapping and closely linked rather than by strict lines of division, autonomy, and hierarchy both regarding the substantive functions and the forms of organization.[28] Pragmatic cooperation, adaptation to historical and societal contexts, and innovation are often seen in Nordic responses to the organization of society. On the one hand, the main values of civil society—freedom of expression, association, and assembly—have been highly appreciated in Nordic societies. On the other hand, autonomous forms of organization to protect these values have not always been chosen. Social rights and liberal rights have more often been combined than juxtaposed in the evolution of Nordic welfare and rule-of-law states. The dilemmas of the optimal combination of such rights and institutional values have been complex in the Nordic region, but are also at the core of the respective societies. It has been pointed to combinations of collectivism and individualization in the social structures and to the roles of schools and participation in society.[29] Nordic societies and their forms of governance are often seen as pragmatic, cooperative, and compromise-oriented rather than distinct, polarized, and ideological.[30] Bo Stråth underlines that Nordic governance should not be seen as consensus oriented. It is open to conflicts between interests in society, but this is solved by making compromises, not by forming consensus.

Francis Sejersted has described the societal change of modernity in his volume on the history of Sweden and Norway in the twentieth century as relying on four dimensions.[31] First, there is the liberation of individuals and their political rights leading step-by-step to more democratic rights and to fundamental changes in political institutions in civil society. Second, there are the economic and technological changes leading to industrialization, urbanization, and more effective markets. Third, there is the increasing differentiation of society into specialized and systematic functions such as politics, economics, science, culture, aesthetics, etc. Many of these relate to both civil society and state authorities, as well as to markets. They create a significant diversity in society normatively and cognitively. Fourth, the nation-state as a basic organizational form was strengthened.

Sejersted argues in this volume that mixed economy, mixed administration and social democratic political movements were crucial characteristics of Nordic societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, particularly in Sweden and Norway. These are not necessarily in contradiction to more autonomous rule-of-law and civil society organizations, but there may be conflicting goals on a governmental level.

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have seen significant changes in civil society practices as well as in state and market institutions. This has continued in the first part of the twenty-first century. Many of these changes are related to the expansion of knowledge and the increasing specialization in a wide range of social areas with new technologies as a result. Social infrastructures and services are run with stricter demands for efficiency, higher standards, instrumental and general goals, etc. A hypothesis arising from this may be that practices and

institutions which had previously been seen as part of civil society, have become more professionalized and instrumental and may now be closer to state authorities and market organizations. One question which needs to be asked is whether civil society as a normative and vital part of society is changing, and how this can be assessed empirically and normatively.

Consequences of New Technologies

Another aspect of the current role of civil society in the Nordic region is the effects of the use of new technologies and the increasing specialization and instrumentalization of the organization of the public sector and the public sphere. Throughout modernity there have been significant changes in the substance, technologies, and organization of the activities which have been part of civil society, state authorities, and markets. The public space functions differently with the internet and digital technologies. New technologies are developed and applied by highly commercial transnational corporations. Social movements have been transformed to political parties which take responsibility in state authorities. The social and educational sectors have expanded continuously and become fully comprehensive in the Nordic states. Both political communication and societal services, which previously may have been regarded as activities and dynamics in civil society, and which have often been informally organized, have increasingly become part of generalized and systematic infrastructures in modern society, and consequently also part of an expanding knowledge-based, professional, and instrumental society. Systematic and instrumental forms of public and private organizational patterns may have been used. Open and vague forms of organization have been left for more instrumental and standardized forms in order to adapt to new technologies. At the same time, the open and free communication in culture, art, politics, scientific research, mass media, ethical evaluations, etc. which have been the crucial aspect of civil society, is still seen as a vital value and an enabler of the systematic and instrumental generalized communicative systems of modernity such as science, politics, law, and ethics. The substantive activities and forms of communication in politics, law, science, etc. depend on both free and informal spheres of communication and on highly organized, systematic, and instrumental institutions. It may, however, be increasingly difficult to distinguish clearly between what is part of the free and open communication in civil society, and what is part of the more instrumental forms of communication in state and market institutions when knowledge-based discourses are the dominant element in a specific area.[32] The increasing specialization of many social areas may have started in civil society institutions, but end up contributing to more systematic and instrumental forms of communication. Social tasks may move from civil society to the more instrumental state and market organization.

The questions which may be asked here are whether the triad of civil society, state, and markets are still the best suited to describe the range of activities and forms of organization in modern society, or whether it is too simplified and concealing the characteristics of the organizations rather than exposing them.

Another question is whether in the twenty-first century we still have a civil society in the same sense as in the nineteenth century, or whether civil society activities have been too comprehensively changed by new technologies and by transnational markets. Is the open and free communication of civil society still characterized by freedom of expression, or has it become more predominantly influenced by highly specialized knowledge-regimes, new technologies, and their demands of instrumental and standardized goals?[33] One may argue that several institutions of education, knowledge production, public communication, etc. need to be described as both open and deliberative in search of truth or critique, and at the same time highly standardized and instrumental in their communication. A question to be asked might be whether civil society has become so diversified in its tasks that the theories of communicative differentiation in modern societies deliver a better description and analysis of what that sector is than "the trias".[34] One dilemma in the analysis over time of civil society is the combination of descriptive and normative analysis which is coined in the concept of "civil society". The activities, services, etc. which are part of civil society will obviously change empirically, but it is a much more complex task to analyze whether and how its values and norms change respectively. What the good and urgent qualities of a public sphere with freedom of expression and assembly are, will be influenced by other factual and normative changes and by the changing interpretation of our basic values.[35] There are clearly diverse views regarding how a free and open public sphere can exist under the new conditions of internet communication, digitalization, and artificial intelligence with its more standardized forms.

By including organizations which are also part of state authorities and economic systems in the analysis, we get a broader and more realistic view of the contributions of civil society in modern society. In the following, some examples of the interaction between civil society, state authority, and market logics and forms of organization from the history of Norway will be discussed.

Political Parties: State or Civil Society

Democratic states can be seen as paradoxical institutions. They enable and protect the freedom of citizens, on the one hand, and establish state authorities with legal competences including the right to use force in the implementation of their legislation on the other. Nation-state legislation, police protection, judicial courts, etc. enable the expression and practices of the freedom of citizens, but also define the limits of the practices of freedom. There are several institutional linkages between the freedom of citizens and the state authorities which contribute to the ordering and stabilizing of the relations between civil society and the state.[36] Democratic elections with the freedom to vote and of expression are one. Political parties are another. Political parties are formed voluntarily by citizens in order to express their political views and work for their interests. Their function in democratic states is to enable the freedom of expression, but in organized ways. In this sense they are part of the organizations of civil society. They are at the same time, and some would argue most importantly, vital parts of the infrastructure before and during

democratic elections. The elected members of parliaments and municipal councils are both citizens and part of civil society, and at the same time part of state and municipal authorities, but in different capacities.

Democratic elections are linkages between civil society and the state. When politicians participate in decision-making in the parliament, government, or municipal political board, they take part in the constitutional and legally based responsibility of those institutions.

Constitutions are agreements among citizens to create a state and may be seen as a *structural coupling* between the citizens and the state. Constitutions include the status of citizens, their basic freedom rights, their election rights, and the authorities of the state with their mandates and competences. Constitutions are documents mandated by the citizens originally and over time by participation in elections and referenda. At the same time, the constitutions authorize state authorities to legislate, make executive decisions, and adjudicate on the rights and duties of citizens. State authorities are elected by the citizens but can also be used against them when there is a legal basis for this. Democratic constitutions can be seen as both authoritative state documents and as permeable borderlands securing both the authority of the state and the rights of citizens. The distinction between civil society and state authorities is a defining part of democratic and liberal constitutions, but the two parts are also closely linked and interdependent. Political parties and democratic elections can be seen as examples of the close interaction and interdependence between citizens in civil society and state authorities. Political parties in liberal constitutional democracies are in general member-based and ideally parts of a civil society, but there may be significant variations in how this is organized and practiced. Party organizations may become increasingly powerful on their own and threaten democratic and transparent internal procedures. They may dominate decisions on access to information on crucial issues, and how decision-making on political programs is organized. In the Nordic countries, member-based organization of political parties is still generally seen as vital and defining for what a political party is. Internal democratic procedures, transparency, large yearly assemblies, decision-making on political programs and regulations for the election of leaders, committees as well as the candidates for parliamentary and municipal elections are all seen as defining qualities for political parties as parts of civil society. This does not mean that there are not recurring discussions on the use and abuse of power internally. In addition to being financed by membership fees political parties in the Nordic countries are given some economic enumeration from state authorities when being represented in the parliaments. They can also receive funding from private persons or associations conditioned by specific and limiting regulations.

Welfare State or Welfare Society

Historically there have been traditions and practices in the Nordic region for taking care of those who cannot take care of themselves by the extended family, municipalities, the church, and voluntary organizations—all part of civil society.[37] In Norway there has been a historical tradition of a duty to participate in society, to

take care of oneself, and of a duty to help. This can be seen as part of norms and traditions of a functioning civil society. The poor had rights, but also duties to participate in work as far as possible. A new law on poverty was passed by the Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget) in 1845 as the first more comprehensive legislation in this area. It was the result of discussions on the "poverty question" and who should have the main responsibility for the measures. The conclusion included the participation of several actors, but it was agreed that it was necessary with a legislation framework and public financial measures in order to secure the general public responsibility. With the legislation by Stortinget on the rights of the poor, there emerges more extensive interaction between state authorities and civil society practices. The running of social welfare or health institutions could still be left to private or voluntary organizations.[38]

Poverty and groups of homeless persons or persons without work were seen as societal problems which had to be solved on a societal level and on a generalized basis.[39] In the nineteenth century, this would have meant the participation of state authorities, not just civil society. This was particularly emphasized regarding the responsibility for the protection of children. They were not only private problems and could not be delegated to be solved only by voluntary organizations or private families. Children and their conditions were increasingly seen as the responsibility of society and thus of state authorities. Begging was forbidden, but interventions in the private sphere of citizens was regarded with scepticism. "The public persona" with responsibility for her life was one of the ideals of the time, but the realization that not everyone could manage that, and that poverty was a significant social problem, led to emphasizing state and municipal responsibility for social welfare.[40] There was also a duty of mutual care within families. Voluntary organizations were still included as vital parts of the practice of welfare measures.

In the transformation of society from a farmers-society to an industrialized age, different social and political movements and labour unions emerged to play vital roles. In Norway, both the Haugianer movement (1796–1804) and the Thrane movement (1849–55) were examples of radical social and political movements in civil society.[41] The poverty question gathered political attention and led to unrest. The Thrane movement gathered up to 30,000 members and resulted in continued work in Stortinget for improved social reforms.[42] A new commission on poverty was appointed in 1853, and a new law on poverty was passed in 1863.[43] A combination of a legislative and state framework with a variety of municipal, church, voluntary, and other private participants was continued pragmatically and with consideration to the available resources of the different actors. The dignity of all social groups and equivalent rights gradually became important aspects of all welfare and poverty reforms. The duty of each individual to take care of themselves and to work was part of this, alongside the duty of society and voluntary associations to take of those unable to take care of themselves.[44] There were distinctions between "the deserving and the undeserving" poor. There is a long line of duty to take care of yourself and your closest family in Scandinavian history, including the duty to work. Where the economic responsibility had previously been on families and local communities with help in kind, different types of insurance reforms

were introduced and developed throughout the nineteenth century. Private forms of insurance paid for by employers, employees, or other private parties were supplemented or replaced by public and state-financed insurance forms and a general public economic responsibility for welfare pensions or benefits. State authorities took a general responsibility for welfare benefits particularly regarding the poorest groups and the homeless. Increasingly comprehensive general pension schemes for those working were financed by contributions from the employees, the employers, and the state.

In 1967 a fully comprehensive general pensions act was passed by Stortinget with old age, sickness, disability, etc. becoming public pension rights. The state had now taken on a general responsibility for social welfare. In 2006 a new act on a combined social welfare and labour rights regime, and a common directorate to administrate it, was passed. Voluntary organizations continued their work, but primarily as service producers for the sick, elderly, disabled, homeless, etc. and for running homes for the elderly and other vulnerable groups. The services were mostly bought and financed by state and municipal authorities.

Norway is thus today transformed from a society with a decentralized and mostly privately financed and organized system of welfare services and benefits, prior to the nineteenth century, to a society with a comprehensively covered welfare state financed through taxation and employers' own contributions, but with additional contributions from voluntary and other private organizations. Labour unions and other professional organizations are other actors with influence on how services are run. The various voluntary organizations and the professional may be seen as boundary institutions between the patients and clients, and the responsible state authorities. Legislative decisions may be made by public authorities, but the implementation of services was and is influenced by citizens using the services, volunteers, and professional organizations, all arguably part of civil society rather than the state.[45]

Labour Unions: Between Civil Society, Markets, and State Functions

Labour unions and industrial organizations emerged in order to take care of the interests of the work-life parties. Labour unions became vital expressions of social movements in a large number of countries in the late part of the nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth. They represented the interests of the workers vis-à-vis the employers and the state, and the internal social needs of the workers. They were vital parts of the freedom of expression, assembly and organization which emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It has been argued that they have been at their most successful in the Nordic countries in terms of effects on social equality.[46] The labour unions can be seen as parts of the civil society in the new industrial age. They are self-organizing and have both social and economic goals for their organizations. The labour unions played decisive roles in the improvement of the situation of workers. After long periods of strikes and conflicts and preliminary forms of relevant legal regulations, they reached a General

Agreement with the industrial employers' organizations in 1935 in Norway and in 1938 in Sweden.[47] This included the rights to organize, negotiate, and strike when agreement was not reached on the yearly tariff negotiations. The state authorities accepted the General Agreement as the basis of their further legal regulations on labour law and labour market conflicts. The main rights, duties, procedures, and infrastructure of the General Agreement of 1935 in Norway have been kept as the main normative pattern of labour law both as practiced in the agreements between the parties and in legislation enacted by the Norwegian state authorities. A similar social, economic, and political compromise was struck in Denmark in 1933 under the name of *Kanslergadeforliget*.[48] This was primarily a compromise between three dominant political parties, both social democratic and as representative of farmers' organizations. In Denmark, farmers and farmworkers were at that time more significant parts of the national economy and of political life than in Sweden and Norway. The compromise concerned the role of state initiatives as part of labour negotiations.

Membership in trade unions for the workers and in industrial organizations for the employers is voluntary in the Nordic countries, but the organizations have been given vital roles in the organization of the labour market. They can arguably be seen both as part of civil society and economic markets, but also as a boundary area between civil society, politics, and markets. With the increasingly central and systematic position of labour unions in the labour market, they could also be seen as part of the economic sector.

Schools as Linkage Institutions

Local schools were vital social, cultural, and educational institutions in Norway before modernity. The Protestant Church would often be the organizer in local societies from 1600 onwards. Schools have still been seen as an institution in themselves, as a local resource and arguably as a part of civil society based on their educational autonomy. "Almenn"-schools (for all children) were organized early on compared to many other European countries in the Nordic countries. This has laid the ground for local municipal schools as a core institution and for the participation of several local actors including children, students, parents, and other local resources. Local schools have arguably been an important part of the infrastructure of local civil society with their emerging educational autonomy. Local schools can also be seen as boundary institutions between civil society, state authorities, and markets. State authorities make decisions on framework legislation with values and instrumental goals and on educational programs. From the twenty-first century, this includes participation in international ratings and comparative controls and decisions on what types of information and digital technology and artificial intelligence should be used at the different levels. Technological decision-making has included the removal of books in favour of screens. This brings the educational sector rather far from what we generally define as civil society and more into highly specialized instrumental and technological educational programs.

The Function of Civil Society in Nordic Democracies

Parts of the literature on civil society in political theory emphasizes the liberal function of civil society as a contrast to and different from authoritative and elitist state institutions. The qualities of civil society are seen as existing as principally different from the constitutionally and legally defined institutions with sovereign power. The two have often been seen as contrasting alternatives to each other in political theory, the liberal and freedom protection vs the established powers. There have additionally been differences within the civil society models, between participatory and more elitist models, between freedom and welfare rights, and between communitarianism and individual rights.[49] Civil society has, across these differences, been seen as particularly valuable in its enabling and protection of freedom of speech and the organization and expression of free will and independence from state authorities. In many European ideal-type definitions of civil society, freedom rights and the sense of a common society have been combined.[50] The history of the Nordic region and the emergence of societal formations and increasingly democratic organizations of modernity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including the various formations of civil society, may be understood as equally complex as the differences referred to here and with interaction and mutual dependencies between the organizations in the different sectors of society. There are many examples of overlapping and interacting social and welfare institutions which are part of civil society, market-based insurances, and/or state or municipal authorities.[51] Legal norms as applied and developed by legislative constitutional authorities in modernity may further be seen as structural couplings between the citizens in civil society, social movements, political parties, democratic elections, and state authorities. With the activities of political parties and constitutional parliaments, there are parallel trajectories and interaction between civil society and state institutions in areas such as welfare, health, and education. Civil society has arguably continued to be the "public space" for open public and political discussions where ideas may come from citizens, to be formulated by movements and political parties and finally decided on by state authorities.

The school system and the universities in Norway have been predominantly owned and run by municipalities and the state. The publicly owned schools have, however, been used by organizations in civil society, both sports and culture, and thus have been important overlapping institutions between civil society and the municipalities. This has laid the ground for the local schools as a core institution and for the participation of priests, parents, and other local actors.

Welfare services and benefits have in similar ways gone from being taken care of locally by families or existing municipalities to being objects of public and state legislation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Behind the discussions on public vs private responsibilities, there has been an emphasis on the one hand on the duty of society to help and on the other hand, the duty to work and to be able to take care of yourself. The duty of "society" to help is seen as the duty of both civil society as well as state authorities. In the twentieth century, there is a normative pattern of a general combined municipal and state responsibility to legislate and

to finance through taxation. Still, civil society organizations, citizens, users, and family members have continued to contribute vitally, particularly in welfare services. The welfare staff and professional contributors may be seen as part of market or state organizations as well as of civil society.

Labour unions have been another crucial part of welfare society with their joint economic and social responsibility for their members. They have had varying numbers of members in the Nordic countries, but generally the membership has been comprehensive.

Publishing houses, newspapers, and media organizations have generally been privately and commercially organized, but partly with the specific regulations on the responsibility of editors and journalists, and owners of publishing houses, and state contributions in the form of financing of public service media and financial contribution to small and local newspapers. The specific organizational regulations and duties for newspaper editors, journalists, and publishing house owners have been a crucial part of civil society organization and normative patterns.

"The public sphere" expands and diversifies in the space between the private sphere and the authoritative state. Knowledge-based regimes, new technologies, professional autonomy, labour movements and political parties are all new *dynamics, movements or institutions* which are part of the emerging modernization of society. These are infrastructures and dynamics cutting across the boundaries of the private/public sectors and contributing to developing new types of economic, knowledge-based, technological, or political power in society. The new organizations may be seen as part of civil society, but they may also be part of more systematic and specialized forms of economic or knowledge-based power in society and thus go beyond the previous civil society model of a voluntary sector with autonomous organizations. Modern society relies on a variety of different functions and forms of power exercised in society, but which go beyond the power of state authorities and economic markets. This may be seen as part of "society" or as part of a changing "civil society". New types of institutions are created based on knowledge-regimes or new technologies and developed and often run by professional specialists. They may be used by the state, but the decision-making is based on knowledge or experience, and not primarily state authority or economic logics.[52]

The Nordic countries have developed relations between civil society and state authorities which can be described as overlapping, interacting, and combining rather than contrasting and conflictual. The countries have had long step-by-step democratic trajectories from 1800 to 2000 with few exceptions other than the Second World War with the German invasion affecting the countries in different ways. The state authorities have increasingly been built on citizens' participation in elections and in most activities. Trust has been built step-by-step between citizens, organizations, and state and municipal authorities. Political parties and social movements protesting against state politics have emerged and practiced in civil society but have also taken responsibilities in state authorities and offices. The current knowledge-based and technological innovation society changes many of the previous relations and normative preconditions of civil society and state relations. Many of the technological innovations of particularly the last fifty years

have led to improvement in living conditions, but also to significant "man-made" uncertainties of their consequences. This period has been labelled "risk society".[53] Risk society with its overload of information and digital technologies have led to increasingly complex interactions between science, professional services, state regulators, transnational market actors, and citizens in civil society. It remains to be seen how the technological aspects of risk society will be able to use the resources of civil society institutions, and how civil society reacts to the complexities of risk society.

Conclusion

Modernity is a distinct historical period compared to the previous times. Civil society as a concept, a value, and an institution is one of the defining qualities of modernity. At the same time, it emerges with different institutional qualities historically and regionally. The trias of civil society, state, and markets is useful and to the point for many purposes, but there are societal institutions which are not sufficiently represented by the three. Knowledge, science, education, and technologies are functions in point, even though they are increasingly crucial for the evolution and dynamics of modernity. It has been argued above that other theories of the dynamics of modernity than the theory of the trias could contribute to more nuances in the description of the institutions of modern society. Luhmann's theory of communicative differentiation is one such theory which applies several more social functions in the definition of modernity. Science, education, and law are examples. It could be argued that the qualities of civil society are crucial for these functions, but that they additionally depend on and use state institutions. Knowledge production, education, welfare, and health services are examples of vital practices and functions in modern societies which depend significantly on the continuous interaction between civil society, state institutions, and markets. The increasingly vital dynamics of knowledge production, science, and education is a transnational trend which may contribute to more similar patterns of civil society institutions across regional boundaries even for the Nordic states.

Notes

1 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, "Introduction," and ch. 1.
2 Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Luhmann, "The Modern Sciences."
3 Egholm and Kaspersen, "A Processual-Relational Approach."
4 Stråth, "Nordic Modernity," Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*; Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*.
5 Stråth, "Nordic Modernity," Sejersted S*osialdemokratiets*; Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*.
6 Luhmann, *Risk*.
7 Kosseleck, "*Begriffsgeschichte*;" Braun, Jordheim, and Sandmo, *Verden*; Weber, *Economy and Society*.
8 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*.
9 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, "Introduction," and ch. 1.
10 Cohen and Arato. *Civil Society*, "Preface," ix.
11 Egholm and Kaspersen, "A Processual-Relational Approach," 6–9.

12 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, "Preface," viii–ix.
13 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, ix–x.
14 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, xii–xiii.
15 Benhabib, "Models of Public Space."
16 Ackerman, "Why Dialogue."
17 Benhabib, "Models of Public Space," 83.
18 Benhabib, "Models of Public Space," 85 ff.; Habermas, *The Structural Transformation*.
19 Benhabib, "Models of Public Space," 86.
20 Foucault, *Society must be Defended*; Foucault, "Governmentality," Luhmann, *Social Systems*.
21 Luhmann, *Soziale Systeme*; Foucault, "Governmentality;" Bourdieu and Waqcuant, *An Invitation*.
22 Stråth, "Nordic Modernity," Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*; Egholm and Kaspersen, *Civil Society.*
23 Egholm and Kaspersen, *Civil Society*, 3–30.
24 Egholm and Kaspersen, *Civil Society*, 4.
25 Egholm and Kaspersen, *Civil Society*, 8.
26 See Byrkjeflot's contribution to this volume.
27 Stråth, "Nordic Modernity;" Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*.
28 Brink-Lund et al., eds, *Associative Governance in Scandinavia*, "Introduction."
29 Stråth, "Nordic Modernity."
30 Brink-Lund et al., eds, *Associative Governance in Scandinavia*; Stråth, "Nordic Modernity," ch. 1, 42.
31 Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*, 14–15.
32 NOU 2004: 34 Mellom stat og marked. Sand, *Styring av kompleksitet*, chs 4, 7, 9, 11, 15.
33 Some examples: NOU 2018: 17 Klimarisiko; NOU 2018: 14 IKT-sikkerhet; NOU 2018: 3 Krisehåndtering.
34 Luhmann, *Risk*, ch. 8.
35 NOU 2023: 17 Nå er det alvor; NOU 2023: 15 Bærekraftsrapportering; NOU 2023: 16 Evaluering av pandemihåndteringen.
36 Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, chs 4.1, 7.1, 8.1; Luhmann, *Law as a Social System*, chs 11 and 12.
37 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 34 ff.
38 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 53 ff.
39 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 60 ff.
40 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 57.
41 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 66.
42 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 65.
43 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 68 ff.
44 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 29, 37–49, 57.
45 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*, 31, 39, 45–50, 60–62.
46 Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*, 17–19; Moene, "Pikettys ulikhetsregimer."
47 Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*, 195–97.
48 Kold, "Kanslergadeforliget."
49 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, 3 ff.
50 Habermas, "The Rationalization of Law," Benhabib, "Models of Public Space."
51 Seip, *Sosialhjelpstaten*; Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets*.
52 Sand, *Styring av kompleksitet*, ch. 14; Sand, "Kunnskaps-samfunnets."
53 Beck, *Risk Society*; Luhmann, *Risk*.

Bibliography

Ackerman, Bruce. ”Why Dialogue?”, *Journal of Philosophy*, 86, 1989.

Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage, 1992.

Benhabib, Seyla. “Models of Public Space: Hanna Arendt, the Liberal Tradition and Jürgen Habermas.” In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig J. Calhoun, 65–99. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

———. *Another Cosmopolitanism: Hospitality, Sovereignty, and Democratic Iterations*, edited by Robert Post. The Berkeley Tanner Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Lois Waqcuant. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. London: Polity Press, 1994.

Braun, Herman, Helge Jordheim, and Erling Sandmo. *Verden*. Oslo: Unipub, 2011.

Brink-Lund, Anker, Haldor Byrkjeflot, and Søren Christensen, eds. *Associative Governance in Scandinavia*. London: Routledge, 2024.

Cohen, Jean L., and Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Egholm, Liv, and Lars Bo Kaspersen, eds. *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*. London: Routledge, 2021.

———. “A Processual-Relational Approach to Civil Society.” In *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*, edited by Liv Egholm and Lars Bo Kaspersen, 3−30. London: Routledge, 2021.

Foucault, Michel. *Society must be Defended: Lectures 1975–1976*, edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, translated by David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003. Lecture 2, 14 January 1976.

———. “Governmentality.” In *Security, Territory, Population Lectures 1977–78*, edited by Michel Sennelart, translated by Graham Burchell, 115−34. New York: Picador, 1978/2007. Lecture 5, 8 February 1978.

Habermas, Jürgen. “The Rationalization of Law. Weber’s Diagnosis of the Times.” In *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1, translated by Thomas McCarthy. London: Heinemann, 1984, 243−72 [orig. *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981].

———. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge: Polity, 1992 [orig. *Strukturwandel der Offentlichkeit*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1962].

———. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Kold, Lotte Flugt. “Kanslergadeforliget 1933.” https://danmarkshistorien.dk/vis/materiale/kanslergadeforliget-1933 (accessed 27 June 2024).

Kosseleck, Reinhart. “*Begriffsgeschichte* and Social History.” In *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by Keith Tribe, 75–92. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004 [orig. *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979].

Luhmann, Niklas. *Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1984/1996.

———. “Demands on Politics.” In *Risk: A Sociological Theory*, translated by Rhodes Barrett. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1992.

———. "The Modern Sciences and Phenomenology." In *Theories of Distinction: Redescribing the Descriptions of Modernity*, edited by William Rasch, 169–84. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

———. *Law as a Social System*, translated by Klaus A. Ziegert. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004 [orig. *Das Recht der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993].

Moene Kalle. "Pikettys ulikhetsregimer i skandinavisk lys." *AGORA* 39(1–2) (2021): 101–15.

NOU 2004: 34 Mellom stat og marked.

NOU 2018: 14 IKT-sikkerhet i alle ledd.

NOU 2018: 17 Klimarisiko og norsk økonomi.

NOU 2018: 3 Krisehåndtering i forsikrings- og pensjonsektoren.

NOU 2023: 15 Bærekraftsrapportering.

NOU 2023: 16 Evaluering av pandemihåndteringen.

NOU 2023: 17 Nå er det alvor (Totalberedskapskommisjonens innstilling).

Sand, Inger-Johanne. *Styring av kompleksitet*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 1996.

———. "Kunnskaps-samfunnets utfordringer og nye former for organisering av stat og sivilt samfunn." *GRUS* (*Danish sociological review*) 19(54) (1998): 5–22.

Seip, Anne-Lise. *Sosialhjelpstaten blir til: Norsk sosialpolitikk 1740–1920*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1984.

Sejersted, Francis. *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder*. Oslo: Pax, 2013.

Stråth, Bo. "Nordic Modernity: Origin, Trajectories and Prospects." *Sage Journals: Thesis Eleven* 77 (2004): 5–23.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1910/2019.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Part II

Civil Society, the State and the Market in a Nordic Context

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

4 Ordering the Social—Socializing the Order

Navigating Trust between Civil Society and State in the Swedish Realm around 1800

Andreas Önnerfors

Introduction

In 1803, the Swedish king issued a patent which aimed to regulate "so called fraternal orders" (*ordenssällskap*) with the purpose of ensuring that nothing "offensive to morality, religion and societal order" was pledged by their members.[1] Leaving definitions of the organizational term aside for a while, the outcome of the governmental regulation covering the Swedish realm (including its eastern part, Finland), resulted in no less than 38 orders and associations submitting documentation to the supreme police authority (*Öfverståthållareembetet*, ÖSE) in Stockholm.[2] They organized men and women, gave themselves programmatic names such as "La Tolerance", "Hypothenusa", or "Svearne" (referring to mythological concepts of the Swedish people) and engaged in everything from serious philosophical speculation to philanthropy, pleasure, and leisure or what we today would call hobbies. Some of these organizations only existed for a few years, whereas others have a history now stretching back more than two hundred years.

This chapter explores how these societies positioned themselves when faced with governmental regulation and investigates its enactment in the transnational context of the post-revolutionary era, where voluntary association of citizens was met with growing suspicion among European governments. The eighteenth has been coined "the associational century" by one of the leading researchers studying the phenomenon of orders, clubs, and societies—mushrooming as much in the centres as well as at the peripheries of the enlightenment.[3] But at the end of the century, with the advent of radical political activism, scandalous exposures of secret societies such as the Bavarian Illuminati and the dissemination of conspiratorial fears of their all-encompassing agency, previous tolerance towards associational life as a key feature of enlightened sociability slowly faded away into state regulation, control, and outright prohibition.[4]

The role of voluntary association in the revolutionary age from 1776 onwards has been subject to considerable scholarly attention and oscillates between exaggeration and ignorance. In the historiographic lore of the American and French Revolutions, the significance of Masonic lodges and other fraternal orders for the formation of a transformative spirit of liberty, fraternity, and equality has been portrayed as a key

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-6
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

factor.[5] Yet, in historical contexts shaped rather by reform and incremental change, fraternal sociability and its potential socio-political implications have been largely overlooked. For the case of the Swedish realm, I have, for instance, compiled the names of more than 4,300 members of Masonic lodges during the eighteenth century, making Freemasonry (introduced in 1735) the largest association promoting enlightenment values.[6] However, in the conventional historiography of the period, the phenomenon is reduced to a mere coterie at the court of King Gustav III (1746–92) or has been described as a dark esoteric undercurrent under the radiant force of enlightened rationality.[7] Only quite recently, the relevance of fraternal orders in Swedish history has been rediscovered.[8]

Located within these conflicting historiographies, this chapter argues from an intermediate standpoint that civil society agency (in a space beyond political control and economic interest) was developed and explored in a huge variety of associational forms and aims under the umbrella term of "fraternal orders" (*ordenssällskap*). These varieties as a whole, as I will explore extensively further on, generated a substantial social capital which contributed to the development of civic agency on several levels, promoting societal reform, engaging in philanthropic projects and cultivating a (political) language of normative claims that could be mobilized in the negotiation of political goods.[9] How these different facets materialized within the Swedish associations affected by the 1803 governmental regulation will be a subject for discussion in this chapter. As matter of introduction, it is however relevant to point out that, within their spectrum, we find four distinctive types organized around (1) philosophical-ethical development of its members, (2) proto-national and distinctly Norse themes, (3) pleasure and pastimes, and (4) philanthropy and education in society.

Most of the associations covered subsequently also show overlaps between these four areas. Others, for reasons that will be addressed later, completely fall outside the scope of governmental regulation itself and any attempts to categorize them along these identified distinctive features as above. In the first section of this chapter, I introduce theoretical considerations and previous scholarship, which is necessary to grasp the concept of associational life of the period in general and of fraternal orders in particular. I then move to extensively presenting and contextualizing the Swedish regulation of 1803 in its transnational context. In the last part of the chapter, I return to the documents submitted as a response to the governmental regulation and finally interpret some examples linking them to the overall thematic frame of this chapter and volume.

Order, Society, and Societal Order

Some introductory remarks concerning the terminology and possibly typology of fraternal orders and its Swedish term are necessary, opening up theoretical considerations. *Ordenssällskap* is a composite noun denoting a "society" that is also an "order" with its double connotations of organizational and structural power, which allows us to play with some concepts related to human (voluntary) organization. The use of the term can be traced to the end of the eighteenth century in Swedish

press sources. According to the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok* (SAOB), an "order" thus can be

> an association with non-profit or societal aims, frequently with secret ceremonies or similar, which are not revealed to outsiders and with insignia of the order or decorations more or less reminding of those in use in state orders of merit.[10]

We will return to this definition shortly. The internationally established term "fraternal order" (which I will stick to with some important caveats) has some genderized connotations that are not easy to explain away and open up an imagery of "fraternization" among men. Whereas the vast number of clubs, orders, and societies in the first wave of voluntary association outside state and church during the eighteenth century was in fact exclusively male, it is possible to argue that "fraternal", as much as the concept of *fraternité* as one of the key mottos of the French Revolution, indeed denotes more than (merely male) brotherhood. Rather, the term could be understood in the words of Goethe as "elective affinities", an ideal of extended and voluntary siblinghood creating social ties, mutual aid, and nodes in (modern) societies with a larger amount of anonymity. If that indeed is the thrust of fraternal orders (*ordenssällskap*) in the Swedish context as well, "brothers" and "sisters" are potentially more than just members of a particular association, but are also emerging citizens of more mature societies with increased reciprocal solidarity and voluntary participation in mutual areas of societal concern. Here are already several important overlaps to conventional definitions of civil society including characteristics such as voluntary association in "a space of social self-organization between the state, the market and the private domain",[11] mutual aid, and non-profit activities.

Historically, an "order" denotes a medieval religious or chivalric organization formed by the authority of the (Catholic) Church and/or secular rulers. Reduced in significance after the Reformation, the concept of the order resurfaced, however, within elaborate court sociability (so-called *préciosité*) and as an expression of official state orders of merit, many of them established in the eighteenth century.[12] One famous example is the Order of the Amaranth, founded in 1653 by Swedish Queen Christina, and which most likely only served the purpose of an advanced social game among educated court elites.[13] But the "order" also very soon would develop into a concept of far wider sociability or, in German, *Geselligkeit*, fellowship. To establish an order, devise rituals of initiation and knowledge progression (or ridicule them), to get together and socialize in ceremonies, for the purpose of organized education, singing, drinking, and dining—including in all-female or gender-mixed settings, became one of the favourite pastimes among European educated enlightenment elites. The ethos of this associational culture ranged, as mentioned, on a spectrum from solemn secular programs of moral (self-)education and philanthropy (*utile*) to mere pleasure and fun (*dulci*—sweet). *Utile Dulci* (1766–95) was in fact also the name of a fraternal order in Stockholm dedicated to literature and music. This variety of aims on a scale from solemn deliberation to social *divertissement* is

an important indicator of what made these associations attractive to their members, since they obviously fulfilled a range of different interests and needs where leisure time could be spent.

Drawing from the famous sociological distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (as an expression of a primordial community such as family, village, or clan) and *Gesellschaft* (as a more abstract and labour-divided organization of human interrelations), it would be possible to make the following case: ideas and practices of ordering human social intercourse have repercussions for organizing societal order as a whole, making it potentially more "social" in the sense of promoting redistributive justice and shaping participation in decision-making processes. If this hypothesis is substantiated by historical sources, we might also find significant entry points to studying associational culture in the Nordic countries as harbingers of incremental societal change shaping shared political goods. For the case of Freemasonry in the eighteenth century, a leading scholar in the area, Margaret C. Jacob, has spoken about Masonic lodges as "schools for government", where members could acquire and practice civil skills necessary for more participatory (constitutional and ultimately democratic) modes of governance.[14] This interpretation of civil society agency in fraternal orders and other voluntary associations can potentially be generalized and expanded. A caveat in this regard is the transtemporal comparability of the analytical term "civil society". Certainly, "civil society" and voluntary association in 1803, 1903, or 2003 are not the same. Yet since the organizational concept of fraternal orders has survived over three centuries it is worthwhile to consider their formation and ability to adapt to various socio-political developments across time and space—sometimes at odds with existing power structures in society, sometimes in harmony. Some of the organizations discussed in this chapter have an unbroken history of almost three hundred years, which begs the question of organizational resilience over time. As Per Sandin has shown, it was for instance of major importance during the early nineteenth century for the new royal dynasty Bernadotte to engage in the associational life of the Swedish-Norwegian union.[15] And at the turn of the nineteenth century, the International Order of Goodtemplars (imported to Sweden from the USA) could serve as an organized method for Swedish workers to achieve education, self-improvement, and temperance, as well as to acquire democratic skills.[16] Even the early trade unions borrowed their symbolism from fraternal orders or established their own.[17] Thus it could be argued that the "fraternal order" as a special case of associational form (just as "civil society" as a whole) can be found at both ends of the spectrum in relation to existing power structures: as part of a top-down consolidation and as part of a bottom-up empowerment of individuals in society.

One additional avenue to follow is a close dissection of the concept of "welfare", which is imperative for the idea of Nordic state formation and its self-identity. As we will see, many of the orders and associations treated in this chapter were active in charity, providing either proactive or reactive support to alleviate poverty, support healthcare, or mitigate social divisions. This agency and the spirit of it developed prior to the modern welfare state and its organized redistributive justice.

Rather than "schools for government", we could potentially conceptualize such civil society agency as "schools for welfare".

As historian Nils Edling argues in his treatment of "welfare" (*välfärd*) as a concept, the image of Sweden as a country which has "developed from a peripheral agricultural country to a modern welfare state" is central to the country's self-identity.[18] The term is placed in the same semiotic corner as happiness, success, security, or wellness and refers to publicly shared political goods. It can be traced back to 1624, when a Swedish theologian stated that welfare was one of the key aims of politics. As well, Samuel Pufendorf, one of the founders of early modern theories of international law, declared that the welfare of the people is the supreme law. There is a clear overlap with protestant teachings, rationalized by the enlightenment philosopher Wolff, who was extremely influential in the Swedish realm. Securing *välfärd* even made it into the Swedish constitutional laws and thus denoted a foundational political value.

But Edling also notes a remarkable shift in the period between 1750 and 1850, when the concept underwent significant changes. What did "welfare" imply for the limits of individual self-realization and the borders of state agency? Just as in concepts of "happiness", there is a noticeable change towards individualization, according to Edling. But it might also be worthwhile to consider a meso-level. In this vein, I suggest that the renegotiation of the meaning of *välfärd* as a collective political good took place in an interplay between civil society and state. This could be theorized as a process in which civil society actors developed self-organized agency to challenge and complement the state as sole provider of welfare. And along the way, they could conquer a new political vocabulary while also rallying around new and proactive concepts of welfare delivery. This in turn might explain the turn from a paternalistic state to a more participatory mode of decision-making around redistributive justice which solidified during the nineteenth century and its recurring crises such as pandemics, mass emigration, and the growth of a labour-based industrial society and its social issues. As such, the concept has echoed through the subsequent centuries where it became the centre point of fierce battles between different political ideologies.

One key study into these renegotiation processes in the Swedish context was conducted by Thomas Neidenmark in his 2011 dissertation *Pedagogiska imperativ och sociala nätverk i svensk medborgarbildning 1812–1828* ("Educational Imperatives and Social Networks in Swedish Civic Formation 1812–1828"). Neidenmark's study focuses on initiatives for improving education among the population and unites several approaches relevant to this chapter and the volume in general. It attempts to capture civic formation as a process promoted by voluntary social organization as well as by actively shaping a public space for deliberation through the dissemination of information in the press and book market in general. The dissertation guides us through and visualizes an interrelated web of publications and associations and makes (collective) biographical information about key actors available. Neidenmark starts his exploration after the peaceful transition of power and constitutional reform of 1809, when after a disastrous war the eastern part of the Swedish realm, Finland, was lost to Russia. Due to the complex developments

of the Napoleonic Wars, Sweden furthermore traded away its German province of Swedish Pomerania (and thus its last continental foothold) in 1815 but entered a political union with Norway in 1814. It is not an understatement to talk about a dramatic period of transition, which begs the question of why it, in general, happened without violent revolutionary change. At the end of peaceful societal transformation and increasing cohesion, the general Swedish *folkskola* (primary public school providing general education for all citizens) was established in 1842, which is frequently hailed as a milestone in the formation of the paternal welfare state, its stable institutions, and the spirit of equality. Yet, Neidenmark's dissertation clearly makes the case that civic formation and state agency interact and that pedagogic ideas of an all-encompassing people's education were deliberated and practiced decades before *folkskolan* was formally introduced. This begs the larger question of how far civic formation and its overlapping networks of actors in different associations and publications proactively cleared the ground for state-enacted reforms associated with the welfare state of the Nordic style.

What emerges is that the promotion of ideas can be related to a social basis, associational life, and a public space of deliberation in the vein of Habermas. Neidenmark maps "a big body of information about relations in terms of membership in associations, kinship, friendships, correspondence, life cycles, marriages" with methods of collective biography, thereby uncovering both vertical and horizontal relations.[19] Thus, he is able to answer the question of how issues of pedagogical reform and the education of the people (or what is called "pedagogization") were discussed and disseminated. Another theoretical assumption guiding Neidenmark's work is Putnam's suggestion that social capital grows in relation to direct encounters between people, generating mutual trust, social networks, and civic engagement, a process accelerated by both intensity of interaction and the sheer number of nodes. No less than 12,000 affiliations to different associations are scrutinized by Neidenmark. Even if his work is focused on the establishment of a people's education in Sweden, it clearly emerges that activity and engagement in educational associations enabled its members to develop political agency in society and thereby to promote pedagogical and thus profound societal change. Neidenmark also makes the case that this agency is closely connected to a new socio-political vocabulary. In line with Koselleck's idea of a "saddle period" ranging from 1750–1850, it is proposed that key concepts of political language were renegotiated and new terms (such as *medborgarskola*, a "school for citizens") formed. In particular, Neidenmark was able to note a significant semiotic shift from the use of "subject" (denoting members of the political community as vertically subordinate to royal power) to the more inclusive term "citizen"—or more tellingly in Swedish, *med-borgare*, a "co-citizen"—in a more horizontal relationship to shared power.

The use of these new concepts (frequently guided by visions about a new future of Swedish society and citizenship) can be directly linked to the participants in overlapping networks of civic engagement. Analysing the social networks of people active in promoting pedagogical change, Neidenmark distinguished between 26 different types of associations, relying heavily upon the classification provided by

Svenska ordnar, sällskap och föreningar m.m., a book published in 1873 by Pehr Gustaf Berg. Unfortunately, although Neidenmark cannot be blamed for this, Berg's categorizations are rather arbitrary and not systematic. Berg's encyclopaedic overview sadly reflects the inadequate treatment of the subject of studying associational life in Swedish historical scholarship, a discrepancy this chapter seeks to address. Neidenmark was able to demonstrate that affiliation to certain types of associations and orders can be linked to the networks promoting pedagogical innovation in Swedish society. Membership in Masonic lodges for instance stands out in comparison to others. But several other fraternal orders that also submitted documentation after the governmental regulation of 1803 are mentioned, for example the Order of the Amaranth (which in 1760 was revived as an order of sociability), Coldinu (established in 1757), or Par Bricole (established in 1779).

Why do Neidenmark's findings matter to this chapter? First of all, the governmental regulation of 1803 and the replies of 38 associations to the supreme police authority allow a snapshot of the state of associational life just after the turn of the new century. The networks covered by Neidenmark did not come into being nine years later *ex nihilo* but are (as he argues as well) the result of social interconnectedness over time, ranging back into the late eighteenth century, if not earlier. Secondly, since quite a few of the associations presented later were either focused on the moral self-education of their members or philanthropic initiatives supporting education and in a wider sense, *Bildung* in society, it makes sense to identify their ethos as an important precursor of the pedagogical initiatives characterizing the later development. Thirdly, as will emerge later, the activities of fraternal orders as much as their vocabulary seem to be connected to the general renegotiation of socio-political concepts in the era. Last, but not least, Neidenmark's work invites reflections about the transnationality of developments of associational life in the period.

As I will outline in the next section of this chapter, the governmental regulation of 1803 was embedded in a European context. Suspicion against voluntary association and its possible nexus to revolutionary activities—in the guise of fraternal orders where oaths of allegiance were taken—led Prussia and Great Britain to pass legislation restricting and controlling such associations in 1798 and 1799 respectively. The Swedish case thus is not an isolated instance but inscribes itself into these larger patterns of balancing freedom and control in connection with radical political change (even under late feudal conditions). Moreover, as it has been proposed and I will return to, fear of Danish revolutionary intervention by means of a secret society might have guided the Swedish clampdown on fraternal orders. By 1803, the "order" as a particular form of association had developed such diversity that it makes little sense to interpret it as a mere imitation of an all-European phenomenon, but rather an established form of human organization adapted to the Swedish context. Henrik Stenius and his work on the development of the breakthrough of mass organization in Finland suggests a chronology where "secret societies" shape associational life in the eastern half of the Swedish realm before the French Revolution, followed by subscription-based organization up to 1809.[20] There is no place here to question this chronological order. However, against the backdrop

of new sources that this chapter presents, organization in fraternal orders with a huge variety of aims also extended to Finland beyond the first phase and is hard to explain as a mere reaction to outside impulses where Scandinavia is portrayed as being placed at the passive and receiving end. Rather, the universal (arguably transnational) form of organization the fraternal order presented was open for local transformation and adaptation in more dynamic patterns of cultural encounters.

For instance: although in existence before the historical scope of this chapter and defunct by 1803, the case of the "Order of Wallhall" in 1788 Finland, popular among noble officers, exposes a considerable variety of motifs ranging from imagined Norse mythology to the Roman republic, paired with Swedish royalist patriotism ("Gustavianism") and the promotion of enlightened philosophy.[21] The order, recently treated based upon previously untapped sources, has been interpreted as a vanguard of Finnish nationalism and independence, yet the connections to the so-called Anjala-mutiny among Swedish officers (against the Swedish-Russian war of 1788) and the circles around proponents of Finnish secession seem very weak. It rather emerges that the order predates the revival of proto-national "Gothicism" (a peculiar Swedish collective mythology of origin) during early romanticism by several decades. This example clearly demonstrates that fraternal orders cannot be reduced to a mimesis of outside impulses, but that their overlapping trajectories challenge multiple chronologies that defy imaginations of linear developments.

The Transnational Context of the Swedish Regulation of 1803

The Swedish governmental regulation of fraternal orders is embedded in a transnational context that I have treated extensively elsewhere.[22] It is however necessary to address briefly the historical background as to why voluntary socio-cultural association beyond government control was met with suspicion. During the eighteenth century, Freemasonry emerged as a significant voluntary social organization, sparking reactions across Europe. The largest of such associations, it faced challenges from state, church, and public opinion. The situation worsened in the 1780s with the collapse of the "Strict Observance", a Masonic system connecting to the organizational culture and chivalric lore of the Knights Templar, and the exposure of the Bavarian Order of Illuminati. These orders, along with alchemist and Rosicrucian orders, seemed to infiltrate European elites, causing public fear of a powerful and covert supra-state.[23] The French Revolution further complicated matters, with Freemasons, Illuminati, and reading societies accused of orchestrating the violent upheaval. Events such as the murder of Swedish King Gustav III in 1792 were blamed upon a revolutionary cabal of radical and ruthless Knights Templar assassins involving a chapter of the order in Stockholm, headed by the king's own brother.[24] Despite the culture of secrecy, these developments were extensively covered in the European press. The public feared the occult activities of the elites, seen as the antithesis of rationality and reason.

This eventually led to legislation in the 1790s, first in Prussia (1798), then in Britain (1799). The Prussian royal edict on secret associations claimed that societal trust was threatened by "seducers" within and outside Prussia. Participation in

a secret society was in principle punishable, and it was mandatory to report such assemblies. Prussian legislation required societies to declare their existence and aims, with prohibitions specified in five points. These included discussions about changes to the government, oaths of allegiance to unknown or known superiors that did not exclude state-related issues, demanding taciturnity about association secrets, and secret aims or means. Some of the criteria led to immediate prohibition. The Prussian edict exempted three Masonic grand lodges from certain criteria, acknowledging their practices of secrecy and symbolism. This marked an important boundary against state interference into their inner affairs. Similar thoughts were also echoed in Swedish legislation five years later.

The principle of territorial exclusivity of Masonic grand lodges within state borders is a notable part of state regulation, more or less banning transnational organization. A similar thought was already expressed in a Danish decree from 1780, prohibiting foreigners from leading Masonic lodges and transferring collected funds outside its borders. This rationale was repeated in 1785 by Austro-Hungarian ruler Joseph II, regulating Masonic lodges to protect "religion, order and morality" in society.

Britain's "Unlawful Societies Act" (1799) mirrored the Prussian edict and was likely influenced by it. It was a response to fears of French revolutionary forces, Irish rebellion, radical activism, and conspiracy theories. The Act targeted secret societies, particularly those using oaths of allegiance to unknown superiors, seen as threats to state security. Masonic lodges were exempt but placed under strict control. Meetings discussing political and social issues were restricted. The Act also regulated printing businesses. Swedish diplomats were well-informed about this Act, most likely influencing similar legislation in 1803.

The Content of the Swedish Regulation of 1803

The Swedish regulation of 1803 opens by stating that the government has been informed about the existence of so-called fraternal orders founded in Stockholm as well as in several cities and towns in the country. Their members pledge to fulfil certain duties and obligations as well as to take oaths degree by degree. It is the content of these obligations the legislation seeks to investigate with the aim of ensuring that "nothing is included in these pledges that more or less runs contrary to morality, religion and social order" (*på det uti dessa förbindelser icke något må ingå, som i mer eller mindre måtto för Moralité, Religion och Samhälls-ordning kan wara stötande*).[25] Thus, each president of a fraternal order—under threat of dissolution of the association—was now obliged to submit to the supreme police authority all oaths and pledges that were included in each degree. The Order of Freemasons was exempted since it was already placed under royal protection. No new fraternal orders were allowed to be formed. Without becoming members themselves, police officers were entitled to visit all fraternal orders without any restrictions and to receive full insight into the workings of each degree. In exchange, police officers had to remain silent about anything happening within the fraternal orders on the same conditions as their own members.

Without stating it clearly, the regulation thus defines a fraternal order in the following way: it is an organization that works degree by degree, which stipulates a process of progression of knowledge on different levels. Members take one or several oaths administered in written form—orders are supposed to have an administrative culture. They pledge to fulfil their obligations which seem to stipulate to stick to normative commitments and behaviours which point to a duty ethics. Fraternal orders have a president and an administrative hierarchy. It is possible to obtain written accounts of the order, stipulating an administrative culture, records, minutes, correspondence, etc. That members are received into a fraternal order through some sort of ritual of initiation is presupposed. There is a sphere of taciturnity within the order and secrecy is acknowledged as playing an intrinsic role in the inner workings of the order.

Compared to the Prussian and British legislation, the political motive (fear of subversion or revolutionary change) is not as clearly expressed, but the Swedish regulation shares general concern for morality, religion, and societal order. In the Swedish case, the particular focus is on the obligations members have promised to fulfil. There is no reference to “unknown superiors” or anonymous, secret leaders to which loyalty is pledged, even if such considerations might have played a role. Nevertheless, the state expresses a direct interest and claims the prerogative of intervention into the oaths taken, demands insight into the activities of the orders, and access to its assemblies. And, as in the Prussian case, the Swedish regulation acknowledges the value of secrecy as a constitutive part of the activities of fraternal orders. Police officers have the right to be admitted to meetings in all degrees but are still obliged to respect the same taciturnity as ordinary members (*pliktige til samma tystnad som Ordens egna Ledamöter*).[26] Non-observance of the regulation is punished with the dissolution of the society and a monetary penalty and, as in Prussia, people holding a public office are penalized more severely. In neither case is it stated why this group receives such special treatment, but it is possible that conflicting loyalties were identified as a larger threat.

Reports and Documentation Submitted to the Swedish Police Authorities

After the publication of the regulation on 26 March 1803, it was most certainly disseminated to the county chiefs across the Swedish realm. In total, ÖSE drafted a list of 38 societies, in alphabetical order and geographical location as follows:

1. *Alexandriner Orden* (Stockholm)
2. *Amaranter Orden* (Stockholm)
3. *Amaranthen* (Gothenburg)
4. *Amore Proximi* (Lovisa)
5. *Augusti Bröders Samfund* (Stockholm)
6. *Coldinu Orden* (Stockholm)
7. *FriByggare Orden* (Stockholm)
8. *Förenad Wänskap* (Västerås)
9. *Gamla Göther* (Vänersborg)

10. *Gammalt Götha Lag* (Stockholm)
11. *Grekiska Faklan* eller *G_ _ _εων* (Stockholm)
12. *Götha Coldinu* (Gothenburg)
13. *Heder och Wännskap* (Stockholm)
14. *Hjelpsamheten* (Stockholm)
15. *Hjelpsamheten* (Syssmä)
16. *Hypothenusa* (Åbo)
17. *Idka Dygden* (Gävle)
18. *Innocens Orden* (Stockholm)
19. *Johanniter Bröder* (Stockholm)
20. *La Tolerance* (Stockholm)
21. ***μεταμ*** – eller *Nybyggare Orden* (Stockholm)
22. *Musicaliska Sällskapet* (Stockholm)
23. *N.W.D.* eller *Nöjet Wänskapen och Dygden* (Stockholm)
24. *Narcissaner Orden* (Stockholm)
25. *Nytta och Nöje* (Stockholm)
26. *Nödhjelps Cassans Direction* (Stockholm)
27. *Nöje och Enighet* (Stockholm)
28. *Nöje och Wännskap* (Stockholm)
29. *Par Bricol* (Gothenburg)
30. *Par Bricol* (Stockholm)
31. *Pro Lantura* (Karlstad)
32. *Pro Patria Kongl Sällskap* (Stockholm)
33. *Sing-Sang Orden* (Wasa)
34. *Sjuttonde Februarii Bröder* (Åbo)
35. *Svearne* (Stockholm)
36. *Södermanländska Gillet* (Stockholm)
37. *Trollhätte Bergsmän* (Trollhättan)
38. *Wänskapen* (Stockholm)

What is striking about this list is, first of all, the concentration of different societies in the capital Stockholm (25), but also the dissemination across the realm: Lovisa (1), Sysmä (1), Vasa (1), Åbo (2), Gävle (1), Västerås (1), Karlstad (1), Vänersborg (2), and Gothenburg (3). County chiefs in Halmstad, Stockholm (as opposed to the city), Kuopio, Uppsala, Kalmar, Örebro, and Härnösand reported no activities of fraternal orders in their counties. But it is also very peculiar that some counties did not submit any reports at all, for instance in Skåne (southern Sweden) and Blekinge, as well as Helsinki (Helsingfors) in the Finnish part of the realm. From historical records we know that, for instance, the naval city of Karlskrona as much as Helsinki and its naval fortress Sveaborg had a very active fraternal life. The order Pro Lantura had its headquarters in Karlskrona and in the report to ÖSE it is even stated that the lodge in Karlstad (No. 31 above, in Värmland) was a branch of it. The "Order of St. Michael" was at the time also active in Karlskrona.[27] In reality, we can safely assume that there existed more fraternal orders in the Swedish realm in 1803, a qualified guess would be between another ten and twenty, making about

fifty in total. Complementary investigations in private and public archives will be able to shed more light on the true number. It appears as if the regulation was not complied very diligently. Yet, as late as 1820 it was used to prohibit a "Society for Citizen's Art of Speech" (*Sällskapet för medborgerlig talarkonst*).[28]

One contradictory feature of the regulation was identified relatively soon. The king was the patron not only of the Masonic order but also of the Order of Carpenters (*Timmermansorden*) and of Coldinu. Already in April of 1803, a letter was directed to ÖSE to the effect of exempting these orders as well. The Order of Carpenters never submitted any documentation at all and the documents of Coldinu (No. 6 and No. 12) were in 1805 removed from the archive of ÖSE together with documents related to the Order of the Amaranth and *FriByggare Orden* (Nos. 2, 3, and 7). Another fraternal order, *Josephinerorden*, submitted documentation directly to the king but was not featured on the list of ÖSE. Of all the material submitted to ÖSE, only the documents of *Johanniter-Bröderna* (No. 19) are in the original archive of the police authority in Stockholm's municipal archive. For 24 fraternal orders, the replies to ÖSE together with descriptions of their ceremonies and obligations have ended up in the private archive of the Swedish Order of Freemasons which also has material about a host of other orders in the Swedish realm. Only fourteen of the 38 on the ÖSE-list feature in the above-mentioned book of Berg on Swedish orders and societies, which clearly demonstrates that his work is in dire need of revision. Swedish author August Strindberg (together with Claes Lundin) in 1882 published a book on the local history of Stockholm.[29] In a chapter on fraternal orders and clubs, seven on the list of ÖSE are briefly mentioned. Strindberg's father was active in a few of them.

Going through the archival material it is striking that several associations on the list do not in the slightest fulfil the criteria of the regulation, as they had for instance neither obligations nor degrees. Still, they reported their existence and activities to ÖSE: *Heder och Wännskap* (13), *Musicaliska Sällskapet* (22), *Nytta och Nöje* (25), *Nödhjelps Cassan* (26), and *Södermanländska Gillet* (36). These societies cultivated different interests ranging from what we today would call local history to music, mutual benefit (insurance) in times of crisis, social intercourse, and entertainment. Apart from this category, four distinct types of associations can be identified:

(1) they engage in a *philosophical refinement* of the worldview of their members (stage a secular education program beyond organized religion);
(2) they demonstrate a clear *patriotic-national consciousness* (which indirectly creates political expectations);
(3) they organize themselves purely for *pleasure-oriented pastimes* (*dulce*, leisure);
(4) they have a *philanthropic agenda* that is social and educational (*utile*, which creates socio-political expectations).

As stated above, these categories are more ideal types than clear-cut definitions and there are several overlaps. Societies with a patriotic thrust can also engage

in the philosophical education of their members and enact extroverted philanthropy. And, most frequently, pleasure and sincerity are blended. As Peter Lind has demonstrated in his dissertation on Carl Michael Bellman's *Bacchi Orden*—an account of a fictional fraternity of ridiculous drunkards penned during the 1760s and 1770s—the phenomenon of fraternal orders was so ingrained into the associational life of the capital Stockholm that it was possible to write an elaborate satire about it.[30] Yet, Bellman in 1779 also founded the real-life and still-existing order *Par Bricole* (also on the list of ÖSE as Nos 29 and 30 above).

Three examples exemplify the spectrum of fraternal sociability among the societies responding to the regulation in 1803: *La Tolerance* (No. 20), *Pro Lantura* (No. 31), and *Narcissaner Orden* (No. 24).[31] The documentation of *La Tolerance* was submitted by Carl Envallson (1756–1806), notarius publicus, dramaturge, author, and member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music. Members were obliged to take an oath on a sword to "revere truth, worship reason and love their fellow human beings". The society enacted a progression of education in seven degrees in two sections: the first three were called "blind" or "heathen" and the last four "enlightened". The reason for this progression was according to Envallson the advance of enlightenment in the world. In the second degree, members for instance exclaimed "Valhall – Valhall" and the activities were designed after the "Edda of Sturloson and the writings of Rudbeck [...] and others", thus linking to the "gothicist" tradition of the age of Great Power in which a peculiar Swedish theory of civilizational origin was promoted. The fourth degree was called "Tolerance Academy". One of the Society's insignia is described as follows: a sun with the letters S and F in the middle, standing for *Sanning* and *Förnuft*, truth and reason, and around it the letters G.F.V.R. These designate Gustaf III, Frederick II of Prussia, Voltaire, and Rousseau. This badge was worn on a crimson ribbon with a white border. Envallson also proclaimed a radiant aim of his order:

> The basic institution of the Society of "La Tolerance" is to train men in godliness, in obedience to the law and in virtue, in a word, to improve all human and civil qualities. In addition, the intention is to celebrate the memory of King Gustav III as a king of high mind, as well as the founder of tolerance and its first protector in Sweden. He is therefore called the supreme Sun of Tolerance. Next to him, Frederick II of Prussia is honoured—then the great philosophers who wrote about tolerance. The word "tolerance" includes and is understood in society as opposed to atheism, harmful mysteries, debauchery in religious matters, hatred, persecution, and fanaticism.[32]

Apart from the memorial submitted to ÖSE, it has so far been impossible to verify membership and activities of *La Tolerance*. Envallson, with a particular taste for dramatic literature, in any case presented a well-designed structure of an order with high philosophical and normative aims. *Pro Lantura* sent eight pages to ÖSE from Karlstad in the province of Värmland. The society was established in 1798 as a branch of the mother organization based in Karlskrona (where it had been founded in 1786). The aim is summarized as "with united forces to alleviate the distress

of suffering fellow human beings, and as far as the ability extends, to reach out a helping hand to those in need".[33] A considerable amount of funds had been raised and disseminated among the poor of the city and to *pauvres honteux*, people from the upper echelons of society who had lost their fortune or sources of income, typically widows and orphans. During a disastrous famine in 1801, the 47 members of *Pro Lantura* built a soup kitchen where the paupers of Karlstad received a portion of the nutritious so-called "Rumford's soup", an early example of a ration to the poor with a recipe imported from Bavaria. Inspired by these activities, the citizens of Karlstad followed the example of the fraternal order and established an institution for fifty paupers, supported by *Pro Lantura* with additional funds. Moreover, money was raised for "the confinement of the insane and poor maiden Nordenberg in the Hospital" and the education of orphans. Until 1803, membership had grown to almost one hundred, among "citizens generally known for honour and virtues". *Narcissaner Orden*, gathering both men and women, was established in 1797 and aimed at combining pleasure and philanthropy, "since charity most likely is exercised in the easiest way with a cheerful and happy spirit".[34] In its twelve pages of reply to ÖSE, the fraternal order outlined its activities and normative foundations, "to engage in charity in general" and in particular to alleviate the misery of *pauvres honteux*. Each summer, the order had supported twelve paupers with food, room, medication, and mud baths (a kind of medical spa treatment). Pensions had been paid out to the needy. To mix men and women in the order was due to the natural tendency among women to take care of the poor and that men were inspired to do good if they were encouraged by women. The easiest way to gather members of both sexes had been to form a dancing association with five degrees and different oaths and where secrecy only served the purpose "to tease curiosity and recruit members". In the third degree, members for instance pledged to conduct themselves as "righteous philanthropists".

These three examples cover a typical range of activities and aims found among the fraternal orders responding to the 1803-regulation. For this chapter, not all available source material has been evaluated and is still work in progress due to the vast number of hundreds of pages and supplementary material that has survived to this day. A more comprehensive review is needed to draw any sound conclusions which certainly promises to break new ground related to the scope and intensity of fraternal association in the Swedish realm around 1800. Concerning the names of the fraternal orders, these already to a certain degree signal normative statements such as *amore proximi* ("altruism", "love of your neighbour", Mark 12:31), *förenad vänskap* ("united friendship"), *hjälpsamheten* ("solidarity" or "tolerance"). Others are more geared towards symbolism such as *Amaranther* (referring to a flowering plant and its qualities), *Grekiska Faklan* ("The Greek Torch"), or *Hypothenusa*. Another type of names refers to symbolic dates such as *Augusti Bröders Samfund* ("The Association of August-Brethren") or *Sjuttonde Februarii Bröder* ("The Brethren of the Seventeenth of February"), or to places such as the province Södermanland or the town of Trollhättan. Yet another category of names is merely functional, such as *Nödhjelps Cassan* ("The Emergency Fund") and *Musicaliska Sällskapet* ("The Musical Society"), or makes fanciful references to

the mythical people of the Goths such as *Gamla Göthers Lag* ("The Company of the Old Goths"). Some associations mimicked the names of chivalric orders such as *Johanniter Bröder* or *Alexandriner Orden*.

Why Sweden, Why 1803?

One witness of the Swedish associational culture at the time was the Swedish-Pomeranian author and professor Ernst Moritz Arndt (1760–1841) whose travelogue from travels to Sweden 1803–04 directly mentions fraternal orders, "some of them with symbols as a way of jokingly imitating deeper meaning".[35] These orders "or rather to say clubs, have different publicly known names such as the Order of the Amaranth, Narcissus or Innocens, etc.".[36] With satirical names they provided "entirely innocent secrets, aimed at social life in Stockholm". Still, Arndt connected Swedish fraternal sociability with ideas about its national character, formed by nature and climate:

> The Swede loves the pleasures of social life, the table and dancing; he has long winters and nights, which force people together; he has a short, but teasing summer with the most wonderful jugglery of the figures of light and night. Because these glories do not last long, he is destined for a quick enjoyment and a quick exchange. For such an exchange, as well as for certain charitable purposes, these orders are established.[37]

Arndt thus puts forward the theory that the Swedish tendency to organize in fraternal orders for the purpose of charity and pleasure is caused by climatic factors. The short summer and long winter make it necessary to streamline the forms of socializing offered by fraternal orders. He mentions this explanation shortly after he has discussed Duke Charles' (later King Charles XIII, 1748–1818) allegedly fanatical commitment to Freemasonry and that Gustav IV Adolf (1778–1837) for political reasons had feared that "the kingdom [was] overrun by […] the seeds of dangerous societies". Arndt also explained that Duke Charles' excessive interest in Freemasonry was a sign of a syndrome that is only found in the Swedish language, *ordensvurm*, having a "craze for orders". This seemingly pathological condition thus has an exclusively Swedish etymology. SAOB defines this craze as someone who has a "craze for [is strongly committed] to fraternal orders" or secret societies.[38] The use of the word can be dated back to 1785. But is it true that Gustav IV Adolf indeed feared that "the kingdom was overrun" by dangerous societies?

The regulation of fraternal orders in 1803 has in previous literature been related to the so-called "Boheman-affair".[39] Carl Adolf Boheman (1764–1831) was a Swedish mystic, Freemason, and businessman with an international career surrounded by a host of rumours which cannot be verified independently. Allegedly, Boheman received documents related to a secret order D.E.L.U. (interpreted as *Deus Est Lux Universalis*) by an Englishman while living in Denmark. He also had contacts with the Danish Prince Charles II of Hesse-Kassel (1744–1836), who was heavily involved in the previously mentioned chivalric Freemasonry

of the SO and its esoteric successors. Boheman succeeded in convincing Duke Charles and mystically inclined Freemasons in Sweden to join a gender-mixed lodge under D.E.L.U. which in 1802 was founded as *Gula Rosen* ("The Yellow Rose"). How this lodge related to the order and what its true history is yet remains to be established conclusively in scholarship, but that it clearly worked with esoteric ideas is undisputable. In the terminology of the time, this orientation was called "illuminism", referring to the search for an inner light, but was also confused with the more radical enlightened and extroverted "illuminatism" of the Bavarian Illuminati.[40] After the French Revolution, both forms of philosophical inquiry in different types of associations was vilified as one of the root causes of violent societal change. Could the Swedish government have suspected Duke Charles and his associates of orchestrating yet another revolutionary plot, this time concocted by a Danish prince? It is not entirely impossible that the conspiratorial rumours of Charles' involvement in the assassination of his brother Gustav in 1792 might have frightened Gustav IV Adolf to act against his own uncle. There is a synchronicity of events coinciding in March 1803 that appear to be related. Boheman was exposed as a dangerous fraudster and was interrogated by police authorities on the same day the king issued his royal patent. And, three days after it was published, readers of the national newspaper *Inrikes-Tidningar* were informed about Boheman's sinister affiliation, the "invisible yet autocratic leadership of the association by an unknown council, the oath of the brethren of the order never to reveal the meeting place of this governing assembly or the names of those who compose it" and the "unrestricted submission under unknown governors". Moreover, it was explicitly stated that "this association runs contrary to the foundations of religion, societal order, laws and morality", almost verbatim resonating with wordings of the royal decree.[41] The lodge of the "Yellow Rose" was suspended and Duke Charles was placed in some form of house arrest until the entire affair ended with the expulsion of Boheman to Denmark and from there, to Germany. The sources do not allow any conclusions as to why the royal decree was issued. If the king indeed had feared a conspiracy, would it not have been enough to prohibit and dissolve D.E.L.U. and punish its members? And, if fear of fraternal orders as drivers of violent political change was imminent, why were the formulations of the royal decree rather mild (compared to Prussian and British legislation)? Even more puzzling is why the apparent negligence of some of the county chiefs to submit information to ÖSE was left without any consequences. Or did Boheman and D.E.L.U. simply serve as the pretext for showing decisiveness towards voluntary association in the light of possible revolutionary activism in line with fears emanating from the age of the Napoleonic Wars? Unless more source material allows us to shed light upon these developments, these questions must remain unanswered.

Yet, what we can interpret, rather than speculating about the true reasons of state agency, are the expressions of self-design of no less than 38 societies, clubs, and orders throughout the Swedish realm which attempt to explain their activities and aims to the authorities. These ego-statements allow us to reconstruct ideas and ideals of associational culture at the dawn of a new century when the question of citizens' participation in political life would develop particular saliency. The "fraternal

order" as an organizational mould could be filled with content ranging from normative utopias to pragmatic philanthropy as much as pleasure and pastimes. Its main legacy is the principle of voluntary assembly among citizens for this wide range of purposes which, as simple as they might appear, also contributed to forming social and political consciousness. Not least, those fraternal orders engaging in the performance of a particular Swedish, "Gothic"/Norse sentiment searched for the foundations of a collective (proto-national) identity adapted to a new time.[42]

The governmental regulation of 1803 shows that, in an international context, trust between state and civil society was blurred. The autonomous activity of civil society actors potentially challenged a state prerogative of problem formulation and solution. Throughout the Swedish realm, fraternal orders highlighted social issues such as poverty, shortcomings of medical care, and education on a structural scale. By actively practicing and referring to normative foundations such as philanthropy, charity, and welfare, the fraternal societies together contributed to creating a political vocabulary, a grammar for the better organization of society, a discursive capital with which the future design of society could be negotiated. This in turn became one of the main lines in the Swedish and, in fact, Nordic social debate of the nineteenth century.

Notes

1 Öfwer-Ståthållare-Embetets Kungörelse, 1.
2 Stockholms Stadsarkiv (Stockholm Municipal Archive, SSA) "Förteckning på De handlingar, som angående i Stockholm inrättade OrdensSällskaper till mig inkommit och ännu innehafvas" and "Förteckning på de dels ifrån Landshöfdingarne dels ock från Wederbörande Styresman inkomne Bref och handlingar rörande i Orterna inrättade Ordens Sällskaper".
3 Im Hof, *Das gesellige Jahrhundert*.
4 Önnerfors, *Freemasonry*, 56–75.
5 Schwartz, *Freemasonry in the Revolutionary Atlantic*.
6 Önnerfors, *Mystiskt brödraskap*, 158–282.
7 Frängsmyr, *Svensk idéhistoria*, 394 and 411; Lamm, *Upplysningstidens romantik*, 3–121.
8 Hayen, "Ordenssällskap"; Söderström, "Förbrödring", 12–20; *Slutna rum* and "Älskade broder".
9 Önnerfors, "1803 års reglering," 16–40.
10 SAOB, "Orden".
11 See the Introduction to this volume.
12 Cross, *Gender and Fraternal Orders in Europe*, 1–15.
13 Önnerfors, "La sociabilité feminine," 77–96.
14 Jacob, *The Origins*, 47.
15 Sandin, "Monarken möter medborgarna", 123–58; Önnerfors, "Karl Johanstiden," 116–43.
16 Ambjörnsson, *Den skötsamme arbetaren*.
17 Arvidsson, *Morgonrodnad*.
18 Edling, "Välfärd", 719–37.
19 Neidenmark, *Pedagogiska imperativ*, 209.
20 Stenius, *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt*.

21 Önnerfors, "Knights of Freedom," 66–84 and Önnerfors, "Ritter der Freiheit," 305–29.
22 Önnerfors, "1803 års reglering," 16–40. Önnerfors, "Masonic Diplomacy," 6–8.
23 Önnerfors, *Freemasonry*, 56–75.
24 Önnerfors, "Criminal Cosmopolitans," 135–60.
25 Öfwer-Ståthållare-Embetets Kungörelse, 1.
26 Öfwer-Ståthållare-Embetets Kungörelse, 3.
27 Garting, *Ordensliv*, 23.
28 Staf, *Polisväsendet*, 360.
29 Lundin and Strindberg, *Gamla Stockholm*.
30 Lind, *"Strunt alt hvad du orerar"*.
31 Svenska Frimurare Ordens Arkiv och Bibliotek (Archive and Library of the Swedish Order of Freemasons, SFMO), 152.26.3 and 152.28 (83 and 104).
32 SFMO, 152.28 (104).
33 SFMO, 152.28 (83).
34 SFMO, 152.26.3.
35 Arndt, *Skildringar*, 99.
36 Arndt, *Skildringar*, 99.
37 Arndt, *Skildringar*, 100.
38 SAOB, "Orden."
39 Carleson, "Affären Boheman," 359–72.
40 Önnerfors, "Illuminsm," 173–81.
41 *Inrikes Tidningar*, No:33 29/3 1803.
42 See also Gunnarsdóttir's contribution to this volume.

Sources

Archives

Stockholms Stadsarkiv (Stockholm Municipal Archive, SSA)

"Förteckning på De handlingar, som angående i Stockholm inrättade OrdensSällskaper till mig inkommit och ännu innehafvas".

"Förteckning på de dels ifrån Landshöfdingarne dels ock från Wederbörande Styresman inkomne Bref och handlingar rörande i Orterna inrättade Ordens Sällskaper".

Svenska Frimurare Ordens Arkiv och Bibliotek (Archive and Library of the Swedish Order of Freemasons, SFMO) 152.26.3 and 152.28 (83 and 104). Stockholm.

Bibliography

"Älskade broder". Radioprogram for the series "Genier och Foliehattar." *Sveriges Radio*, 19 July 2014. https://sverigesradio.se/avsnitt/400257 (accessed 28 May 2024).

Ambjörnson, Ronny. *Den skötsamme arbetaren: Idéer och ideal i ett norrländskt sågverkssamhälle 1880–1930*. Stockholm: Carlsson, 1988.

Arndt, Ernst Moritz. *Skildringar ur svenska historien under Gustaf III och Gustaf IV Adolf*. Uppsala: n.pub., 1840.

Arvidsson, Stefan. *Morgonrodnad: socialismens stil och mytologi 1871–1914*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2016.

Berg, Pehr Gustaf. *Svenska ordnar, sällskap och föreningar m.m*. Stockholm: n.pub., 1873.
Carleson, Robert. "Affären Boheman." In *Hertig Carl och det svenska frimureriet*, edited by Dan Eklund, Sten Svensson, and Hans Berg, 359–72. Uppsala: CFE, 2010.
Cross, Máire Fedelma, ed. *Gender and Fraternal Orders in Europe, 1300–2000*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Edict wegen Verhütung und Bestrafung geheimer Verbindungen, welche der allgemeinen Sicherheit nachtheilig werden können. Prussian governmental regulation. Berlin: n.pub., 1798.
Edling, Nils. "Välfärd." In *Svenska Begreppshistorier från antropocen till åsiktskorridor*, edited by Jonas Hansson and Kristiina Savin, 719–37. Stockholm: Fri tanke, 2022.
Frängsmyr, Tore. *Svensk idéhistoria: bildning och vetenskap under tusen år*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 2004.
Garting, Bengt. *Ordensliv i Carlskrona*. Karlskrona: Föreningen Gamla Carlskrona, 1980.
Hayen, Mats. "Ordenssällskap – hemligt i slutna rum." *Släkthistoria*, 31 August 2019. https://slakthistoria.se/livet-forr/ordenssallskap-hemligt-i-slutna-rum (accessed 28 May 2024).
Im Hof, Ulrich. *Das gesellige Jahrhundert: Gesellschaft und Gesellschaften im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*. München: Beck, 1982.
Inrikes Tidningar. No:33 29/3 1803.
Jacob, Margaret C. *The Origins of Freemasonry: Facts and Fictions*. Philadelphia: Penn Press, 2006.
Lamm, Martin. *Upplysningstidens romantik: Den mystiskt sentimentala strömningen i svensk litteratur. Senare delen*. Stockholm: Geber, 1920.
Lind, Peter. *"Strunt alt hvad du orerar": Carl Michael Bellman, ordensretoriken och Bacchi Orden*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2014.
Lundin, Claes, and August Strindberg. *Gamla Stockholm: anteckningar ur tryckta och otryckta källor / framletade, saml. och utg*. Stockholm: Gidlund [1912] 1976.
Neidenmark, Thomas. *Pedagogiska imperativ och sociala nätverk i svensk medborgarbildning 1812–1828*. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 2011.
Öfwer-Ståthållare-Embetets Kungörelse om hwad af de så kallade Ordens-sällskaper hädanefter i akt tagas skal. Gifwen Stockholm den 26 Martii 1803. Cum Gratia & Privilegio S:æ R:æ Maj:ts. Stockholm, Tryckt i Kongl. Tryckeriet, 1803.
Önnerfors, Andreas. *Mystiskt brödraskap – mäktigt nätverk: studier i det svenska 1700-talsfrimureriet*. Lund: Minerva, 2006.
———. "La sociabilité feminine en Suède au XVIIIe siècle." *La Pensée et les Hommes* 82–83 (2011): 77–96.
———. "Illuminism." In *The Occult World*, edited by Christopher Partridge, 173–81. London: Routledge, 2015.
———. "Ritter der Freiheit? Der *Wallhall*-Orden in der schwedischen Armee und seine Verbindungen zur Anjala-Meuterei 1788." In *Krieg und Frieden im 18. Jahrhundert: Kulturgeschichtliche Studien*, edited by Stephanie Stockhorst, 305–29. Hannover: Wehrhahn, 2015.
———. "Knights of Freedom? The Swedish 'Order of Wallhall' as a Secret Network of Officers and the Anjala-Mutiny in 1788." In *Geheime Netzwerke im Militär 1700–1945*, edited by Gundula Gahlen, Daniel M. Segesser, and Carmen Winkel, 66–84. Schöningh: Paderborn, 2016.
———. *Freemasonry – A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
———. "1803 års statliga reglering av ordenssällskapen." In *Svenskt frimureri under 1800-talet*, edited by Marcus Willén, 16–40. Uppsala: Eckleff, 2018.

———. “Karl Johanstiden – mellan nedgång och unionsideologi.” In *Svenskt frimureri under 1800-talet*, edited by Marcus Willén, 118–43. Uppsala: Eckleff, 2018.

———. “Criminal Cosmopolitans: Conspiracy Theories surrounding the Assassination of Gustav III of Sweden in 1792.” In *Höllische Ingenieure: Kriminalitätsgeschichte der Attentate und Verschwörungen zwischen Spätmittelalter und Moderne*, edited by André Krischer and Tilman Haug, 135–50. Konstanz: UVK, 2021.

———. “Masonic Diplomacy in London around 1800.” *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* 134 (2021), 13–64.

Sandin, Per. “Monarken möter medborgarna.” In *En dynasti blir till: Medier, myter och makt kring Karl XIV Johan och familjen Bernadotte*, edited by Nils Ekedahl, 123–58. Stockholm: Norstedts, 2010.

Schwartz, Hans. *Freemasonry in the Revolutionary Atlantic World*. New York: Peter Lang, 2022.

Slutna rum. Thematic issue of *Kurage – idétidskrift för det civila samhället* (2012).

Söderström, Olle. “Förbrödring i hemlighetens kammare.” *Släkthistoriskt Forum* 2 (2021), 12–20.

Staf, Nils. *Polisväsendet i Stockholm 1776–1850*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1950.

Stenius, Henrik. *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt: Föreningsväsendets utveckling i Finland fram till 1900-talets början med speciell hänsyn till massorganisationsprincipens genombrott*. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, 1987.

Svenska Akademiens Ordbok (SAOB). “Orden.” Spalt O 1142 band 19. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien, 1950.

5 Emerging Civil Society in Iceland

Enlightenment Ideas and Old Norse Heritage

Margrét Gunnarsdóttir

Introduction

At the turn of the nineteenth century, Iceland was perceived as the cradle of Nordic culture and history. Iceland represented the Nordic democratic and integrative spirit, a true antiquarian gemstone under the sceptre of the Danish Crown. The correspondence of Icelandic officials at the time provides the opportunity to search beneath this ideal surface. Their letters reveal various experiences of civil society and arising tension with the advent of voluntary associations in Icelandic society.

Iceland was a province within the Danish-Norwegian dual monarchy. The country was settled around 870. In 930 a national assembly, the Althing, was established with a common law code, the Norwegian Gulathing being its model. This was the Icelandic Commonwealth which lasted until 1262 when Icelanders submitted their rule to the King of Norway after a fierce struggle between domestic leaders which amounted to a civil war. In 1380, with the unification of the Danish and Norwegian monarchies, Iceland became a part of the Danish composite state for nearly six centuries. Copenhagen was from then on the administrative centre of Iceland. Icelanders sought university education in Copenhagen and several of them held posts in the administration. The first Icelandic voluntary societies, such as the Icelandic Society of Learned Arts, founded in 1779 and publishing a yearbook until 1796, had their base in Copenhagen.

With the foundation of the Icelandic Society, the first society based solely in Iceland, in 1794 cosmopolitan Enlightenment literature characterized Iceland's civil society. For a few years this locally based society had great impact on the moulding of the public sphere. When it petered out thirty years later, another society with roots in Iceland, the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries had been established in Copenhagen. In Iceland, this enterprise was met with enthusiasm by most people and soon it had more than 1,000 subscribers/members (out of a population of around 50,000), which was the same number as the Icelandic Society had prided itself on having three decades earlier.

This chapter will shed light on the effort made from the end of the eighteenth century until around 1830 to strengthen the development of civil society and education in Iceland. The aim is to give examples of how these two societies advocated different ideological strategies for building civil society in Iceland. The activities of

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-7
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

these two voluntary associations represented different ideas about the basic pillar needed for the development of a modern civil society. Should the integrative Old Norse culture lead the way, or would modern Enlightenment ideas be a more useful tool towards the future in Iceland?

The societies had political as well as cultural implications on both local and state levels. The special role Icelandic civil society played within the transnational sphere of the Danish absolute state is also discussed in regard to the activities of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries in Iceland.

The diverse purposes and, at times, the complex nature of civil society-state nexus in Iceland will be highlighted. The uncertainty about the operative law of the country, the interweaving of Icelandic and Danish laws, made Dano-Icelandic state-civil society development delicate. The tension in regard to old and new ideas is discussed further in the final part of the chapter as it was seen as important to establish and nourish the roots of the common Nordic elements, that is the Old Norse heritage preserved in Iceland.

Associations in the Nordic countries have been described as important for democratic developments.[1] In this respect the emerging civil society practices in Iceland are illuminating not only as case studies on a national level but also as representing a common Nordic thread, crystalized in the republican constitution in Iceland during the Commonwealth era. The Althing gave a sense of continuum which can not be overlooked. This special common role Icelandic civil society played within the transnational sphere of the Danish Crown is underlying in the narrative.

The Foundation of the Icelandic Society

The Icelandic Society was founded at Thingvellir in the summer of 1794 under the Icelandic name *Hið íslenska Landsuppfræðingarfélag* which translates as the Icelandic Society of the Education of the Nation or the Icelandic Society of National Enlightenment. In English it was called the Icelandic Society in contemporary sources.[2] A Scotsman who visited Iceland in 1810, Sir George Steuart Mackenzie, described the Icelandic Society in his journal:

> The object of the institution was the promotion of knowledge and improvement among the people; and with this view, a fund was provided by the annual contribution of a dollar from each member, and devoted to the publication of books, to be distributed among the subscribers.[3]

The most prominent member of the Icelandic Society was a young lawyer, Magnús Stephensen (1762–1833), who belonged to the wealthiest family in Iceland. Stephensen, who served from 1796 as president of the Icelandic Society was appointed as the first chief justice of Iceland when the Icelandic Royal High Court of Justice was established in 1800.[4] Stephensen had many threads in his hands, influencing public opinion as well as laying the grounds for a modern judicial system on behalf of the administration in Copenhagen.

At the time of the foundation of the Icelandic Society, Stephensen confided in a letter to the bishop and co-founder Hannes Finnsson (1739–1796) that the purpose was to establish a popular society with democratic principles.[5] Expectations were high, the establishment of the Society would be a turning-point in Icelandic history. District governor Stefán Thorarinsson (1754–1823) declared that the Society would be the most powerful tool for reforms in Iceland "since the first settlement" in the ninth century. Ages had passed, but now progress was finally in sight. For this to happen people of all classes had to show solidarity and join the Society.[6]

It was seen as important to gain large number of members. Soon members numbered more than a thousand from all parts of society: peasants, priests, and officials.[7] Thus it could be argued that the Society represented the whole nation. Stephensen wrote in a letter to Copenhagen that "it is like a miracle that in a country where the economy is not in good shape 1012 people have become members of the Society". This success was according to Stephensen "the only pure example in the history of the world of a powerful enlightenment spirit".[8] Stephensen labelled the year of the foundation "a patriotic year" as it demonstrated the patriotic spirit of the nation, its unity, in times of constraint due to adverse commercial policy.[9]

At the Althing, where officials assembled in July every year, Stephensen circulated in 1795 a petition to the king for free trade with foreigners. The limited free trade plan introduced in 1787 had been a failure and something had to change for the better.[10] The officials, with the exception of the governor J. Chr. Vibe (1749–1802), signed the petition, which was referred to as the General Petition.[11]

The laws of the Icelandic Society were printed in 1796 along with a list of its members.[12] They were praised for taking part along with the founders who were "a few patriots". Those who didn't sign up were sarcastically scolded and described as "villains".[13] This remark indicates that although the officials had convened at the Althing and had signed the General Trade Petition, there was some disunity within their ranks due to political issues.

Different Opinion on the Abolition of the Althing

Political factions had emerged in Iceland, on the surface due to lack of commercial freedom. Yet, the differences were more deeply rooted and concerned the interpretation of Icelandic history during its first centuries, i.e. the ideological meaning of the Commonwealth period (930–1262).[14] The Althing, which is still today the name of the Icelandic parliament, has been described as holding a special position in regard to Icelandic nationality due to its historical status and constitutional heritage.[15] Furthermore Old Icelandic heritage was a unifying Nordic symbol, as was the ancient Norwegian language (Icelandic, also the Norse tongue and Danish tongue) which was still spoken in Iceland, the common language of the Nordic people in the past. The same held true for the saga literature.[16]

The Royal High Court of Justice convened for the first time in 1801, not at Thingvellir where the Althing had operated for centuries, but in Reykjavík, which was by far the largest town with 457 people. Most Icelanders lived on farms located all around the country.[17] To move the Court was a sensitive political issue which

met with opposition. Since the foundation of the Althing in 930 it had served the role of a legislature and a jury. By the second half of the eighteenth century it had lost its legislative role. However, it was still the seat of the judicial court which met at Thingvellir for the last time in 1798.[18]

Stephensen, who aimed to unify the Icelandic nation under the auspices of the Icelandic Society, was instrumental in abolishing the Althing at Thingvellir.[19] In a speech given when the High Court first assembled in 1801, Stephensen emphasized the importance of justice and law and order for a healthy civilized society. His interpretation of the Commonwealth period was negative, the Althing with its unifying democratic elements was for him no more than a plague which led to anarchy.[20]

Stephensen said it was fantastical to describe the Commonwealth period as a golden age: Iceland's old laws did not bring happiness and prosperity to the nation. The lenient and remote power of the Norwegian kings and their laws suited the nation better. According to Stephensen, Iceland did not begin to flourish until King Haakon the Old and the Icelanders sealed the Old Covenant (*Gamli sáttmáli*) in 1262/64.[21] Stephensen, admired *Jónsbók* (Laws of Later Iceland), a civil law introduced in 1281. When he was a member of a commission on educational and judicial reforms in Iceland (1799–1800), he proposed to the Chancery that a special Icelandic law code should be published, separate from the Danish law code.[22]

The foremost legal experts, apart from Stephensen himself, opposed the move of the Court to Reykjavík.[23] Their interpretation of Icelandic history and civic life during the Commonwealth period was different from that of Stephensen. They emphasized admiration for the "golden age" of the Commonwealth republican period and the heritage of common law. The understanding of Icelandic laws, or what they should constitute, thus differed widely. Stephensen's colleague at the High Court, assessor Ísleifur Einarsson (1765–1836), insisted that the independence and freedom of Icelanders during the Commonwealth period was a time of glory when Icelanders were respected for their learning by the kings of "Norway, Sweden, England, Denmark, Russia (Garðaríki), Turkey (Miklagarði)".[24] Einarsson's words were in line with ideas expressed by others before him who stressed the long tradition of cooperation in the North, where Iceland took a centre place.[25]

It is telling that Einarsson was not a member of the Icelandic Society,[26] and he was suspicious toward Stephensen as well. In an 1804 letter to Grímur Thorkelin (1752–1829), the Royal Archivist in Copenhagen, antiquarian, jurist, and first editor of *Beowulf*, Einarson wrote that he feared Chief Justice Stephensen would "disgrace" the country with his ideas and actions.[27]

Thorkelin, who was in close contact with his countrymen in Iceland although living in Copenhagen, had been in the British Isles and Ireland from 1786–91 on behalf of the Danish Crown and was there widely regarded as a specialist on Anglo-Saxon and Old Nordic constitutional and dynastic history.[28] Thorkelin became the leader of the Icelandic officials who advocated civil society which would have the potential to strengthen the union with Denmark, in a similar way as unionist nationalism developed in Scotland.[29] During his stay in Britain, he had been in collaboration with the Enlightenment philosopher Adam Ferguson (1723–1816), known

for his groundbreaking analysis of civil society, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Ferguson emphasized the stabilizing benefits of union policy.[30]

Thorkelin's ties to Scotland did endure. Ebenezer Henderson (1784–1858), a Scottish missionary, worked closely with him in Copenhagen and wrote an insightful description of Iceland as a mature civil society with roots in the Althing, where Icelanders' "admirable constitution had been established, their laws framed, their magistrates elected, and all the various concerns of the nation finally adjusted".[31]

Writings of intellectuals abroad at the time emphasized the symbolic meaning of the Icelandic Commonwealth and the Althing. The political thinker J.C.L. Simondi Sismondi (1773–1842) stressed Iceland's historical importance as a model for political freedom. Iceland could be seen as "Athènes des glaces" he wrote in his biography of Paul-Henri Mallet (1730–1807), the Swiss author of *Northern Antiquities*, whose message had been the same, laying stress on the importance of the Commonwealth republican constitution of the Althing as a political heritage for the Danish absolute monarchy.[32]

Education of the Public

Knowledge of international affairs was an important element in the development of civil society.[33] The Icelandic Society prepared the public for taking part in modern society with various publications. Stephensen insisted that membership of the Society would be more desirable if its publications were frequent from the outset.[34] The Society's periodical, *Minnisverd Tídindi (Noteworthy News*), was published for eight years from 1796 to 1804. It had the potential of being a powerful tool to influence the Icelandic public sphere in the making. More than 1,000 copies were printed of each issue and sent to members who circulated them widely among friends and neighbours.[35]

Minnisverd Tídindi contained detailed narratives of current affairs abroad.[36] Following his account of the French Revolution in the first issue, Stephensen, the editor-in-chief, wrote about nations and countries where there were disagreements about the form of government and how society should be constructed. Detailed accounts about potentially incendiary issues in, for example, Ireland, Poland, Holland and Germany were not shied away from. Toussant Louverture and the revolution in "St. Domingo" (i.e. Haiti) were also of special interest to the editor.[37] Stephensen was well aware that his political standpoint was not to the liking of all of his fellow countrymen. In a letter to his closest co-worker, Bishop Finnsson, while preparing the first issue for printing, he wrote: "I shiver and tremble with fear, as I can be certain that [what I write] will be condemned."[38] These words show that Stephensen had no intention of hiding his progressive views even though they were provocative and dangerous to publish elsewhere in Europe.[39]

Critical voices were soon heard. It was claimed that *Minnisverd Tídindi* was generally ill-reputed.[40] One of the Danish merchants located in Iceland noted that the narrative of the "bloody" French Revolution was not suitable for peasants, as careless use of concepts such as "liberty" and "equality" in publications for the general public was dangerous as common people lacked the necessary background

to understand such terms properly. It could have the opposite effect to the intended enlightenment and even lead to a "bloody" revolution.[41]

Minnisverd Tídindi gave regular accounts of discussions in the British parliament and public meetings in London.[42] The London Correspondence Society, which had around 2000 members, was introduced to Icelandic readers.[43] More than 100,000 people had gathered "on the fields near London, … where the citizen John Binns was chosen as a president, emphasizing the unhappiness and poverty of common people". Illustrative examples like this were meant to serve as an "extra reminder" for the Icelandic public.[44]

There were no political gatherings in Iceland, but people traditionally came together in the evenings at each farm for the "evening wakes" (*kvöldvaka*) where the sagas were read aloud.[45] The Icelandic Society wanted to make use of this tradition and in one of its first publications, which bore the title *Qvøld-vøkurnar (Kvöldvökur)*, it introduced modern literature and scientific discoveries.[46] Icelanders young and old needed to adapt to a new reality. In their turf houses on dark winter nights, it was now possible for people to listen to detailed accounts of current affairs and modern literature read aloud instead of the Old Norse literature.

The abolition of the freedom of the press in the Danish Kingdom in 1799 did not deter Stephensen. At the same time as censorship laws were being upheld in Copenhagen, it so happened that Icelanders from all ranks of society and in every isolated corner of the country could read freely about global events and radical political developments in other countries.[47] Strangely enough, upholding this law in Iceland was for practical reasons the duty of a single individual, the person in charge of the only printing press, that is Stephensen himself. The Icelandic Society had bought and united the two printing presses in the country, the press in Hrappsey (secular) and the press at Hólar-Episcopal see (religious).[48]

This had consequences for religious life and soon Bibles were in short supply. In Copenhagen, Thorkelin acted quickly and started preparing a new edition of the Bible in Icelandic in a collaboration with the British and Foreign Bible Society and the missionary Henderson.[49] Along with Icelandic officials, Henderson established the Icelandic Bible Society much to the displeasure of Stephensen.[50]

Signs of disunity on the board of the Icelandic Society were felt as early as its first meeting in 1795. Soon two prominent founding members of the society, the aforementioned Thorarinsson and the provost Markús Magnússon (1748–1825), cut all ties with Stephensen.[51] In 1806 Thorarinsson confided in a letter to Thorkelin that he dreaded that "in Iceland there would evolve a kind of new literary monopoly instead of the former commercial monopoly", thus referring to Stephensen being in control of the only printing press in Iceland.[52]

The Icelandic Society: Influences and Possibilities

Although the publications of the Icelandic Society were numerous, the structure of the society was not democratic. There were only three meetings of the board, in 1794 (foundation), 1795, and 1796.[53] In only one meeting did ordinary members participate.[54] No general meetings were ever held in the Icelandic Society, not even

at the outset, in order to discuss and approve the regulations of the Society. This gave the director of the Society, a post held by Stephensen from 1796, total freedom of control.[55] The number of the members was illusory. Much later, Stephensen admitted that in the second year only a quarter of the members paid the annual fee.[56] By 1800, no one paid the annual membership fee anymore thereby making the Icelandic Society defunct.[57]

During the summer of 1808, Royal Archivist Thorkelin contradicted Stephensen in *Nyeste Skilderiet af Kjøbenhavn* in an unusually outspoken manner. He said that the state did not need Stephensen's advice on the administration of Iceland as "the King and his government were fully aware what was required" in Iceland.[58] These words were published at the zenith of the Napoleonic Wars, when the ties between Iceland and Denmark were fragile, after the British bombardment of Copenhagen in 1807. When Stephensen was preparing to sail back from Copenhagen to Iceland after a year away from home, Thorkelin demanded publicly clear answers from him about the purpose of the Icelandic Society. Thorkelin insisted that the society could hardly anymore be described as a proper society, but rather as a "privat" apparatus as the members were "only subscribers to Stephensen's private publications".[59]

In one article after another in *Kjøbenhavns Skilderie*, Thorkelin repeated his question about the nature of the Icelandic Society, but Stephensen avoided answering.[60] In his last article, Thorkelin addressed "the Danish and Icelandic Public", claiming that something unexpected was "supposed to happen" in Iceland in connection with the Icelandic Society. Thorkelin was very concerned,[61] asking "What is the Icelandic Society?", thereby indicating that it had some kind of a hidden political purpose.

Stephensen resided in Bergen during the winter of 1808–9. There he was in contact with Dutch and American merchants who showed interest in trading with Iceland.[62] Before sailing from Norway to Iceland in the spring of 1809, after successfully (according to himself) securing trade with the United States, Stephensen was in an optimistic mood. Looking ahead he was convinced that soon plenty of "rice-pudding with rum and brown sugar" would be available in Iceland.[63]

Stephensen was familiar with the Norwegian public sphere and early associational life. The Society for the Welfare of Norway (*Selskabet for Norges Vel)*, which was founded at the end of the year 1809, was the first nation-wide organization in Norway accepted by the authorities in Copenhagen.[64] Herman Wedel Jarlsberg (1779–1840), who had a seat in the Norwegian Commission of Government (functioning 1807–10), had been selected as the president of the society. According to a contemporary account, his real purpose in the nearest future was to make it "the core [germ. *Seele*] of a national assembly".[65] As Morten Nordhagen Ottosen and Rasmus Glenthøj have argued, the Norwegian Society had a hidden political agenda: "its central management or *management board* could in a sense resemble a government body".[66] The board of the Icelandic Society could have played the same role in Iceland, which might explain the escalating tension within the circle of Icelandic officials at the time. The Society's influence on civil society, in a country

which lay far afield from the administration centre, was seen as suspectable by advocates of a strong union with Denmark.

Testing Times in Iceland during the Summer of 1809

By the spring of 1809 Stephensen was back in Iceland. The Napoleonic Wars were raging and the bond between Iceland and Denmark had been severed. A strange course of events started when a British commercial expedition arrived in Reykjavík in June. During the summer, Danish absolute power was abolished and a new constitutional order established. This short-lived revolution was explained away at the time as the sole responsibility of a young Dane, the "adventurer" Jörgen Jörgensen (1780–1843).[67] But had Thorkelin's vague predictions about "something" about to happen come true? Were the Icelandic Society and its president Stephensen involved?

On 21 June 1809, a British trading vessel arrived in Reykjavík. Four days later the crew arrested the governor, Frederich Christopher Count of Trampe (1779–1832), and seized power on the island with a Proclamation dated 26 June. After two weeks, a new Proclamation dated 11 July was printed at the Icelandic Society's printing press. The press was during that summer, as for the many years past, under the control of the president of the Icelandic Society, Chief Justice Stephensen.[68]

The first article of the second Proclamation made clear that the constitutional ties between the Icelandic nation and the Danish Crown had been broken. "That We, Jorgen Jorgensen, have undertaken the management of public affairs, under the name of PROTECTOR, until a settled constitution can be fixed on." The new constitution should ensure that the Icelandic nation would be autonomous and have "full power to make war or conclude peace with foreign powers".[69] A representative assembly in the modern sense should be established within a year.[70]

Local officials were generally not pleased with this bold enterprise. One of them, county magistrate Gunnlaugur Briem (1773–1834), insisted in a long pamphlet titled *Quid sentimus? Quid faciendum?* that to cut ties with the Dano-Norwegian state would be harmful. It would lead to "Anarchy", a new *Sturlungaöld* (the age of Sturlungar), the period of civil unrest during the thirteenth century.[71] It is an indication of the state of civil affairs that the term *Sturlungaöld* was widely used in letters between officials as a reference to the present political situation.[72]

The second proclamation, with the prospect of the establishment of an Icelandic representative assembly in 1810, clearly broke Iceland's ties to the Danish Crown. Stephensen's decision to allow the printing and issuing of it was an audacious affair. His master printer, Skagfjörð, officially took the responsibility for printing the proclamation. He explained that he had to choose between life and death as Jörgensen stood in front of him with a loaded gun and that it had been printed without asking permission from Stephensen.[73]

However, it is clear that Chief Justice Stephensen had been two-faced during the summer.[74] As he realized that the game was over in August when the British Royal Navy intervened, he was quick to condemn everything concerning the events and

the proclamation.[75] To clear the situation the British Crown put Iceland under a neutral state by an Order in Council on 7 February 1810 by the Privy Council.[76]

Stephensen's account to the Danish Government to explain his involvement in the 1809 affair was in the eyes of Trampe a distorted description, full of "inescapable lies, distortions and missing parts".[77] The same sentiment was expressed elsewhere.[78]

In the aftermath, uncertainty loomed in the air, and the issuing of the second proclamation on 11 July was obviously a crime of treason. Officials agreed that long books could be written about the events, but very soon there seems to have been a concerted effort to lay to rest what had taken place.[79] In the autumn of 1809 Governor Trampe wrote a long Memorandum to the Earl of Bathurst where he insisted that the episode he witnessed during the summer was "without example in all the revolutions which history records" but had the same result as in other revolutions, that is, "severing a people from their lawful prince" (i.e. King Frederick VI).[80] In a private letter Trampe wrote from Copenhagen in the spring of 1813 to assessor Einarsson he remarked that it was best, considering all circumstances, to sweep the events of 1809 "into forgetfulness in æternum".[81] Einarsson was regarded as having been a man of honour during the 1809 events, a true protector of the Danish state as Thorkelin declared in 1810. He thanked him for being "a rock when many had failed in their dutiful service to the King and the fatherland" and by his actions saved the state from an "indelible dishonour".[82]

Suspicions about Stephensen's involvement in the plot were rife in government circles, although nothing was said publicly. District governor Bjarni Thorsteinsson (1781–1876) recalled later that Stephensen had lost all respect amongst dignitaries in Copenhagen where he had previously been held in high regard.[83] After the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Stephensen had to defend himself formally against the rumours.[84] In England, Sir Joseph Banks (1743–1820), president of the Royal Society and a Privy Councillor, who had put his trust in Stephensen as letters from the years before 1809 suggest,[85] refused to answer his letters in the aftermath of the affair.[86]

But Stephensen did not retreat after the Napoleonic Wars ended. His influence as the main proponent of the Enlightenment was still profound and the printing presses of the Icelandic Society were still operating. A monthly periodical *Klaustur-Pósturinn* (*Cloister Posten*) was printed from 1818–25 and then again for one last year in 1827. As was the case before with *Minnisverd Tídindi*, international current affairs as well as a thorough survey of the Napoleonic Wars were published.[87]

The Jónsbók-affair and the Final Days of the Icelandic Society

Stephensen's admiration for *Jónsbók* had not waned since he delivered his opening speech at the High Court in 1801. In 1819 Stephensen received a doctorate from Copenhagen University for his dissertation *Commentatio de legibus, qvæ jus Islandicum . . .*, on Icelandic law and *Jónsbók* in particular. The aim of his study was to clarify the legal framework in Iceland.[88] Stephensen confided in a letter to

Thorsteinsson in 1820 that the laws for Iceland should be separate from the Danish law code and customized with *Jónsbók*.[89]

In the autumn of 1825, after years of preparation, Stephensen sailed to Denmark with his new edition of *Jónsbók* which he had translated to Danish as well. He presented this work to the Chancery in four folio-volumes.[90] However, Stephensen's edition of *Jónsbók* was never published. In contrast, Thorkelin's edition of the ancient laws of Norway, *Gulatings-loven*, was published.[91] The Chancery suggested that Stephensen should combine relevant passages from *Jónsbók* with current Danish and Norwegian laws, but Stephensen was not interested in such a venture.[92]

The Chancery's refusal did not deter Stephensen who was determined to publish *Jónsbók*.[93] In private letters to Thorsteinsson, he discussed this project in detail. His purpose was still to create a separate law for Iceland, as he confided in the spring of 1826.[94] During the summer, Thorsteinsson, who had been given the task of editing *Jónsbók*, wrote to inform Thorkelin that Stephensen was planning a new "coup", in all likelihood referring to the 1809 events. The new "coup" concerned the publication of *Jónsbók*.[95] Thorkelin gave Thorsteinsson his instructions. The *Jónsbók* manuscript should be used in a positive manner for "amalgamation" of the Icelandic "nation" and "the honourable Danes". Thorkelin's heartfelt wish was to have "one law, one people and one custom" in the Danish state. The Icelanders were best served by assimilating "to the Danish noble race as much as possible". He added that it is necessary to "promote honourable laws in the country as it has been Iceland's biggest harm to have been without order nearly forever".[96]

It was high time that matters regarding civil life in Iceland were brought to a head. During Stephensen's stay in Copenhagen in 1825–26 he had to defend himself on several fronts. The Icelandic Society had not been operating properly for years and financial irregularities were being investigated. It appeared to be functioning only in connection with the publications of Stephensen's own work.[97]

Accusations put in jeopardy Stephensen's thirty-year dominance of the only printing press in Iceland. For a time it seemed he would need to cease the publication of the periodical *Klausturpósturinn*. Thorkelin was happy with this development as he had long been worried about the state of the press in Iceland.[98]

Stephensen had been tolerated for too long according to some of his Icelandic opponents. They were pleased that he did not receive the honours from the king he had expected and in the spring of 1826 he was not chosen as an honorary member of the Icelandic Literary Society, which had been established in 1816 and had branches in Denmark and Iceland.[99]

The 1809 affair, which had tainted the honour of Icelandic officials, was frustrating, and now Stephensen had a new project on his mind, the publication of *Jónsbók*. Even the next generation of Icelandic officials were aware of the situation. The priest Tómas Sæmundsson (1807–1841), who was the main leader of an influential movement of young romantic nationalists, confided in assessor Einarsson about Stephensen's and his followers' "guilty conscience" about the 1809 affair.[100]

Vigfús Erichsen (1790–1846), an Icelandic jurist living in Copenhagen, published a pamphlet titled *Island og dets Justitiarius Magnus Stephensen*, a damning account of Stephensen.[101] Erichsen insisted Stephensen had acted in every way opposite to the advice he received from Thorkelin in his public writings to him in 1808 "to show justice, piety, religion, love and modesty".[102] Thorkelin, one of the instigators of this attack, was pleased with Erichsen's book,[103] but Stephensen was incensed and sued Erichsen.[104] Erichsen, on his part, regarded his book and indeed the court-action as a way to reclaim the public reputation of Icelanders and demonstrate that they were trustworthy subjects of the Danish State.[105]

In Iceland, Stephensen convened the board of the Icelandic Society in 1826. According to Erichsen this was a "pseudo-meeting" trying to counteract the accusations.[106] Dissolution of the Icelandic Society was in process in 1827 and its printing operation came to a temporary end.[107] One year later, Thorkelin was optimistic on behalf of the "Old Iceland" which he claimed was admired by the king. Continual local conflict had been devastating for Icelandic society. He wished "concordia" would thrive with trustworthy officials and better educational opportunities and added: "God give that the country for once can be free from Justitiarii St. [Stephensen] persecution and damaging plans".[108]

The Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries takes Roots in Iceland

The Icelandic Society was about to take its last breaths when the Society of Northern Antiquaries (*Det Nordiske Oldskriftselskab*) was taking its first steps. This Society aimed at publishing the Old Norse medieval literature, mostly of Icelandic origin. It became an important tool for integration and gradually developed an interconnected global network.[109] The Society became a key element in promoting common Nordic heritage, as Ruth Hemstad has pointed out.[110] The Society had the backing of the Danish Crown and from 1828 it held the title of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries.

It all began in a Dano-Icelandic environment as it was important to lay a solid foundation for the project, although the collection of the Icelandic medieval manuscripts was mainly kept and preserved in Copenhagen.[111] The connection to Iceland gave it authenticity as it held meaning to establish its roots in Iceland where the Old Norse Saga literature, and sources on Norwegian and Danish kings, had been written during the Middle Ages. Carl Christian Rafn (1795–1864) and two Icelanders, Gísli Brynjólfsson (1794–1827) and Sveinbjörn Egilsson (1791–1852), started preparing for the foundation of the Society in January 1824. In the spring the first plans were sent to Iceland. The reception was, according to Rafn, who soon became the leader, very positive. He thought it uplifting to know that the sagas were still read by "Commoners". "Many, not only farmers, but also *servants*, yes even women had subscribed to the first Icelandic Saga [published by the Society]." This he found pleasantly surprising as commoners had to deal with a great shortage of money.[112]

The subscriptions of the sagas turned out to be very popular with about 1,000 people signing up for membership.[113] This was seen as symbolically important, as Rafn later (1834) explained in a letter to the American philologist and diplomat George Perkins Marsh (1801–1882):

> From the remotest ages down to the present day the Icelandic peasant has sought the gratification of his passion for the old national literature, and for the acquisition of knowledge, in laboriously copying out in Mss. the ancient Sagas, and there are many among the peasantry of Iceland who are possessed of no inconsiderable collections of such Sagas, written partly by their ancestors, partly by themselves.[114]

To lay down the roots of the Society in Iceland was in Rafn's eyes a patriotic deed which symbolized Danish gratitude towards the Icelandic nation.[115] The traditional "evening wakes" were the best place to influence civil society. For a few years, this cultural and educational haven had been under the influence of the publications of the Icelandic Society. Now the aim was to reclaim these with publications of the Society of Northern Antiquaries, thereby giving a cooperational meaning.

Stephensen did not approve of this undertaking, as a letter he wrote in 1829 to the Society of Northern Antiquaries indicates. The competition would have bad effects on the marketing of his educational publications. He insisted that it was important to promote the "right culture and learning" and "true enlightenment" in Iceland. People were led astray by the publications of the Society of Northern Antiquaries. He made a clear distinction between publication for learned cultural activity, which should be the prime concern of the Society of Northern Antiquaries, and the publication of books aimed at educating the masses in Iceland, which should be the concern of the Icelandic Society. It would be detrimental to the civilizing process in the country if the public only got "Icelandic Sagas and Chaotic Works and ... legends" to read, the old heritage, the Icelandic culture itself, could suffocate modern ideas and progress.[116]

From Stephensen's point of view, a clear break from the past and the glorification of the old Commonwealth period was necessary for modern civil society to flourish in Iceland. The existence of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries and its undertakings in Iceland were a thorn in his eye.

Conclusion

The first three decades of the nineteenth century provided many opportunities for the progress of civil society in Iceland. The turnout of members of the two very distinct societies discussed was high (1,000 members/subscribers), indicating that the public sphere in Iceland was a fertile ground for ideas old and new.

The moulding of modern civil society in Iceland was a process based on varied foundations. Underneath the surface, tension was building. The president of the

Icelandic Society and the Chief Justice, Stephensen, held many threads of power in his hands. Some officials distrusted Stephensen and feared he would not act responsibly. He might misuse his power as the controller of the only printing press in Iceland. This position he utilized powerfully to influence the public with publications such as *Kvöldvökur*, *Minnisverd Tídindi*, and *Klaustur-Pósturinn*. At civil society level, this was a new kind of monopoly, a cultural and homegrown one, rather than the commercial monopoly imposed upon Icelanders by the Danes. Even though civil liberty seemed to be growing, with flourishing secular publications, many locals felt the civil space was suppressive.

The events of 1809 gave more serious concerns for unionists. The press was in a delicate state although it was flourishing. When the ties between Iceland and the Danish administration were briefly broken, the printing press under the control of the Society was used to print a proclamation, which cut the ties to the Crown. The civil society-state nexus was in this respect volatile. Thorkelin's public questions about the purpose of the Icelandic Society in the months leading up to the so-called "Icelandic Revolution" in 1809 show concerns about the delicate balance needed when the weaving of state-civil society was in the making in the province of Iceland.

The national institution of the Althing, which held a special meaning as a pillar of civil society, had been disbanded and the court moved to Reykjavík. The fate of the Althing was fraught with meaning. It had ideological implications since the Althing held a symbolic meaning for the Danish Crown as a sign of democratic/republican heritage. This was the reason why some of the most loyal officials opposed the move of the court to Reykjavík. The chief justice in the new Court, Stephensen, was instrumental in the move.

Growing tension on many levels which local officials believed mirrored the period of *Sturlungaöld*, the only example of civil warfare in Iceland, indicate the delicate and intricate situation. Thus, it can be claimed that the Icelandic Society had a subversive influence on the union between Iceland and Denmark as suspicions about the role of the Society indicate. The discourse gives examples of visions of national patriotism and unionist nationalism and the tension these conflicting ideas evoked.

Stephensen's ideas in regard to the publication of a separate Icelandic law code *Jónsbók* were also seen as provocative. In 1825 he hoped to put this plan in action, but the Chancery opposed it, claiming it would not be useful to have a separate Icelandic law code. It was important that the Danish law code was securely in place as well. By this time, the Icelandic Society was under special investigation by the state.

The Icelandic Society was seen as threatening on the state-civil society level and its operation, even though based on progressive ideas of enlightenment, awoke distrust. The Society of Northern Antiquaries was different in nature from the Icelandic Society. Its agenda had cultural roots, to promote Nordic medieval literature with the overall aim of inclusiveness. This also had political meaning, as the Old Norse culture could build bridges between people.

The civil space in Iceland had an ingrained common Nordic democratic element, presenting the modern world with the symbolism of political freedom of the Althing and the continuous thread of the Old Norse heritage of the Danish and Norwegian kingdoms.

Notes

1 See the Introduction and Önnerfors' contribution to this volume.
2 Holland, *The Iceland Journal of Henry Holland 1810*, 157, 164.
3 Mackenzie, *Travels in the Island of Iceland*, 309.
4 A historical study about the ideology of Magnús Stephensen gives detailed information on his various projects throughout his life. See Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*. On the Stephensen family network, Hreinsson, *Nätverk och nepotism*.
5 *Lbs.* Lbs. 29, fol. Stephensen to Finnsson, 26 July 1794.
6 *Lbs.* JS. 513, 4to. Thorarinsson, 22 April 1795. All translations are by the author, unless otherwise stated.
7 *Lbs.* Lbs. 29, fol. Stephensen to Finnsson, 4 September 1794. Mackenzie, *Travels in the Island of Iceland,* 309.
8 *Lbs.* Lbs. 130, fol. Stephensen to unknown recipient, 28 May 1795. See as well *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 171. Finnsson, "Inngangur," *Qvøld-vøkurnar*, xiii–xiv.
9 *Islands almindelige Ansøgning til Kongen om udvidede Handels-Friheder*, 22.
10 See e.g. detailed accounts on commercial treaties (i.e. Jay's treaty) in *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 126, 145–6. On foreign relations between the U.S. and France and Britain, *Minnisverd Tídindi* 2:1 (1798–1801), 58; 2:2 (1798–1801), 271, 273.
11 Melsted, *Concise History of Iceland*, 74.
12 *Samþycktir hins Islendska Lands-Uppfrædingar Félags*.
13 *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 171.
14 Gunnarsdóttir, "Ísland og danskt krúnuvald á Norður-Atlantshafi," 162–75, 275–90.
15 See i.e. Hálfdanarson, "Þingvellir," 5.
16 Mallet, *Northern Antiquities*, 393. Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*, 162–63, Gunnarsdóttir, "Ísland og danskt krúnuvald á Norður-Atlantshafi," 116.
17 Agnarsdóttir, "Iceland in the Eighteenth Century," 11–16.
18 Þórðarson, *Landsyfirdómurinn 1800–1919*, 25–26.
19 Thorarensen to Magnússon, 28 February 1833, I, 209. Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensen*, 48–49, 57–58.
20 Þórðarson, *Landsyfirdómurinn 1800–1919*, 39. See Sigurðsson, "The Icelandic Enlightenment as an Extended Phenomenon," 379.
21 Þórðarson, *Landsyfirdómurinn 1800–1919*, 36–45. Þorsteinsson and Líndal, "Lögfesting konungsvalds," 23–24.
22 Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 58. See as well: *Jónsbók*.
23 Kristjánsson, *Endurreisn Alþingis og þjóðfundurinn*, 40. Henderson, *Iceland; or the Journal of a Residence in that Island*, II, 167.
24 Einarsson, "Nokkrar þíngræður Ísleifs Einarssonar, sýslumanns í Húnavatnssýslu," 110.
25 See e.g. Olavius, *Upartiske Tanker om det islandske Handels-Compagnie*, 14. [Thomson], *Travels into Norway, Denmark, and Russia, in the Years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791*, 54–61.
26 *Samþycktir hins Islendska Lands-Uppfrædingar Félags*.
27 *Lbs.* JS. 95 b, fol. Einarsson to Thorkelin, 12 September 1804.

28 Gunnarsdóttir, "Ísland og danskt krúnuvald á Norður-Atlantshafi," 183–91, 235–49.
29 Jackson, *United Kingdoms*, 212.
30 See various letters in *EUL*. La III. 379. Correspondence of Professor Thorkelin, Keeper of the Records, Copenhagen 3. vols., 1790–1824. Thorkelin to Robert Jamieson, 13 June 1820, f. 884. Ferguson to Thorkelin, f. 534–36. *RA*. Privatarkiv no. 6431, personlige papirer m. m. 5. McDaniel, *Adam Ferguson in the Scottish Enlightenment*, 113–18.
31 Henderson, *Iceland; or the Journal of a Residence in that Island*, II, 168.
32 Sismondi, *De la vie et des écrits de Paul-Henri Mallet*, 27. Mallet, *Northern Antiquities*, I, 173–181. Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*, 84–93.
33 Götz, "Civil Society in the Nordics."
34 *Lbs*. Lbs. 29, fol. Stephensen to Finnsson, 30 December 1794.
35 Agnarsdóttir, "Iceland in the Eighteenth Century," 27. The last issue covered two years: 1802–4.
36 Hermannsson, *The Periodical Literature of Iceland*, 17–20.
37 *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 129–131 (Ireland), 139–40 (Poland); 131–35 (Holland), 135–37 (Germany), 16–17 (St. Domingo), 1:3 (1796–1798), 395–97 (Spain).
38 *Lbs*. Lbs. 29, fol. Stephensen to Finnsson, 2 May 1796.
39 Hemstad, "*Like a herd of cattle*," 329.
40 *Lbs*. JS. 269, 4to. Ólafsson to an unknown recipient [1798].
41 Kyhn, *Nødværge imod den i Island regierende Øvrighed*, 257. Further on Stephensen's publications at the time and his attitude towards the Danish merchants. See e.g.. Schram, *Syenaalen og Eenskillingen*, 8, 17.
42 *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 121–22, 2:1 (1798–1801), 177. See Mackenzie, *Travels in the Island of Iceland*, 302–3 on the detailed account.
43 Palmer, *The Age of Democratic Revolution*, 721.
44 *Minnisverd Tídindi* 1:1 (1796–1798), 121–22.
45 Sigurðsson, "The Icelandic Enlightenment as an Extended Phenomenon," 379.
46 Finnsson, *Qvøld-vøkurnar 1794*. Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 108.
47 *Lovsamling for Island*, VI, 386–97, 408.
48 *ÞÍ*. Hið danska kansellí 1928 KA/61-15.
49 Henderson, *Iceland; or the Journal of a Residence in that Island*, II, 171–79. *Lbs*. JS. 95 b, fol. Magnússon to Thorkelin, 21 August 1815.
50 Pálmason, "Magnús Stephensen og bókmenntastarfsemi hans," 164–88. Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 99.
51 Pálmason, "Magnús Stephensen og bókmenntastarfsemi hans," 90–91.
52 *Lbs*. JS. 95 c, fol. Thorarinsson to Thorkelin, 22 February 1806.
53 *Lbs*. Lbs. 172, fol. Jónsson to Hoppe, 10 August 1827.
54 *Minnisverd Tídindi* 2:1 (1798–1801), 134–6. *Lbs*. Lbs. 31 b, fol. Finnsson to Jónsdóttir, 19 October 1796.
55 Pálmason, "Magnús Stephensen og bókmenntastarfsemi hans," 89.
56 *ÞÍ*. Bps. C.V. 236 B. Stephensen, 31 December 1827.
57 Thorarensen to Thorkelin, 19 August 1827, II, 58.
58 *Nyeste Skilderiet af København* 85, 89, 90 (1808).
59 *Lbs*. Lbs. Collection of articles from Danish newspapers 1800–1899. Transcript from *Nyeste Skilderiet af Kjøbenhavn* 5 (85) (2 August 1808). On the nature of the Society see for example *Lbs*. Lbs. 29, fol. Stephensen to Finnsson, 4 September 1794, Thorarensen to Thorkelin, 22 October 1826, 53, *Minnisverd Tídindi*, 2:1 (1798–1801), 134–36, and Pálmason, "Magnús Stephensen og bókmenntastarfsemi hans," 87.

60 *Nyeste Skilderiet af Kjøbenhavn* 5: 86 (6 August 1808), 1363, 1366.
61 *Nyeste Skilderiet af Kjøbenhavn* 5: 89 (16 August 1808), 1411.
62 Stephensen, *Ferðadagbækur Magnúsar Stephensen 1807–1808*, 114–22. *Lbs*. Lbs. 342 b, fol. Stephensen to Thorsteinsson, 25 February 1809.
63 *Lbs.* Lbs. 342 b, fol. Stephensen to Thorsteinsson, 13 March 1809.
64 Engelhardt, "Patriotic Societies and Royal Imperial Reforms," 213.
65 Nielsen, *Lensgreve Johan Caspar Wedel Jarlsberg 1779–1840*, I, 345.
66 Glenthøj and Ottosen, *Experiences of War and Nationality*, 140–1.
67 Kaalund, "Jørgen Jørgensen," 7–10. *Íslenzk sagnablöd* (1817), *Collegial Tidende* 12:63 (1809), 769–808. Þorkelsson, *Saga Jörundar Hundadagakóngs*. For secondary sources: Agnarsdóttir, "Iceland under British Protection during the Napoleonic Wars," 254–66. Briem, *Sjálfstæði Íslands 1809*.
68 Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 14.
69 Hooker, *Journal of a Tour in Iceland in the Summer of 1809*, 368. The proclamations 359–73.
70 Hooker, *Journal of a Tour in Iceland in the Summer of 1809*, 371.
71 *Lbs.* Lbs. 197 fol. Gunnlaugur Briem, "Quid sentimus? quid faciendum?"
72 See for example *Lbs.* JS. 95 b, fol. Thorsteinsson to Thorkelin, 2 March 1827. *Lbs.* Lbs. 340 d, fol. Thorsteinsson to Jónsson, 17 December 1828, *Lbs.* ÍB. 94 a, fol. Helgason to Rask, 3 March 1828.
73 Skagfjörð to Stephensen, 25 August 1809. Printed in Þorkelsson, *Saga Jörundar Hundadagakóngs*, 199– 200.
74 Holland, *The Iceland Journal of Henry Holland 1810*, 141. *Lbs.* Lbs. 1128, 4to. Konráðsson, Jörginsþáttur, 54. *ÞÍ*. E. 14. 1. Trampe to Einarsson, April 1813. *Kgl. Bibl.* 3268 4to., Thorgrimsen to Jónsson, 28 November 1810.
75 Stephensen, *Ferðadagbækur*, Appendix II, Magnús and Stefan Stephensen to the honourable Captain Jones, 22 August 1809, ADM 1/1995, 153–161.
76 *Sir Joseph Banks, Iceland, and the North Atlantic*. Draft of the Order in Council, 7 February 1810, 383–85.
77 *ÞÍ*. E. 14. 1. Trampe to Einarssson, April 1813.
78 See i.e. Vídalín to Thorsteinsson, September 1810, 98. *Kgl. Bibl.* 3268 4to. Thorgrimsen to Jónsson, 28 November 1810 *Lbs.* JS. 95 c, fol. Thorarinsson to Thorkelin 30 May 1810.
79 Vídalín to Thorsteinsson, 14 August 1810, September 1810, 96, 98. *Lbs.* Lbs. 197 fol. Gunnlaugur Briem, "Quid sentimus? quid faciendum?"
80 *Sir Joseph Banks, Iceland, and the North Atlantic.* Memorandum from Count Trampe to Earl of Bathurst, 6 November 1809, 343.
81 *ÞÍ*. E. 14. 1. Trampe to Einarsson, April 1813.
82 *ÞÍ*. E. 14. 1. Thorkelin to Einarsson, 18 August 1810.
83 Thorsteinsson, "Sjálfsævisaga," 180.
84 Stephensen's *Apologia* in *RA.* 303, Rentekammeret, akter til den Jørgen Jørgensen'ske usurpations... (Island) 373.133, Stephensen to Kaas, 19 September 1815. *Fra Hoffet og Byen*, 24 September, 118–19.
85 Stephensen to Banks, 17 October 1807, 222–29, a letter never sent from Banks to "Mr. Stephensen of Reikiavick," 254–56.
86 Banks to Hooker, 26 July [1810], 411.
87 Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 121–23. Stephensen, "Stutt yfirlit fyrsta Fjórdúngs 19du Krists aldar," *Klausturpósturinn* 9 (1827) 3–65.
88 Róbertsson, "Áform um endurskoðun íslenskra laga," 53. Stephensen, *Commentatio de legibus*.

89 *Lbs*. Lbs. 342, fol. Stephensen to Thorsteinsson, 6 March 1820.
90 *Lbs*. JS. 135, fol. *Summarisk Oversigt Af Conferenceraad og Justitiarii Dr. Jur. M. Stephensens Levnet og Arbeider.* Sigurðsson, *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensens*, 65, Halldórsson, "Indledning," *Jónsbók*, xxvii–xxix.
91 *Regis Magni legum reformatoris Leges Gulathingenses*.
92 Róbertsson, "Áform um endurskoðun íslenskra laga," 53–4.
93 Stephensen to Magnússon, 4 March 1827, 61.
94 *Lbs*. Lbs. 342 b, fol. Stephensen to Thorsteinsson, 29 March 1826.
95 *Lbs*. JS. 95 a, fol. Thorsteinsson to Thorkelin, 12 August 1826. *ÞÍ*. E. 273. 21. For "certain reasons" the Chancery did not want Stephensen to revise *Jónsbók* according to Thorsteinsson in 1841. Jón Guðnason, "Eftirmáli," 197–8.
96 *Lbs*. Lbs. 342 c, fol. Thorkelin to Thorsteinsson, 15 April 1828.
97 Kristjánsson, *Nú heilsar þér á Hafnarslóð*, 196–211. Thorarensen to Thorkelin, 22 October 1826, II, 53. Stephensen, *Ferðarolla*.
98 *Lbs*. Lbs. 342 fol. Thorkelin to Thorsteinsson, 7 May 1826. Mackenzie noticed Stephensen's dominance: "The state of the press is extremely injurious to the literature of Iceland." Mackenzie, *Travels in the Island of Iceland*, 153.
99 *ÞÍ*. E. 182. Oddsson to Repp, 9 March 1830.
100 *ÞÍ*. E. 14.1. Sæmundsson to Einarsson, 1 October 1831. Ólafsdóttir, *Baldvin Einarsson og þjóðmálastarf hans*, 26–9.
101 Erichsen, *Island og dets Justitiarius*, 23.
102 Erichsen, "Til Læseren!," *Island og dets Justitiarius*.
103 *Lbs*. Lbs. 342 b, fol. Thorkelin to Thorsteinsson, 5 April 1827.
104 *ÞÍ*. E. 14. 1. Stephensen to Einarsson, 25 April 1831.
105 *Lbs*. Lbs. 339 a, fol. Erichsen to Thorsteinsson, 29 September 1833.
106 Erichsen, *Island og dets Justitiarius*, 37–8.
107 *Lovsamling for Island*, IX, 169–70. *ÞÍ*. E. 182. Magnússon to Repp, 31 May 1827.
108 *Lbs*. JS. 95 a, fol. Thorkelin to Thorsteinsson, 15 April 1828.
109 Simonsen, "The Cultivation of Scandinavism," 79–81, 89–90.
110 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer til nordisk vinter*, 47. On transnational Nordic societies, see also Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
111 See i.e. Hálfdanarson, "Þjóðnýting menningararfs," 44–6.
112 *ÞÍ*. E. 37. Rafn to Gräter, 16 September 1824.
113 List of members was published in *Fornmanna sögur*, III, 257–83. *Lbs*. ÍB. 91 c, fol. Correspondence of Þorgeir Guðmundsson. Letters and lists of membership. Wawn, *The Anglo Man*, 134.
114 Rafn to Marsh, 29 November 1834, 296. Marsh was a pioneer in studies of northern antiquities in the United States. See Beck, *Útverðir íslenskrar menningar*, 17–18.
115 Mülertz to Rafn, 1824, 92.
116 *Lbs*. JS. 98, fol. Stephensen to the Royal Society of the Northern Antiquaries, 3 March 1829.

Sources

Archives

Copenhagen, Rigsarkivet *(RA)*

Copenhagen, The Royal Library *(Kgl. Bibl.)*
Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library *(EUL)*
Reykjavík, National Archives of Iceland *(ÞÍ.)*
Reykjavík, National and University Library of Iceland, Manuscript Collection *(Lbs.)*

Bibliography

Agnarsdóttir, Anna. “Iceland Under British Protection During the Napoleonic Wars.” In *Scandinavia in the Age of Revolution: Nordic Political Cultures, 1740–1820*, edited by Pasi Ihalainen, Michael Bregnsbo, Karin Sennefelt, and Patrik Winton, 254–66. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

———. “Iceland in the Eighteenth Century: An Island Outpost of Europe?” *Sjuttonhundratal* 10 (2013): 11–38.

———. Ed. *Sir Joseph Banks, Iceland, and the North Atlantic: Journals, Letters and Documents*, edited by Anna Agnarsdóttir, 1–34. Abingdon: The Hakluyt Society, 2016.

Beck, Richard. *Útverðir íslenskrar menningar*. Reykjavík: Almenna bókafélagið, 1972.

Breve fra og til Carl Christian Rafn, med en Biographi, edited by Benedikt Grøndal. Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendal, 1869.

Briem, Helgi P. *Sjálfstæði Íslands 1809*. Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka þjóðvinafélag, 1936.

Collegial Tidende, 1809.

Einarsson, Ísleifur. “Nokkrar þingræður Ísleifs Einarssonar, sýslumanns í Húnavatns sýslu.” *Ný félagsrit* XVII (1857), 95–116.

Engelhardt, Juliane. “Patriotic Societies and Royal Imperial Reforms in Denmark, 1761–1814.” In *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century: Patriotic Reform in Europe and North America*, edited by Koen Stapelbroek and Jani Marjanen, 212–31. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Erichsen, Vigfús. *Island og dets Justitiarius Magnus Stephensen: Aktstykker, vedkommende det kongelige islandske Landsoplysnings-Selskab, samlede og med Anmærkninger og Tillæg*. Kjøbenhavn: H.F. Popp, 1827.

———. “Til Læseren!, ” *Island og dets Justitiarius Magnus Stephensen: Aktstykker, vedkommende det kongelige islandske Landsoplysnings-Selskab, samlede og med Anmærkninger og Tillæg*. Kjøbenhavn: H.F. Popp, 1827.

Finnsson, Hannes. “Inngangur.” In *Qvøld-vøkurnar 1794*. XIII–XIV. Leirárgörðum við Leirá: Ed Islendska Lands-Uppfrædingar-Félag, 1796.

———. *Qvøld-vøkurnar 1794*. Leirárgörðum við Leirá: Ed Islendska Lands-Uppfrædingar-Félag, 1796–97.

Fornmanna sögur, Eptir gömlum handritum útgefnar að tilhlutan hins norræna *fornfræða félags*. Þriðja bindi. Kaupmannahöfn: Hardvig Friðrek Popp, 1827.

Fra hoffet og byen. Stemninger og tilstande 1793–1822 i breve til Joh. Bülow til Sanderumgaard. III *Memoirer og breve*, edited by Julius Clausen and P. Fr. Rist. København: Nordisk forlag, 1906.

Geir Vídalín. *Geir biskup góði í vinarbréfum*, edited by Finnur Sigmundsson. Reykjavík: Bókfellsútgáfan, 1966.

Glenthøj Rasmus, and Morten, Ottosen. *Experiences of War and Nationality in Denmark and Norway 1807–1815*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Guðnason, Jón. “Eftirmáli.” In *Ferðarolla Magnúsar Stephensen*, edited by Jón Guðnason, 193–199. Reykjavík: Bókfellsútgáfan, 1962.

Gunnarsdóttir, Margrét. "Ísland og danskt krúnuvald á Norður-Atlantshafi: Fyrstu skref frjálsrar verslunar 1751–1791" [Iceland under the Sceptre of the Danish Crown in the North Atlantic: Initiating Free Trade from 1751–1791]. PhD dissertation, Reykjavík: University of Iceland, 2023.

Götz, Norbert. "Civil Society in the Nordics." www.nordics.info, 2019.

Halldórsson, Ólafur. "Indledning." In *Jónsbók: Kong Magnus Hakonsson Lovbog for Island. Vedtaget paa Altinget 1281 og Rættarbætr De for Island givne Rettarbøder af 1294, 1305 og 1314*, edited by Ólafur Halldórsson, i–xxxix. København: S.L. Møller bogtrykkeri, 1904.

Hálfdanarson, Guðmundur. "Þingvellir: An Icelandic "Lieu de Memoire." *History and Memory* 12 (1) 2000: 4–29.

——— "Þjóðnýting menningararfs." *Menningararfur á Íslandi. Gagnrýni og greining*, edited by Ólafur Rastrick and Valdimar T. Hafstein, 41–65. Reykjavík: Háskólaútgáfan, 2015.

Halldórsson, Ólafur. "Indledning." In *Jónsbók: Kong Magnus Hakonsson Lovbog for Island. Vedtaget paa Altinget 1281 og Rættarbætr De for Island givne Rettarbøder af 1294, 1305 og 1314*, edited by Ólafur Halldórsson, i–xxxix. København: S.L. Møller bogtrykkeri, 1904.

Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian summer til nordisk vinter: Skandinavisk samarbeid, Skandinavismes og Unionsoppløsning*. Oslo: Akademisk Publishering, 2008.

———. Ed. *"Like a herd of cattle": Parliamentary and Public Debates Regarding the Cession of Norway, 1813–1814*. Oslo: Akademisk publisering, 2014.

Henderson, Ebenezer. *Iceland; or the Journal of a Residence in that Island*, I–II. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Waugh and Innes, 1818.

Hermannsson, Halldór. *The Periodical Literature of Iceland: Down to the Year 1874. An Historical Sketch.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Library, 1918.

Holland, Henry. *The Iceland Journal of Henry Holland 1810*, edited by Andrew Wawns. London: Hakluyt Society, 1987.

Hooker, William Jackson. *Journal of a Tour in Iceland in the Summer of 1809*. London: Vernor, Hood and Sharpe; W. Miller, 1811.

Hreinsson, Einar. *Nätverk och nepotism, Den regionala förvaltningen på Island 1770–1870*. Göteborg: Göteborg universitet, 2003.

Islands almindelige Ansøgning til Kongen om udvidede Handels-Friheder m.v. Kiøbenhavn: Gyldendal, 1797. https://baekur.is/bok/65d379af-7d38-46e8-9de2-3f1a76ccebca/0/4/Islands_almindelige_ansogning#page/n3/mode/2up

Íslenzk sagnablöd, 1817.

Jackson, Alvin. *United Kingdoms: Multinational Union States in Europe and Beyond, 1800–1925*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023.

Jónsbók: Lögbók Íslendinga hver samþykkt var á alþingi árið 1281 og endurnýjuð um miðja 14. öld en fyrst prentuð árið 1587, edited by Már Jónsson. Reykjavík: Háskólaútgáfan, 2004.

Kaalund, Kristian. "Jørgen Jørgensen." In *Dansk biografisk leksikon*, IX, edited by C. F. Bricka, 7–10. København: Gyldendal, 1895.

Kristjánsson, Aðalgeir. *Endurreisn Alþingis og þjóðfundurinn*. Reykjavík: Sögufélag, 1993.

———. *Nú heilsar þér á Hafnarslóð. Ævir og örlög í höfuðborg Íslands 1800–1850.* Reykjavík: Nýja bókafélagið, 1999.

Kyhn, Georg Andreas. *Nødværge imod den i Island regierende Øvrighed, eller betimelig og fornøden Dom veiledende til en nøiagtig Undersøgelse og rigtig Bedømmelse af en saa kaldet Islands almindelige Ansøgning til Kongen*. Kiøbenhavn: n.pub., 1797.

Lovsamling for Island VI–IX, edited by Oddgeir Stephensen and Jón Sigurðsson. Kjøbenhavn: Andr. Fred Höst, 1856–60.

Mackenzie, George Steuart. *Travels in the island of Iceland during the summer of the year MDCCCX*. Edinburgh: Arch. Constable & Co.,1811.

Mallet, Paul-Henri. *Northern Antiquities: Or, a Description of the Manners, Customs, Religion and Laws of the Ancient Danes, and Other Northern Nations, Including Those of Our Own Saxon Ancestors. With a translation of the Edda, or System of Runic Mythology, and Other Pieces. From the Ancient Islandic Tongue*. In two Volumes. Translated from Mons. Mallet's *Introduction a l'Histoire de Dannemarc*, &c. with Additional Notes by the English Translator. Translated by Thomas Percy. London: T. Carnan, 1770.

McDaniel, Iain. *Adam Ferguson in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Roman Past and Europe's Future*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Melsted, Bogi Th. *Concise History of Iceland*. Translated by Jon G. Palmeson. Copenhagen: n.pub., 1903.

Minnisverd Tídindi, 1796−1804.

Nielsen, Yngvar. *Grev Herman Wedel Jarlsberg og hans samtid 1779−1840*. Iste del 1779−1814. Kristiania: Cammermeyer, 1888.

Nyeste Skilderiet af Kjøbenhavn, 1808.

Olavius, Ólafur. *Upartiske Tanker om det islandske Handels-Compagnie og dets farende Kiøbmænd*. Kiøbenhavn: Brødrene Berling, 1771.

Ólafsdóttir, Nanna. *Baldvin Einarsson og þjóðmálastarf hans*. Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka bókmenntafélag, 1961.

Palmer, R.R. *The Age of Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America 1760–1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Pálmason, Ólafur. "Magnús Stephensen og bókmenntastarfsemi hans." Cand. Mag. thesis, Reykjavík, University of Iceland, 1963.

Regis Magni legum reformatoris Leges Gulathingenses, sive Jus commune Norvegicum. Cum interprætatione Latina et Danica edited by Grímur Thorkelin. Havniæ: Rangell, 1817.

Róbertsson, Gísli Baldur. "Áform um endurskoðun íslenskra laga." In *Jónsbók*, edited by Már Jónsson, 35–54. Reykjavík: Háskólaútgáfan, 2004.

Samþycktir hins Islendska Lands-Uppfrædingar Félags. Leirárgarðar: G. J. Schagfiord, 1796.

Schram, Chr. Gynther. *Syenaalen og Eenskillingen. Et Par ord til Laugmand Magnus Stephensen og hans Sødskendebarn i Island*. Kiøbenhavn, 1799.

Sigurðsson, Ingi. *Hugmyndaheimur Magnúsar Stephensen*. Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka bókmenntafélag, 1996.

———. "The Icelandic Enlightenment as an Extended Phenomenon." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 35(4) (2010): 371–90.

Simonsen, Kim. "The Cultivation of Scandinavism: The Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries' International Network, Seen through the Letters of Carl Christian Rafn." In *Scandinavismen: Vision og virkning*, edited by Ruth Hemstad, Jes Fabricius Møller, and Dag Thorkildsen, 73–97. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2018.

Sismondi, J.C.L. Simondi. *De la vie et des écrits de Paul-Henri Mallet*. Genève: J.J. Paschoud, 1807.

Stephensen, Magnús. *Commentatio de legibus*. Videyæ, 1819.

———. *Brjef til Finns Magnússonar*, edited by Bogi Th. Melsteð. Kaupmannahöfn: Hið íslenzka fræðafélag, 1924.

———. *Ferðarolla Magnúsar Stephensen*, edited by Jón Guðnason. Reykjavík: Bókfellsútgáfan, 1962.

———. *Ferðadagbækur Magnúsar Stephensen 1807–1808*, edited by Anna Agnarsdóttir and Þórir Stephensen. Reykjavík: Sögufélag, 2010.

———. "Stutt yfirlit fyrsta Fjórdúngs 19du Krists aldar," *Klaustur-Pósturinn* 9 (1827): 3–65.

[Thomson, William]. *Travels into Norway, Denmark, and Russia, in the Years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791*. London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1792.

Thorarensen, Bjarni. *Bréf* I–II, edited by Jón Helgason. Kaupmannahöfn: Hið íslenzka fræðafélag, 1986.

Thorsteinsson, Bjarni. "Sjálfsævisaga." In *Merkir Íslendingar: Ævisögur og minningargreinar*, II, edited by Þorkell Jóhannesson, 260–343. Reykjavík: Bókfellsútgáfan, 1947.

Wawn, Andrew. *The Anglo Man: Þorleifur Repp, Philology and Nineteenth Century Britain*. *Studia Islandica* 49. Reykjavík: Menningarsjóður, 1991.

Wood, Ian. *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Þorkelsson, Jón. *Saga Jörundar Hundadagakóngs. Með 98 fylgiskjölum og 16 myndum*. Kaupmannahöfn: Gyldendal, 1892.

Þórðarson, Björn. *Landsyfirdómurinn 1800–1919: Sögulegt yfirlit*. Reykjavík: Sögufélag, 1947.

Þorsteinsson, Björn, and Sigurður Líndal. "Lögfesting konungsvalds." *Saga Íslands* 3, 19–108. Reykjavík: Hið íslenska bókmenntafélag, 1978.

6 Military Sports in Northern Clothing

How Sharpshooting became Nordic Heritage

Odd Arvid Storsveen

Introduction

Voluntary associations have been prominent in Nordic countries ever since the middle of the nineteenth century, including associations for sharpshooting.[1] The sport of shooting has attracted and organized several hundred thousand people of all ages and sexes for more than 160 years. It is therefore of interest to discuss how such a military-like sport became part of Nordic civil societies, and how it has developed in countries often associated with a mostly non-violent culture.

Norway, Sweden and Denmark have all managed to combine a seemingly non-violent civic culture with a special fondness for deadly weapons such as rifles and the like. Nordic sport leaders have even been eager to include shooting in other sports, even inventing new military sports, as we will see. However, this paradox—if it is one—seems to have been somewhat neglected outside the shooters' own subculture. Nearly all books and articles on Nordic shooting are written by shooters themselves, or by shooting fans. This essay aims to be a small contribution to augment this state of knowledge, by examining the shooting sports in both national and transnational perspectives. Most of my older examples will be drawn from the Norwegian experiences, but supplying perspectives to the other Nordic countries should lead to a common conclusion: making sharpshooting a "people's" sport did have some positive effects on these societies as a whole.

As mentioned, shooting regarded as a "culture" or a "discourse" seems to have been a more or less closed shop, with little attention from historians or social science scholars. Most Nordic historians have also been ignoring this kind of sports as a research subject, at least when compared to other studies of popular Nordic sports, like cross-country skiing or ski jumping.[2] This fact is nonetheless surprising, as the overall medal statistics of the Olympic Games by nations place Sweden in fifth place among shooting events, while Norway comes seventh. This is especially interesting, since Olympic medals have become the foremost symbolic proofs of any sport's public "value". No individual triumph in sport seems in modern times more coveted than an Olympic gold medal (notwithstanding gains in soccer, horseracing or motor sports). The Nordic results in sharpshooting have often been better for these countries than in other summer events. The overall status

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-8
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

of the sharpshooting sport should not be questioned, but as a subject for historical studies it has nevertheless been somewhat neglected.

Development of the Shooters' Movement

Sharpshooting started as a mass sport and has remained so. An example is the annual Norwegian rally, taking place in late summer and gathering more than 4,000 shooters and a public of 10,000–15,000 for a week of sportsmanship. This rally is even characterized by family camping, various festival-like arrangements (including children, with their self-made toy guns), and a certain kind of "equality" spirit that allows men and women to compete in exactly the same events. We should not neglect the importance of such a mass movement for recruitment to elite sharpshooting as well. By teaching its members to use a weapon, training them in military-like weapon discipline and sharpshooting skills, the voluntary shooter societies must have been instrumental in connecting a culture belonging to the armed forces with the leisure culture of a civil society.

The first actual shooter associations can be traced back to the Napoleonic age, when non-conscripted students and citizens organized voluntary military by exercising through their own social "clubs".[3] Sharpshooting as a civil activity was part of the new sport reforms running through (male) Europa at the time, with examples from "Turnvater" Jahn in Prussia to the Swedish drill of P. H. Ling. It was an alternative to the structured kind of physical exercise which had been restricted only to army and navy. The political and cultural elites began to see the advantages of more physical exercise for adults, and the first associations of the combined sports of gymnastics and sharpshooting were established around 1860. One of the great inspirations at that time was Garibaldi's voluntary corps, with its successful campaign in southern Italy.

In Norway, the call for associations of this type was supported by some of the nation's most prominent men.[4] From the beginning it was stated that the overall aim was patriotic—to strengthen the younger generation's ability to protect nation and society by the practicing of shooting and gymnastics. This was clearly marked in the official Norwegian name, The Central Association for the Spread of Body Exercise and Weapon Practice (*Centralforeningen for Udbredelse af Legemsøvelser og Vaabenbrug*).[5] In Sweden as well, the year 1860 is normally regarded as the beginning of the shooter associations, whereas in Denmark an "Academic Shooting Society" was founded in 1861. The basic activity of these associations was rifle shooting at different targets and at varying distances in newly established shooting fields. As in other sports, the shooters competed in different classes with the aim of winning medals or silver cups. The shooters also learned to clean their rifles properly and keep them in good condition and were trained in weapon discipline and restrictions at the shooting field, but without the more strict hierarchy in common military exercise.[6]

The shooter associations seem to have become part of a broader liberal trend in politics in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In Sweden, the pioneers also campaigned for a constitutional reform, which was implemented in 1866 when a

parliament of two chambers replaced the old estate Diet, *Riksdagen*. To organize "common people" in militarily organized associations may thus be seen as a democratic grant when the right to vote was still restricted.[7] Membership in the shooter associations, however, was not restricted to any form of property or income. Even women were admitted to the new, so-called voluntary shooters' organizations that were established in Norway in the early 1880s in the form of provincial unions (*Skyttersamlag*) based on local countryside associations.

The new Norwegian associations differed somewhat from the "official" teams organized through the National Sports Associations, which originally were closely connected to the armed forces and the Departments of Defence.[8] Through the 1880s, we can observe shooters changing their membership from the "official" to the new associations, outgrowing the former in number. Obviously, some members of the old association changed their membership, which declined from about 15,000 in 1880 to 8,600 in 1885. On the other hand, the new ones expanded to 13,350 in 1885, although only a third of them actually got real rifles (around 4,700 available).[9] However, the new associations became part of the liberal left opposition, with demands for a parliament-based government and universal suffrage for adult men. They also played a significant role in the liberal propaganda and often paraded with their newly purchased guns at liberal political rallies.[10] The Norwegian poet and political activist Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson even wrote a militant verse about "The Ring of Rifles" around the parliament building, ready to defend the liberal plurality with their weapons.[11]

Historians have discussed whether these voluntary associations assisted the liberal Left Party in getting this plurality (and again in 1885), forcing the king to appoint a new government under the Left Party leader Johan Sverdrup. Some of these even held their own "maneuvers" in the field, like in North Trondelag, a bastion of radical liberals under their political leader, "shooter general" Ola Five.[12] It seems unlikely, however, that they could ever have been militarily operational in an ordinary way[13]—partly due to lack of ammunition, guns, and experienced commanders, and partly because of logistical problems with transportation, supplies, and food that only a regular army can manage. The actual role of these left-wing associations was to boost national and liberal morale by making a political stand against royal and conservative power. It seems that the conservative government had greater fear of a possible liberal "mutiny" within the Norwegian army than within the shooters' associations. As the government controlled the army depots, it ordered the disarming of stored rifles in some cases. A high officer, however, warned the king that a mobilized army consisted of "soldiers for only 30 days, but discussing citizens for 330". Nothing more came of it.[14]

It may be that the eventual political conflict between the "old" and "new" parts of the shooters' movement has been grossly exaggerated. As a reconciliation, in 1893 the Norwegian associations went for a political compromise and amalgamated into one common national organization. Likewise, in Sweden, the local societies were gathered into a new official association under the direction of Wilhelm Wahlquist.[15] King Oscar himself approved it.

In Norway the new joint shooter association was named the Voluntary Shooter Service (*Det Frivillige Skyttervesen*) with a membership of about 19,000. However, the aims of the old Central Association of 1861 remained a general program of all Norwegian sport even after the shooter associations by 1893 were separated. As a result, the year 1861 is still celebrated as the foundation year of today's Norwegian Union of Sports, even if this is somewhat anachronistic.[16] The current union was first established in 1946.

The Norwegian shooters' movement expanded after 1905, probably due to the national enthusiasm after the dissolution of the union with Sweden. The membership grew to about 57,000 in 1914, more than any other national sport at the time. Then, the number declined somewhat in the years after World War I to about 32,000 in 1932, but rose again to 49,000 members in 1940, and in 1949 it claimed to have nearly 120,000 members in about 1,800 local societies.[17] Even if the association was formally independent, it continued to work closely with the Defence Department and the army at large. As late as the 1990s, Norway had registered about 180,000 organized shooters, and the sport is especially popular in the rural countryside.

The same situation occurred in Sweden. Although the national movement from 1893 called the Swedish Shooting Movement (*Svenska Skytterörelsen*) actually had fewer members than its Norwegian counterpart at that time—about 16,000—it soon expanded considerably, and by 1904, it could count no less than 116,000 members.[18] By 1945, Sweden had registered approximately 279,000 active shooters. It seems that in the early twentieth century, only Switzerland and the USA (and perhaps Soviet Russia) could boast of similar numbers.

The first Central Committee for establishing shooter unions in Denmark, *De Danske Skytteforeninger*, was founded in 1861, and here the reconstruction after the fatal defeat in the 1864-war led to a growing interest in both shooting and gymnastics. In the countryside, however, the new Grundtvigian people's *high school* movement was dominant,[19] and here gymnastics got priority, partly due to the gymnastic tradition in the Denmark where gymnastics became an obligatory school subject as early as 1828.[20] Sharpshooting, then, became more of a city-sport, but nonetheless the Danish sport shooters performed excellently in early international competitions and were the first among Scandinavians to win medals: in Athens 1896 they were awarded 3 shooting medals—one silver and two bronze.[21] These elite shooters were from the *Dansk Skytte Union*, organized in 1913. This union became a member of *Danmarks Idrætsforbund*, while *De Danske Skytteforeninger* has become part of the broader *DGI* (*Danske Gymnastik- og Idrætsforeninger*), where the main focus is on mass sports.

Finland, as a non-independent country, had to wait a bit, although some "autonomous clubs" existed before 1900. However, the Russian Revolution of 1905 created a short liberal period and a national association of "Championship Shooters" was accepted in 1907. In the Olympic events, Finland took part from 1908 and won their first medal in 1912, a bronze in team deer shooting.[22] After the independence, a National Shooter Association was established in 1919. However, the Finnish

shooters' movement also recruited for the semi-military associations of "defence squads" (*skyddskår*) that played an important role on the "White" side during the civil war of 1918.[23] The peculiarities of the Finnish case cannot be discussed in more detail here. However, it can be noted that the shooting sport in Finland became more politicized than in other Nordic countries. At any rate, Finnish elite shooters were among the best of the Nordics during the 1930s, with many victories in the World Championships.[24] The number of registered shooters reached around 100,000 in 1939, and Finnish sharpshooters were generally admired for their great skills during the Winter War of 1939–40.[25]

Sharpshooting as a Quality Sport

From the 1920s, sharpshooter competitors likely to aspire to the Olympic Games or other international championships had their own specialized sub-organizations.[26] As an international competitive sport, sharpshooting has changed a lot through the last 100 years, from the introduction of dioptric sights (1920s) to today's shooter jackets which are padded and "stiffened" to a level that resembles some kind of outer corsets (to minimize trembling). All equipment like rifles, pistols, ammunition, and targets have become different overall. However, these specialized technical improvements do not seem to have diminished the recruitment to shooting sports. After all, sharpshooting has always tested real marksmanship, with target practice on specially-made butts. Up to 2004, the targets might also depict an animal, usually a deer or a boar, even if the sport had little to do with actual hunting, similar to skeet and trap shooting with unspecified clay "birds" as targets. There have also been many changes in rules of positions and distances. Rifle shooting was originally done standing, but gradually kneeling and prone positions were also accepted.[27]

Olympic rifle competitions today are restricted to miniature (or small bore) rifles, where the distance is 50 meters, and to air rifles, with a distance of only 10 meters. The caliber of a miniature rifle (today, normally Sig Sauer) is just .22, or 5.59 mm, and this is somewhat smaller than the 6.5 mm caliber of the popular Norwegian Krag Jørgensen rifle, meant for long-distance shooting.[28] In the early Olympic rifle competitions, this Krag Jørgensen helped provide Nordic shooters with many of their medals.[29] Even without this advantage, today's Nordic shooters are among the higher profiled in international competitions.[30]

Among sharpshooting peculiarities has also been the relative insignificance of age or of extreme physical attributes, for long being one of the few sports without a natural age limit. Of course, there have always been some physical limitations, with regard to weak eyesight and the like. However, sharpshooters do not necessarily perform more poorly with age, and they may not even be at their best at the age of 27–30, like most other kinds of modern athletes. A kind of embodiment of this is the legendary Swede Oscar Swahn, who at an age of 72—with a long, white beard—managed to win an Olympic silver medal in the 1920 Antwerp Olympics. By then, he had already won quite a few Olympic medals.[31] Swahn still reigns as

the oldest Olympic medalist of all times and all sports, thereby proving that not all great sports need to be based on physical strength or speed.

Another significant feature of the sharpshooting sport is its relative simplicity—the only basic provisions have been a good gun or pistol, some ammunition, and a shooting field, albeit it there could always be some difficulties in equipping such a field adequately. A good rifle may be quite expensive to purchase, but is normally more durable than most other sports gear. As many people already had experience in using guns (from military service or hunting), the learning curve was perhaps a bit shorter than in sports that require physical, technical, and tactical training over many years. Originally, shooting may have come through as a more "natural" sport, like kicking or throwing a ball, at least in its elementary forms. It could also be both an individual sport and a team sport.

The voluntary shooting associations were also among the first to accept women as members on an equal footing with men, although it seems that only a few women actually became active shooters in the formative years.[32] In the 1920s, there was some complaint about the non-attendance of women in national competitions, and shooter Gerda Helseth in 1926 stated that she has almost been the sole woman competing in the Norwegian rallies.[33] Before World War II, women are rarely found in the lists of medal winners, even the local ones.[34] This situation did not change until the 1950s and 1960s, when special women's classes were established.[35] From 1971, the Nordic championship had women's classes in rifle shooting.[36] Women were then invited into Olympic shooting when a separate class was introduced in 1984.[37] Norway, at least, can actually claim that it possesses some of the best women shooters in the world today.[38]

In the annual Norwegian national rallies, there is still no segregation: men and women compete on the same level. At this point, the practice of homogenous competition has been extraordinarily progressive, and there can easily be found good arguments for defining sharpshooting as an essentially trans-gender sport (along with, for example, chess, gaming, and the like). Shooting is also the only sport that is accustomed to using the terms "King" or "Queen" in its ranking. The overall champion of long-distance rifle shooting (3-positions) has for many years officially been called the Shooter King (*Skytterkonge*). When women on three occasions in later years have won the competition, they have been rightly been titled Shooter Queens.[39]

A Short Outline of Shooting as a Nordic Sport

From early on, the common "Nordic" element in sharpshooting was established by the organization of Nordic Championships. The very first championship saw the light of day already in Stockholm 1885, with a rally presented as a people's festival with more than 1,500 participating shooters, most of them Swedes. This mass gathering was repeated at the island of Gressholmen by Kristiania (today Oslo) in 1892, when over 1,300 took part, while the last one was held in Copenhagen in 1901, with about 1,500 shooters present.[40]

However, these mass events were of course expensive to arrange, and they were soon discontinued, perhaps because of the "freeze" in Nordic cooperation in the first years after the Swedish-Norwegian union conflict and dissolution of the union in 1905.[41] When the Nordic competitions were resumed in Copenhagen in 1912, it was in the form of an invited assembly of the 30 best shooters representing each of the Nordic capitals.[42] This *Nordiske Hovedstadsstevne* became a tradition from 1915 onwards. From 1919, the Finns also took part, and Helsinki hosted the last pre-war competition in 1937. A good example of the quality of these "capital rallies" is the one held in Oslo in 1928. King Haakon himself was the rally's overall patron, and three of the honorary presidents came from the highest military leadership in Norway, in addition to the Conservative mayor of Oslo.[43] The newspapers enthusiastically reported about the Swedish and Finnish shooters marching along with the Norwegians and Danes from the train station up to Akershus Castle; in "their gray-green neat uniforms they created an obvious stir" among the public, one paper declared, and placed a nice photo of the shooters on its front page.[44] It seems that the close connection between the armed forces and the shooters movement was never in question.

One aspect here is surely the historic military traditions, as well as the Nordic history of army and navy conscription, primarily from the younger strata of male peasants. Certain knowledge of "weaponry" among the broader parts of common country people (the towns and cities were exempted) seems to have been widespread already before the nineteenth century, and this fact may have set some kind of "populist" or militia-like stamp on the very art of shooting. Along with the normal and not very regulated use of guns in hunting wild animals, this tradition seems to have made shooting a "household" activity, at least in the countryside. Firing off a gun or two in the air was also a traditional form of celebration during all festive rural events, especially weddings. The disposal of a personal gun was both a real and symbolic safeguard of civil rights in a rurally populated society. Shooting ability made you truly recognizable as a "free" peasant.

From a wider perspective, these abilities were useful not only locally, but in promoting national patriotism as well. Even today, official leaders of the Norwegian Shooter Service are accustomed to stressing the significance of general weapon knowledge for the national defence of Norway.[45]

The system of ranking and awarding medals and cups was, as in all modern sports, obviously inherited from the army and navy tradition. The movement's own rhetoric also seems to mark its national status as something *more* than "just" a sport, as shown by the title of the national gathering in Norway, *Skyttertinget* (The Shooter Council), copied from the name of the Norwegian parliament, *Stortinget*.[46]

Outside Finland, the Nordic shooters movement never associated directly with anti-democratic political forces. *Norsk Skyttertidende* in 1932 rejected any accusations of belonging to some sort of "White Guards", which was hinted at by the workers movement. An invitation to cooperate with the semi-military organization *Leidangen* in 1935 came to nothing, even if some of the leaders were somewhat positive about it, like the editor of the movement's paper, Johan Albert Hoff. Formally, *Leidangen* should teach military skills to civilians outside of or after

conscription, as a kind of modern Home Guard which Norway lacked at the time. It was established in 1933 by Minister of Defence, Vidkun Quisling, and supported by the Conservative Party, the Peasant Party, and the Liberal Left Party. However, the Labour movement saw it as a potential semi-military force to be used against militant workers, and when the new Labour Government in 1936 prohibited uniformed private political bodies, the old *Leidangen* was outlawed and then reshaped into an ordinary shooter society until it was abolished in 1940.[47]

What had then happened to the essential or basic ideology—if any—behind the sharpshooting sport? What about the military element, compared to the social or more explicit competitive elements, such as the pure "sportsmanship" appeal compared to the significance for the national defence? With the exception of Finland, the stressing of patriotism since the very beginning had *not* led to aggressive actions. Instead, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark had restrained from war after 1864. In this last period of imperialist colonization, the great powers of France, Britain, Russia, Germany, the United States, and Japan had all used their military strength to conquer and repress new territories and divide the world between them. The brutal execution of colonial rule continued even after World War II in the Dutch Indies, Indochina, Madagascar, and Kenya, among others. By then, Denmark and Sweden had sold their small overseas colonies long before.[48]

In the Nordic countries, then, both army and navy were gradually looked upon as defensive forces, for use only in protecting the nation's interests, externally and internally.[49] For the moment, this non-expansionist attitude did not prevent the use of armed forces against internal strikes or demonstrations, even if the actual bloodshed in such actions was relatively small compared to other European countries or the United States. The most disreputable of them was perhaps when ordinary Swedish troops shot dead four workers and a young girl in the northern county of Ådalen in May 1931. This shocking event did at least stop any future political use of the common army in labour conflicts. In Norway, this happened for the last time that very summer, at Menstad in Telemark, though luckily without any deaths. Since then, only police forces have been used in these kinds of conflicts.

Normally, the voluntary shooters' societies were not involved in such actions during the intensified class conflicts in the 1920s and 1930s. Evidently, even a semi-military sport such as sharpshooting managed to be relatively compatible with the general anti-militarism in the labour movement, who organized their own sharpshooters at the time. Some of them were already of national, if not international, quality before World War II, like Erling Kongshaug, who later, in 1952, became double World Champion and even won a gold medal in the Helsinki Olympics. This parallel development was perhaps caused by the sport itself, as this child of the Liberal Left of the nineteenth century seemed to become less political during the interwar period. When the Voluntary Shooters' Service held its last national rally before World War II at Kongsvinger in June 1939, it gained direct support from the local trade union in the city, who set up their own cup as one of the prizes. Old conflicts within the world of sport seemed to be swept away, even if the old connection to the army was just as visible at the Kongsvinger rally as ever.

The rally program of 1939 also included a visit to historical battlefields such as Lier and Matrand (the last ones of the war between Norway and Sweden in 1814). As another part of proper learning, however, another trip was made to the Peace Monument at the small border village of Magnor, raised in 1914 to commemorate the lasting peace between Norway and Sweden. The assembly of all the visiting sharpshooters around this monument of peace may also have indicated something more: the common will to enforce neutrality and peacefulness in times of threatening war.

Still, no one could just then really imagine that this monument only a year later would mark the borderline between tyranny and freedom. With the German occupation of Norway, the shooting sport there withered away, while in neutral Sweden it became stronger than ever before. In Finland, it was to be used in real, uncompromising war. At any rate, a common Nordic spirit was strengthened throughout these dark years, due to both food deliveries (from Denmark and Sweden to occupied Norway) and refugee protection (Norwegians, Danes, and Finns were welcomed into Sweden). Soon after the war, it seemed to be reborn, even among shooters—the first shooting match between Norway and Sweden already took place in the summer of 1945. Again, there was a period of increasing Nordic cooperation, marked for instance by the establishment of the inter-parliamentary Nordic Council (*Nordisk Råd*) in 1952.[50]

Through these years, there was also a lot of discussion on how to improve the connections between the Nordic shooters' movements. National rallies sometimes included Nordic championships for invited shooters, the "capital rallies" of the 1930s were resumed, and a new system of Nordic field shooting competitions was set up. Then, in 1954 Stockholm arranged the first mass Nordic Championship of all basic rifle and pistol events, beginning a new tradition continuing to recent years.[51] By this, the shooting sport has shown an especially durable "Nordic common spirit", at least more than most other popular Nordic sports.[52]

In sum, there has always been a thin line between sharpshooting as a military and civilian discipline. Nonetheless, the shooter movement as *a whole* seems to have turned out to be a national as well as a transnational social meeting place. This is why we could raise the question of whether the sport of sharpshooting could be called a "typically" Nordic pastime.

Inventing New Sports

An international sport with military roots that includes shooting, is the often neglected, but truly *Olympic* sport of Modern Pentathlon. The sport is said to be the child of Olympic founder Pierre de Coubertin himself, who wanted to expand the Games from the more classic program of athletics and semi-athletic sports with a very new "modern" sport.[53]

Modern Pentathlon, then, had its debut in the Stockholm Olympics of 1912, and the original rules of this semi-military sport, which requires sharpshooting qualities, were made by an all-Swedish committee. It was headed by the leaders

of the Organizing Committee of the Stockholm Olympics, Officer Viktor Balck (chairman) and athlete Kristian Hellström (secretary).[54] Balck is a legendary figure in the history of Swedish sport, and has even been called "The Father of Swedish Sport".[55] Clearly, he was the real originator of the Stockholm Olympic Games, as he was a long-time acquaintance of de Coubertin and an early member of the IOC.

The new sport managed to combine five different elements into a single competition, usually held over five consecutive days. First, there was a horse-jumping race, then epee fencing, then pistol shooting, then swimming, and finally running. The idea seems to be based on the trials of a military courier or orderly: in order to deliver a message, the competitor (originally, only male) must ride a horse until he is unmounted, then fence with an enemy, shoot a way out, cross a river, and run cross country to the finish. Balck and Hellström probably did associate this with *real* deliveries through enemy territory, which would imply great physical challenges.[56]

Modern Pentathlon was not only created in Sweden but Swedes also totally dominated it from early on, winning 13 of the 15 possible Olympic medals from 1912 to 1932, including all golds.[57] Neither Norwegian nor Danish athletes have ever excelled in Modern Pentathlon.[58] It can then be argued that Modern Pentathlon is more of a typically "Swedish" sport than a "Nordic" one, but it has not only a military *form* but is also a sublimation of a real inter-military activity.[59] The international organization for Modern Pentathlon, UIPM, was founded in 1948, and one of its early leaders was the champion from the 1928 Olympics, Sven Alfred Thofelt from Sweden. He would soon play a decisive role in the construction of another semi-military sport for the wintertime: biathlon.[60]

In fact, sharpshooting had never received the same promotion in Sweden, Norway, and Finland as the "typically" Nordic winter sports of cross-country skiing, ski jumping, or skating. However, when the Nordic Games (*Nordiska Spelen*) in winter sports were arranged between 1901 and 1926—a forerunner to the Winter Olympic Games—some military sports were included, alongside newer sports, like hockey and bandy. They seemed at least to be a natural part of the greater Nordic family of winter sports.[61] The sport of biathlon, however, was not established yet, even if cross-country skiing combined with rifle shooting did occur in some national, even Nordic, competitions.[62] Such competitions were not restricted to the Nordic countries, however, as this combination was also well known in the alpine countries.[63]

There might seem a quick way to regulate these activities into a more organized sport, but it was not that easy at the beginning. There was the rather humble inclusion of "military ski patrol teams" in the first Olympic Winter Games in Chamonix in 1924, repeated in the games of 1928, 1936, and 1948, but now registered as only a supportive rather than official Olympic event. It was, nonetheless, still deemed an accomplishment to win this event, but it was no easy sport to attend. The military teams consisted of ski patrols, three privates or NCOs and a commanding officer with many kilos of baggage on their backs, who during their run did sharpshooting

at various targets. Obviously meant to resemble a real military expedition, the run took place at a long distance from any onlookers, far into the mountainous wilderness. Naturally, Nordic teams could do quite well in such an event.[64] Moreover, the run of the Norwegian ski patrol in 1928 has become a part of Norway's mental history, due to some words uttered by commanding officer Ole Reistad. When his team faced a steep downhill, he commanded "Samling i bånn!"—"Gather at the bottom" [of the hillside, that is]. The patrol did as ordered and won the gold medal. Since then, Reistad's expression has become a symbol of how Norwegians should act in a grim or challenging situation.

The ski patrol event could now also be included in the FIS World Championships. In the Cortina championship of 1941, no Norwegians took part due to the German occupation, and Finns and Swedes were totally dominant.[65] This time, the ski patrol run seems to have gained special attention exactly *because* of the war situation. As noted in *Nordisk Familjeboks Sports-Lexikon*, the event "was esteemed as a proof of the military standard", at least by the Swedes, who won the gold.[66] After World War II, however, the ski patrol event ended up as part of the special championships in military sport. It had its last Olympic appearance in St. Moritz in 1948, where the Swiss team won ahead of Finland and Sweden. Norway did not even take part. Instead, there was renewed interest in establishing a somewhat similar winter sport with more *civil* connections.[67]

Indeed, this seems to have been the idea of Sven Thofelt, Swedish member of the IOC, who in the early 1950s proposed to IOC president Avery Brundage to include a new sport in the Olympic Games with both shooting and cross-country skiing. Brundage himself was no fan of shooting or other military elements in sport, but he admired the Nordic "purity" in winter sports, and this, combined with his dislike of the more popular, but money-infected alpine sports in Central Europe, made it easier to persuade him to accept this new winter sport with good prospects.[68] After this initiative, the first Nordic competition in field shooting on ski was held in 1956, the first World Championship in "biathlon" was arranged in 1958, and the new sport got its Olympic debut at the Squaw Valley Games in 1960.

The original biathlon competitions gave good shooters an advantage, as each missed shot would add two minutes to the 20 km ski run time. From early on, it also attracted excellent Nordic sharpshooters. The very first World Champion was, naturally, a Swede, Adolf Wiklund. So was the first Olympic Champion, Klas Lestander from Arjeplog in the north.[69] Even good skiers profited as the events multiplied over the years. Today, this so-called "normal distance" of 20 km is just one small, though highly revered, part of biathlon. The added time for missing was soon reduced from two minutes to only one minute, the caliber of the gun was reduced, shorter distances with a penalty track for missed targets was introduced, and so on. Some modern athletes have even tried to combine the two sports.[70] Still, Norwegian and Swedish competitors (and occasionally Finnish) are among the dominants in the sport, along with German, French, and Italian athletes.[71] The shooting element in the sport continues to be the most exciting and thrilling, with the shooting field as the main arena for public cheering and grieving. Today, biathlon is perhaps the most popular of all winter sports, the alpine ones included.

Military Sports and Social Comfort

Any sport is, of course, an integrated part of a "modern" civil society and may mean just as much for the onlooker as for the actual participant. It may also play a disproportionally large role in most Nordic (or indeed, "Western") lives. All the sports in question here are culturally developed or even directly *constructed* sports that manage to enclose the dangerous element of firing a gun into a social event.

International competitive shooting has its roots in the civil movement that celebrates these skills. The very art of sharpshooting does not seem so dangerous when you can regulate it into a sport or a certain form of entertainment, real sportsmanship and exciting competition. Generally, the Nordic way of keeping the military aspect of sharpshooting relevant has been to include it in *collective* actions. Such actions surely normalize the shooting activity as well, making it an element of a more sublime knowledge or consciousness: learning to protect the *fatherland*, practicing it as a *sport*, demonstrating only the *possible* use of guns in killing an abstract enemy, or, in serious cases, in actual war (or perhaps organized hunting). You *do not* shoot at anyone in adventurous or private cases.

Moreover, the ability to shoot is not a part of everyday, real life, but is a part of a showing or display, an artificial activity done for personal "fun" or satisfaction. It is somewhat outside of reality, as all sports are, but even more so because shooting sports also definitively show a "real" ability, albeit without having to use it for any "real" purpose. By this, they contain an element of reality that escapes most other popular sports. Excluding money or fame, what kind of everyday skills do you really learn from kicking a ball into a goal? What real use can you have, outside of sport itself, of pole vaulting?[72] Sharpshooting has, in some ways, a more earnest character than many other sports, because any gun can be deadly, and not just in imaginary ways. Shooting ability, then, also requires a statement of social morals, rather than mere personal strength, trust, or pleasure.

The rather low-key promotion of the military element in all shooting sports may be a sort of sublimation of military skills by masking them as "just competition" or "just good sportsmanship". It could also be called a certain form of "aesthetication" of vulgar or dangerous activities, as many sports are, while sports historian Finn Olstad has called the development a "sportification" of real actions.[73] However, by keeping the military elements alive, extending them to other sports, or even by creating new sports with a "modern" emphasis, the shooting sport also reminds us of a set of abilities inside any civil society. Although these abilities seem only latent in peaceful countries, even these have, sometimes, to be militarily minded. Whether we like it or not, all modern shooting sports are products of a war culture, but they are also a middle zone *between* this culture and a civil society culture.

Today, it still seems imperative to be able to check and regulate the use of arms inside modern civil societies. Training and excelling in shooting sports, both at elite and mass levels, *could* be a way to do this more efficiently than mere state intervention is capable of. This way of sublimating weaponry into an organized, collective "arms culture" of shooting at man-made targets, rather than human ones, seems sometimes threatened. Still, we must believe that the *good* traditions of

Nordic sharpshooting should prevail through organized work, and that they now are too deep rooted to vanish, even in a perfect storm.

Notes

1 More on the general development e.g. in Jansson, *Adertonhundratalets associatoner*, or in Seip, *Utsikt over Norges historie*, 44–141.
2 A current review of (mostly) Norwegian historic literature on sport is to be found in Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 255–62.
3 Local patriotic shooters' societies were often founded by town residents during the Napoleonic Wars, like Norway's "Prince Christian Augusts Friends" from 1810, consisting of non-conscripted males. The very first of this kind in Norway, however, seems to be the Bergen Shooting Society from 1769 (!). Most of my examples here will come from Norwegian sources, such as Fjeld, *Skyttersaken i Norge før 1893*.
4 Slagstad, *[Sporten]. En idéhistorisk studie*.
5 Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 10–14.
6 The strict ways on how to handle a gun can still be clearly observed in today's sharpshooting or biathlon sport.
7 Hellstenius, *Skjutande borgerliga revolutionärer*, 37. The right to vote for adult males in Norway was restricted until 1898 and in Sweden until 1909 (for the Second Chamber), while Denmark had made male suffrage universal from 1849. Universal suffrage for women was introduced in Finland 1906, in Norway 1913, in Denmark 1915, and in Sweden 1921.
8 They have been said to represent "the liberal left in both spirit and action", Mjeldheim, *Folkerørsla som vart parti*, 75.
9 In 1882, only about 4,000 of registered shooters owned a personal weapon. Kaartvedt, *Kampen mot parlamentarisme*, 135.
10 Kaartvedt, *Kampen mot parlamentarisme*, 131–32, Mjeldheim, *Folkerørsla som vart parti*, 74–75.
11 "Opsang for de norske Skytterlag" (1881, often called the song of "Rifleringen"), in Hoem, *Vennskap i storm*, 303–04.
12 Kaartvedt, *Kampen mot parlamentarisme*, 133, Mjeldheim, *Folkerørsla som vart parti*, 74–75, Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 15–16. In his civic life, Ola Five was actually a school headmaster, but he was also registered as a reserve officer.
13 Solbakken, *Folkevæpningssamlagene i nytt lys*, 74–76.
14 Kaartvedt, *Kampen mot parlamentarisme*, 330 and 308–10, Nerbøvik, *Norsk historie 1870–1905*, 98–99, Strømme, *I tilfelle opprør*, 152–55, 157–58.
15 More on this in Wahlquist, *Sveriges frivilliga skytterörelse*.
16 Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 14–15. After 1893, the rest of the *Central Association* continued as the main organizer of other sports, like track and field and other new ones. Uniting all other sports into a single association could not have been possible before 1910, when *Norges Riksforbund for idrett* was started. It was then reorganized as *Norges Landsforbund* in 1919, and at lastly, as *Norges Idrettsforbund* in 1946. During the 1920s and 1930s the workers movement in Norway and Finland had separate sport associations (even for sharpshooting). They were admitted into new common unions after WWII.
17 *Norsk skyttertidende*, 1940, 174, and 1949, 437. Also in Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 45.
18 *Norsk skyttertidende*, 1905, 187, and 1940, 9.

19 See also Byrkjeflot's contribution to this volume.

20 Gymnastics in Denmark owed its position to Franz Nachtegall, who from about 1799 taught gymnastics based on the teachings of GutsMuths in Copenhagen. See e.g. *Nordisk Familjeboks Sport-Lexikon*, vol. 2, 1939, 518 and 535–39.

21 One of the medalists was Holger Nilsen, later famous for his life-saving method. The greatest name, however, was Lars Jørgen Madsen, with two Olympic gold medals (individual 1900 and in team 1920), besides being World Champion many times up to the 1930s.

22 However, this was overshadowed by track and field runner Hannes Kohlemainen's victories in both 5,000 meters and 10,000 meters, by which he paved the way for long-distance running as Finland's most "treasured" sport through the next decades.

23 These "squads" were abolished altogether in 1945.

24 E.g. in the championships of 1930 and 1935, and in Helsinki 1937 (when Finns won nine of the events). See also "Skytte en betydningsfull fisnk sportsgren" in *Nordisk Familjeboks Sport-Lexikon*, vol. 2, 1939, 1083–87.

25 "Finland has the best shooters in the world", declared *Norsk skyttertidende*, 1940, 18. A current Norwegian author, Frank Magnes, has emphasized the role of voluntary shooters in the Norwegian army during the campaign against Nazi Germany in 1940. However, there seems to be scant research on such matters.

26 In Norway, these were *Norsk avdeling av den Internasjonale Skytterunion* (NAIS, 1923), *Norsk Sportsskytterforbund* (1925) and *Norsk Miniatyr-skytterforbund* (1927), amalgamated into *Norsk Skytterforbund* in 1946. Likewise, the specialized *Svenska Skyttesportförbundet* was established in 1943. In Finland the international competitors were still administered through the people's movement. In Iceland, an organization for sharpshooting was not founded until 1979.

27 The combination of them is known as 3-Positions Match (in Norway called "Helmatch"). Distances could vary much more, from 300 meters and up to 1000 yards (London Olympics, 1908), or 800 meters (Paris in 1924).

28 Interestingly, the normal rifle used at long-distance shooting at today's Norwegian rallies (named Sig Sauer STR 200) has the same caliber. Another much-used rifle for long-distance shooting was, of course, the Mauser, with a calibre of 7.62 mm. The Hercules rifle was also popular, especially in 1912 and afterwards.

29 In the Athens Intercalated Games of 1906, shooter Gulbrand Skatteboe won the first-ever Norwegian gold medal winner in the 300-meter free rifle. A new gold medal was collected in the same event by Albert Helgerud in the London Games of 1908, where Norway's 6-man team also won the 300-meter team event, with Sweden second and Denmark fourth, see *Social-Demokraten*, no. 158, 1908.

30 In total, Sweden has gained fifteen Olympic gold medals and Norway thirteen. Finland had lesser success, but can still boast of four gold medals, while Denmark has three gold medals. A short review of the best Norwegian shooters is given in Olstad, *Da sporten erobret Norge*, 223.

31 Swahn's first win was a gold medal in the London Olympics of 1908, at the more moderate age of 60.

32 The first woman registered as a participant at the Norwegian National Shooters Rally seems to have been Mrs. Aagot Wesmann-Kjær (b. Brodtkorb, 1875–1937) in 1914. She accompanied her husband Oluf Wesmann-Kjær (1874–1945), another excellent sharpshooter, to the 1924 Paris Olympics. Jorsett, *Norges skytterkonger gjennom 100 år*, 35.

33 She mentions the rallies of 1921, 1924, and 1926. Gerda Helseth in *Norsk Skyttertidende*, nos. 49, 50, 51, 1926.

34 Local medalists are mentioned in *Norsk Skyttertidende*, 1935, 109 (Borghild Biltvedt) and 1937, 413 (Valborg Fredriksen). Karoline Omlid from Larvik won the prize set up by the newspaper *Østlendingen* at the national rally in 1939, cf. *Norsk Skyttertidende*, 1939, 306.

35 From 1954, Norway's National Championship included a miniature rifle class for women.

36 In this championship in Gothenburg, Sweden's Christina Gustafsson won the 3-positions match, while Finland's Ritva Pentillä won miniature shooting and Norway's Ingeborg Sørensen won standard rifle shooting.

37 Internationally, desegregated competitions in the Olympics can be found only in equestrian sport, where women were allowed on the same footing with men from 1952.

38 Among them are World Champion Jeanette Hegg Duestad, European Champion Jenny Stene, and Junior World Champion (of 2023) Synnøve Berg.

39 This happened for the first time in 2003 (Mette Elisabeth Finnestad), again in 2015 (Eileen Torp), and then in 2017 (Katrine Aannestad Lund). Otherwise, any best woman shooter since 1955 is named *Shooter Princess*. The titles are official and definitive and should not be compared to popular common terms in media, like "Skidkung" (about Mora-Nisse and Sixten Jernberg) or "Rockkung" (about Elvis, and others).

40 Cf. *Norsk skyttertidende*, no. 11, 1938, and Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter*, 217–18.

41 More on this in Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter*, 321–28. See also Hemstad's contribution to this volume.

42 Hemstad places this on a par with the earlier rallies, but it had now become more of an elite arrangement.

43 Torgeir Anderssen-Ryst, Minister of Defence, Commander-in-Chief General Christian Theodor Holtfodt, and Commander of the Military Castle of Akershus in Oslo, Major General Ivar Aavatsmark, an eager supporter of the shooters movement from early on. The first three belonged to the Liberal Left Party, and both Holtfodt (1914–19) and Aavatsmark (1919–20 and 1921–23) had been Ministers of Defence.

44 "Det nordiske skytterstevne begynner i dag", *Nationen*, no. 191, 1928.

45 Uttered on Norwegian TV 2 in August 2022, at the national shooters' rally (*Landsskytterstevnet*).

46 "Ting" is the Old Norse word for the legislative gathering of local councillors or chieftains. In Sweden, it was called *Skytteriksdagen* ("The Shooting Diet").

47 On "White Guards", see *Norsk Skyttertidende*, 1932, 153–54, on *Leidangen*, *Norsk Skyttertidende*, 1935, 201. The ban on uniforms was restricted to political groups. Civilian or humanitarian associations such as the Scouts, the Salvation Army, or sport clubs were free to use their formal uniforms.

48 Danish Tranquebar and Serampore and the Nicobar Islands to Great Britain (in 1845 and 1856, respectively), and the Danish West-Indies to the USA (in 1917). Sweden handed over St. Barthelemy to France in 1878. However, Denmark for a long-time kept Iceland (until 1918), Greenland, and the Faroe Islands in a sort of colonial state.

49 Norwegian expropriations of inhabited land in the South Atlantic (like Bouvet Island) was primarily due to private expeditions with whaling interests. On the other hand, Finland's participation in the war against the Soviet Union in 1941–44 seems more like an anomaly, as mere revenge for the losses in the unprovoked Winter War of 1939–40. Sweden, then, remains the only European nation that has avoided war — even civil war — in more than 200 years (since August 1814). Surely, that has some merit.

50 The Council consisted of delegations from Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Iceland; Finland joined in 1955. Today, even the autonomous regions of the Faroe Islands, Åland, and Greenland are represented. See also Stadius' contribution to this volume.

51 Today, the championship is limited to shooters from Sweden and Norway.

52 A reminiscence of these days of yore is the annual competition of Sweden and Finland in athletics, in Sweden called *Finnkampen*.

53 Inventing new sports was quite normal in this period, with popular sports of today like basketball (1891) and volleyball (1895) as good examples. Even today's outdoor lawn tennis is a rather late invention (from 1873).

54 Kristian Hellström (1880–1948) was himself an active athlete in track and field and participated in the intercalated Olympic Games in Athens 1906, where he won the bronze medal in the 1500 meters race.

55 Viktor Gustaf Balck (1844–1928) had a long military career but paid most of his attention as an officer was given to teaching gymnastics and other mass sports. Among his achievements, he introduced track and field competitions in Sweden. He was also the original sponsor of Swedish speed skating and played a central part in organizing the first Nordic Games of winter sports in 1901.

56 The element of fencing may even stem from Balck, an excellent fencer. A cross-country race may have been an idea from Hellström, who in 1901 arranged the first cross-country competition in Sweden (a race he also won).

57 A curious fact: best "foreigner" in the Olympics of 1912 turned out to be the American lieutenant, later general, George S. Patton, who finished fifth. Even after their heyday, Swedes have shown especially good results: Wille Grut won a gold medal in London in 1948, Lars Hall did likewise in Helsinki 1952 and Melbourne in 1956 (actually, the first non-officer to win), while Björn Ferm (b. 1944), rather surprisingly, won in Mexico City in 1968. Ferm had his best event in swimming but was also a good sharpshooter. As late as 1984, swimmer Svante Rasmuson (b. 1955) won the silver medal, and in 1980 he was part of the Swedish bronze medal team.

58 Danes, however, had good results in the Olympic Games of 1920 and 1924, and the best Finnish results in the Olympics were silver and bronze medals in 1956 and bronze medals for teams in 1952 and 1956.

59 The horse jumping element was changed a bit in the Olympic Games in Paris.

60 High Officer Sven Alfred Thofelt (1904–93) was a good epee fencer, winning the silver medal with the Swedish team in 1936 and the bronze medal in 1948. Later, he got the biathlon sport included in the UIPM, renaming it UIPMB.

61 The Nordic Games introduced quite a range of new or uncommon sports, like a reindeer run (1901), or motorcar and motorcycling events (1922). From 1917 women, too, were allowed to compete in cross-country skiing (10 km), 35 years before they could do it in the Winter Olympics (Oslo 1952).

62 *Norsk skyttertidende*, 1895, 59, reports that the Kristiania Eastern Shooter Society has held a "Winter Reward" competition of a "supposedly new kind", combining a 5-km ski run with five shots at various targets. In Norway, at least, armed companies on skis had been part of the regular army since before 1800.

63 In France, organized military field shooting by ski patrols was arranged at least since 1912, in Sweden since 1904, and in Norway since 1910. Solberg, *Idrettsmann og skytter*, 92–93.

64 They gained a plurality of the twelve medals: one gold (Norway), four silver (Finland), and two bronze (Sweden). Even small balloons were introduced as targets in 1936; later on, balloons were used in biathlon relays in the 1960s.

65 The Cortina rally has later been suspended as an official championship.

66 *Nordisk Familjeboks Sports-Lexikon*, vol. 5, 1943, col. 912.

67 There have been some doubts about whether the military patrol team event should be seen as the biathlon's forerunner, see Storsveen, *Våre skiskyttere*, 80, who instead points

to the Swedish tradition of field shooting on skis. At any rate, the Swedes' successes in both Modern Pentathlon and military patrol teams must undoubtedly have influenced their involvement in making biathlon an international sport in the 1950s.

68 Storsveen, *Våre skiskyttere*, 78–79.

69 Storsveen, *Våre skiskyttere*, 81, 93, 119. Wiklund was an employee of the Swedish Air Force, based at Frösön, close to Östersund. Lestander was neither a soldier nor military employee, but an expert hunter — his victory in Squaw Valley was mainly the result of perfect shooting, with twenty target hits of twenty possible. Norway's *Skytterkonge* of 1959, Jon Istad, turned out to be one of the best biathletes during the 1960s, forming part of the silver medal team of the 1964 Winter Olympics and becoming World Champion in 1966. By then, military or semi-military occupations were the norm among the soon dominant competitors from the Soviet Union and GDR.

70 Norwegian Olympic Biathlon Champion Ole Einar Bjørndalen did occasionally compete as a cross-country skier. World Champion in 15 km cross-country skiing in 2007, Norway's Lars Berger, was basically a biathlete.

71 In the Olympic Winter Games in Beijing 2022, Norway gained six gold medals and Sweden one, of a total of eleven.

72 An apology to Armand Duplantis: it *is* good fun, though.

73 More on this in Slagstad, *[Sporten]. En idéhistorisk studie*.

Bibliography

Agøy, Nils Ivar. *Militæretaten og 'den indre fiende' fra 1905 til 1940*. Oslo: Acta Humaniora, 1997.

———. *For konge og fedreland? Offiserer, politikk, unionsstrid og nasjonalisme 1890–1905*. Oslo: Den norske historiske forening, 2001.

Berg, Roald. *Norsk forsvarshistorie* vol. 2, 1814–1905: *Profesjon – union – nasjon*. Bergen: Eide Forlag, 2001.

Dunér, Arthur. *Skytteväsendets historia: En 100-årig kulturkrönika*. Stockholm: Lars Hökerbergs Bogförlag, 1933.

Fjeld, Birger. *Skyttersaken i Norge før 1893: Centralforeningens og Folkevæpningssamlagenes tid 1863–1893*. Oslo: Det frivillige skyttervesen, 1979.

Greenberg, Stan. *The Guinness Book of Olympic Facts and Feats*. London: Guinness Publishing, 1996.

Hellstenius, Mads. *Skjutande borgerliga revolutionärer: Skarpskytterörelsen och 1800-taletsliberala moderniseringsprojekt*. Skrifter med historiska perspektiv 6. Malmö: Malmö Högskola, 2008.

Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter: Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008.

Hoem, Edvard. *Vennskap i storm: Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson 1875–1889*. Oslo: Forlaget Oktober, 2010.

Jansson, Torkel. *Adertonhundratalets associatoner. Forskning och problem kring ett sprängfullt tomrum eller sammanslutningsprinciper och föreningsformer mellan två samhällsformationer ca. 1800–1870*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upasaliensis, 1985.

Jorsett, Per, ed. *Skyttersaken i Oslo gjennom 100 år*. [Oslo]: Oslo Skyttersamlag, 1983.

———. *Norges skytterkonger gjennom 100 år*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1993.

Kaartvedt, Alf. *Kampen mot parlamentarisme 1880–1884: Den konservative politikken under vetostriden*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1956.

Lundkvist, Sven. *Folkrörelserna i det svenska samhället 1850–1920*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upasaliensis, 1977.

Magnes, Frank. *Kampene i Sør-Odal, Glåmdalen og Østerdalen 1940*. Tønsberg: Ares Forlag AS, 2022.

Meinander, Henrik. *Towards a Bourgeois Manhood: Boys' Physical Education in Nordic Secondary Schools 1880–1940*. Commentationes Scientarium. Socialium 47. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters, 1994.

Mjeldheim, Leiv. *Folkerørsla som vart parti: Venstre frå 1880-åra til 1905*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1984.

Nerbøvik, Jostein. *Norsk historie 1870–1905*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1973.

Nordisk Familjeboks Sport-Lexikon. Vols. 2–6. Stockholm: Nordisk Familjeboks Förlag AB, 1939–46.

Norsk Skyttertidende, 1882–2023.

Olstad, Finn. *Norsk idretts historie, Vol. 1*: *Forsvar, sport, klassekamp*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1987.

———. *Da sporten erobret Norge*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2022.

Seip, Jens Arup. *Utsikt over Norges historie*. Vol. 2. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1981.

Slagstad, Rune. *[Sporten]. En idéhistorisk studie*. Oslo: Pax Forlag, 2008/2015.

Solbakken, Sondre. "Folkevæpningssamlagene i nytt lys. En studie av de venstreradikale skytterlagenes politiske betydning." MA-avhandling, Universitetet i Sørøst-Norge, V-2021.

Solberg, Glenn Eilif. "Idrettsmann og skytter. En historisk undersøkelse av skiskytingens utvikling og organisering i Norge før 1930." Masteroppgave, Universitetet i Bergen, V-2019.

Storsveen, Viktor. *Våre skiskyttere: Skiskyttersporten gjennom 60 år – sett fra innsiden*. [Hamar]: Vist Media AS, 2018.

Strømme, Ottar [pseud. = Lars Borgersrud]. *I tilfelle opprør*. *Det norske militærapparatet fra 1814 til 1905*. Våpen mot folket – 1. Oslo: Forlaget Oktober A/S, 1979.

Vigander, Haakon, Frantz Gustav Seeberg, and Johan Albert Hoff. *Skyttersaken i Norge: Dens historie og nuværende stilling*. Fredrikstad: E. Sems Trykkeri, 1927.

Wahlquist, Wilhelm. *Sveriges frivilliga skytterörelse under åtti år 1860–1939*. Stockholm: Nordisk Rotgravyr, 1940.

Wallechinsky, David. *The Complete Book of the Olympics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1984–2008.

7 Hybridity and Blurred Borders between Market and Civil Society

The Case of Danish Cooperatives, Savings Banks and Corporations

Mads Mordhorst, Louise Karlskov Skyggebjerg and Mathias Hein Jessen

Introduction

In this chapter, we perceive civil society as a discursive, rather than a distinct empirical phenomenon. We view civil society as a construction that is produced, contested, and changed due to historical context and discursive struggles, rather than a fixed reality. It is, in a historical perspective, only recently that we have come to think of civil society as something distinct, with its own logics and values. Before the nineteenth century, civil society was largely associated with the state. To thinkers like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, civil society was political society or the state, as seen in distinction to the uncivil state of nature. To thinkers like Hegel, Marx, and Tönnies in the nineteenth century, civil society could only be understood as the emerging market society. It is only from the 1980s that we find a conception of civil society as a sphere or logic distinct from both state and market.[1] The borders between civil society and other sectors of society have thus always been blurred and hybrid. However, in everyday parlance, we often view them as fixed, empirical realities. This means that all organizations are "hybrid". In this chapter we draw attention to the practices and blurred borders of associations working in the intersection between what we today associate with "civil society" and market, that is organizations for whom hybridity is a "problem", that is, something that is contested, and for whom there is a struggle to put themselves, and their adversaries, into a category. We look at how these categories were historically and discursively constructed, contested and transformed over time.

As stated in the introduction to this volume, the contemporary debate on civil society has centered on two understandings. One, often framed as normative, is where the focus has been on the positive functions of civil society to society at large, like contributing to democratic development and the common good. The other is a sectorial understanding of civil society, associated with a specific sphere of society, the "third" sector or sphere, outside and distinct from the state and the market. In this, sometimes framed as descriptive, conceptualization of civil society, associations are either market actors or civil society. In this chapter, we hold that a

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-9
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

"descriptive" perspective is also normative, and that describing yourself—or your adversaries—as belonging in a certain "sphere" has performative consequences. Being narrated as part of the civil society has in general been seen as positive and a part of doing something good for the larger society, while being a market actor has been seen as focusing on self-interest and profit. These positive narratives of being a part of the civil society can be mobilized as resources and legitimacy in competition with the other market actors.

Civil society research in both perspectives has focused primarily on studying the associational and organizational forms that are conceived "negatively", as something other than state and market, for instance voluntary organizations, non-governmental associations, or social movements. As part of civil society studies, associations like cooperatives, enterprise foundations, and social-economic enterprises are mostly analyzed as being in opposition to pure market actors and as a moderation of pure market forces. However, in practice, the borders between market, civil society, and the state are not clear cut, either for the organizations themselves or for society in general. In corporatist or neo-corporatist states, like Nordic welfare states, there is a great deal of coordination and cooperation between the state, business, and civil society organizations. NGOs in the Nordic states—despite their "non-governmental" moniker—are, for example, often funded and act in close cooperation with the state. Despite this, the discourse of three separate sectors with their distinct logics and values has a powerful hold on how we conceive and understand society.[2]

In this chapter, we focus on the relation between civil society and the market. We draw attention to how the borders between sectors have been narratively produced and the performative aspect of this discourse. We do this by highlighting historically three organizational types that illustrate the hybrid nature of organizations that are "in between" what we would normally ascribe to be civil society or market actors, namely cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations. The first two are organizational forms which are often linked to civil society, while the corporation in the form of the public limited company has been perceived as the paradigm of the pure economic form. We hold that it must be the subject of contextual and historical analysis whether such organizations should be viewed as either part of civil society or the market. In addition, we hold that the degree to which the different actors place themselves and their opponents in these spheres has performative aspects and is the subject of struggle. For instance, in Danish history, the cooperative sector succeeded in painting itself as democratic and contributing to the common good, whereas the business corporation was painted as purely economic, potentially harmful, and thereby the subject of state regulation.[3] As a result, cooperatives are hailed as expressive of the Danish cooperative spirit, whereas the role of corporations in economic development is largely neglected, even though cooperatives have rarely been as much dominated by democracy as claimed and more by economic imperatives.[4] We limit our analysis to the historical development of cooperatives (*andelsforeninger*), specifically agricultural producer co-operatives), savings banks (*sparekasser*), and corporations (understood

as limited liability companies, *aktieselskaber*) in Denmark, but all the forms have been prominent in the Nordic countries and, despite differences, have had parallel developments.[5]

Instead of defining them as either market actors or civil societies, we analyze the organizational forms through the notion of *association* understood as people combining with each other to achieve certain ends or aims.[6] While these aims are *also* economic, they are not exclusively so. Especially regarding savings banks and cooperatives, it would be reductionist to view them as only concerned with economic profit, but it would be equally reductionist to view them as purely "civil society" concerned with the common good. In short, different objectives, aims, reasons, and rationalities have been at stake. This means that we do not view the organizational form of the market as focused entirely on creating profit and civil societal organizations as a form of association where the purposes are values or activities not reducible to the economic level. Instead, we are interested in how the distinctions or dualities between associations perceived as being of societal value and those perceived as being purely for profit are produced in the narrative and discursive processes and the effects of this production.

This leads us to an interest in the relation between *praxis* and *narrative* and the investigation of how the savings banks and the cooperatives, in particular, have created certain narratives about their practice focused on their contribution to the common good in contradistinction to an exclusive focus on money and profit—narratives that at the same time assigned the role of the villain to the corporations. As our cases will highlight, savings banks, for example, came to be seen in opposition to the profit-seeking banks as associations contributing to the common good by providing access to saving activities for the lower classes and income levels in the society. Cooperatives were described as democratic organizations that, despite being market actors, had a higher purpose. In the case analysis, we identify differences between praxis and narratives in the three cases and look for the performative effect of the narratives. This adds to our more general interest in how the story of different kinds of hybrid associations contribute to our understanding of the relation between what traditionally has been understood as two distinct categories, the market and civil society.

Our chronological framing is from the late nineteenth century until 2010, with a focus on two transformative periods that show huge differences in the practice and narratives over time. The first period can be called the long formation period. It focuses on the latter decades of the nineteenth century when new structures and organizations emerged and developed in the Danish society after the defeat in the Second Schleswig War in 1864 and the loss of Schleswig and Holstein, which reduced Denmark to a small nation state grappling with economic, political, and cultural crises at the same time as industrialization only slowly took off. The second is the decades before and after the millennium when cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations had all become central market actors and were transforming to act in a very different societal context after processes of deregulation, centralization, and globalization.

The chapter will be structured as follows: first, we provide a short overview of the Danish context, before we present our three empirical cases: the cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations. In the discussion, we sum up the analysis with a focus on the question of hybridity and performative effects of narratives before we conclude.

The Danish Context: A Historical Overview

The associations analyzed in this chapter are products of the modernization processes that the Nordic nations underwent in the nineteenth century. Originating as responses to the possibilities and needs of modern societies, these associations hold a unique position in Danish history. Danish corporations can trace their origin to an elite project initiated by the king in the seventeenth century. However, by the nineteenth century, these entities evolved into associations that had to consider both shareholder and stakeholder perspectives. Concurrently, savings banks emerged in the early nineteenth century and flourished in the latter half of the century. This formative period compelled these associations to navigate the complexities of being both market actors and 'civil society' organizations, in praxis functioning for profit while simultaneously contributing to the common good. The latecomers were the cooperatives. The first cooperative dairy in Denmark was founded in 1882 but multiplied rapidly, reaching over a thousand within two decades.

Economically, legal reforms, not least the 1857 Free Trade Act, liberalized markets and opened avenues for new forms of economic organization. Politically, the transition from absolutism to democracy in 1849 was relatively peaceful, but distrust towards the state and the political system persisted. The conflict-ridden aftermath of the 1864 war and a revision of the constitution in 1866 led to a dysfunctional political system until 1901. Against this backdrop of crises and conflicts, the associations studied in this chapter developed in nineteenth-century Denmark. This development manifested in the urban centers mainly with the growth of corporations and in the rural areas with savings banks and cooperatives. Although all these economic activities were associations, their cultural and narrative framing differed.

Post-WWII changes in urbanization, industrialization, and competition facilitated structural changes leading to fewer but larger organizations, and the subsequent wave of globalization from the late twentieth century onwards further accelerated centralization. Some cooperatives were transformed into globalized enterprises, including multinational giants such as the Danish-Swedish dairy Arla, at the same time as the biggest savings banks merged into commercial banks and became part of much larger corporations such as the Nordic bank Nordea. In addition, corporations once numbered in the thousands merged and consolidated, which meant that more of them became part of global supply chains, and some became huge global actors like the pharmaceutical company Novo Nordisk. This structural development and enhanced market competition challenged the established forms and narratives of associations that had come to emphasize smallness and

Danishness. Small associations had been narrated as a means to bridge the divide between the state, market, and civil societies, thereby offering solutions to the crises post-1864. However, by the end of the twentieth century, Denmark was still a small but now as well an economically successful nation dominated by large enterprises.

In the following, we analyze in turn how the cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations became an integrated part of the societal changes, and how it affected the perception of their relations to the civil society.

Corporations

The Birth of the Business Corporation—Corporations before 1917

The earliest joint-stock corporations were colonial trading companies chartered in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. During the eighteenth century, an increasing number of corporations were formed not only for colonial trading companies but also some banks and insurance companies. This shows the advantage of the corporate form, especially with regards to limited liability, as it made it possible to amass large amounts of capital as the individual shareholders are not liable for corporate debts. A corporation was a good tool for risky, but potentially very profitable, endeavors, and was chartered for public purposes that the state could or would not itself undertake. In this sense, the corporation came into use as a form of association with aims beyond the merely economic. It was used for larger high-risk projects such as colonial trading, insurance, and banking companies and later for infrastructure projects like the telegraph company Great Northern, set up in 1869.[7]

After the Free Trade Act in 1857, it became much easier administratively to establish corporations.[8] In the course of the nineteenth century, the corporation was used more extensively for business and the drive for profit became dominant. The legislative framework was extremely liberal,[9] and this continued after the introduction of the first corporate law which was still very liberal by international comparison. A specific corporate law (*aktieselskabslov*) was not introduced in Denmark until 1917, which is late by international standards. In comparison, Sweden instituted the first corporate law in the Nordic region in 1848.[10] In the Danish act, a limited liability corporation is defined as “any business Company in which none of the Participants (Shareholders) are personally liable for the Obligations of the Company”. The act also states that “A Company is considered to be a Business Company when its purpose […] is to gain economic profit for the distribution between the Participants.”[11] The corporation in this sense is an association whose primary purpose is to produce economic profit for its members.

While personal ownership dominated business organization towards the end of the nineteenth century, and financing came either from the personal capital of the owners or through their personal credit and loans, personal ownership became increasingly challenged by new economic needs and developments and companies with big capital demands and investments with big risks attached.[12] Share ownership became more dispersed among the population, but was still dominated by big merchants, civil servants, shipowners, royalty, nobility, and manorial lords. Where

earlier, there had been a limitation on voting rights in relation to ownership of shares, towards the end of the nineteenth century, shareholders received increasing influence through voting in the general assembly corresponding to their shares.[13] Generally, the economic aspect started to become a larger part of the corporation, with economic profit superseding other aims and ends of the corporate form.

With the emergence of cooperatives at the end of the nineteenth century, which we will analyze in the next section, a struggle emerged between the cooperatives, which were mainly rural and agricultural, and the corporations which were mainly urban and in industry and trade. The central distinguishing feature was that in corporations the profit was distributed according to the size of each individual investment, whereas in cooperatives the returns were distributed according to the businesses of the individual members. In corporations, voting rights and influence were allocated according to the number of shares, whereas cooperatives observed the principle of one person one vote. Finally, corporations enjoyed limited liability, whereas cooperatives had joint liability.[14] Particularly, the cooperative movement championed the idea that these two forms represented different economic forms, one "capitalist" and the other "democratic," and there was a tension and struggle between these associative forms regarding which should dominate the Danish economy.[15]

The increased use of the corporate form for business also increased the number of scandals and frauds which accelerated the discussions about regulating the excesses of the corporate form, just as corporations were criticized for suffocating smaller businesses.[16] The motives of regulation were to secure ordinary people against fraud, but also to secure shareholders and creditors, underlining the need to regulate to make the business activities more transparent to attract investors. This points to the importance of corporations for the common good. Corporations were seen by the regulators as essential to the economic growth and prosperity of the country and as necessary to finance certain risky projects. This importance was also underlined by the liberal corporate law in 1917 that did not mean tighter regulation and was not very strict regarding either financial reporting or the publication of ownership structures and shareholder agreements. Industrialists and business owners retained the right to regulate the market privately through monopolies, competition-limiting cartels, and price agreements.[17]

A Country of Big Corporations—1989–2010

Despite the now-challenged narrative of Denmark's economic history as one of cooperatives and small- and medium-sized enterprises with an emphasis on agriculture,[18] corporations of all sizes have been a central part of the economic development of Denmark. Especially since the 1990s, a few large multinational corporations have been acting as the drivers of the economy.[19] Generally, the percentage of the total turnover represented by corporations in the Danish economy increased immensely from the post-WWII period until today, with the corporate form increasingly edging out other enterprise forms.[20] From the 1980s, and not least following Denmark's increasing integration into the European Single Market

in the 1990s, the Danish business structure thus underwent a "dramatic development" toward the dominance of a few big global corporations.[21] In fact, the turnover of the ten biggest corporations doubled from 19.5% of gross domestic product in 1990 to 46% in 2010.[22]

From the 1990s, the corporation was seen as a "universal solution"[23] where state-owned enterprises were privatized and turned into corporations, and where corporations were increasingly perceived as the main drivers of both economic and social growth in the "competition state".[24] At the same time, the savings banks and cooperatives came more and more to look like corporations as described in the next sections. The cooperative sector became dominated by two entities (Arla and Danish Crown) that are formally cooperatives (with limited liability), but in practice multinational enterprises.[25] Thus, the Danish business sector has increasingly been organized like corporations—however, sometimes with an ownership form that points to blurred borders between market and civil society. Another case in point is Denmark's high concentration of foundation-owned enterprises where many of the biggest corporations are foundation-owned.[26] Foundations own the majority of controlling shares in publicly listed companies such as Mærsk, Novo Nordisk, and Carlsberg.

Another kind of hybridity has also emerged. From the 2000s, there has on the one hand been an increased tendency towards a focus on shareholders and profitability.[27] This focus on profit and growth has in the financial sector been framed as financialization, a concept that covers a development where financial motives, markets, and actors get an increased role in the economy, and where the financial sector has its own risk-based orientation towards growth.[28] On the other hand, corporations are increasingly expected to contribute to the common good as responsible taxpayers and by contributing to corporate social responsibility (CSR), meaning that cooperations have a responsibility not just to shareholders but also to a broader group of societal stakeholders.[29] This has been visible both in the media with discussions about the triple bottom line—economic, social, and environmental, now often conceptualized as profit, people, planet—and in legislation that began to ask for green accounts. As has been the case since the 1980s, foundations also need to donate to certain charitable causes, like research and art, if they want the tax benefits connected to the organizational form of the enterprise foundations.[30]

More importantly, the 1990s also saw the dawn of corporate environmentalism in Denmark.[31] This focus became built into the now widespread CSR concept. This is a testament to the role that corporations are seen to have in contemporary society as not just focusing on business and profit but also as contributing to the common good in a broader way than just through the "invisible hand" of economic wealth, employment, and growth. One indicator is that still more companies, like the largest Danish company Novo Nordisk, have adopted the triple bottom line framework where corporations, in addition to economy and profit, are also held accountable for their social and environmental impact.[32] Another indicator is the embracing of the discussion of the UN sustainable development goals emphasizing economy, society, and governance (ESG) and the role of corporations in this

framework. Since 2009, the largest Danish corporations have legally been obliged to have a CSR strategy, and generally, these frameworks have developed into a competitive capacity.

Cooperatives

The Cooperative Idea and its Breakthrough in Denmark, 1880–1900

The concept of cooperatives is often traced back to the Rochdale pioneers in England, who established the first cooperative grocery store in 1844. However, the cooperative associational form is widely acknowledged to have gained significant traction in the Nordics and has been seen as a core part of the so-called Nordic model.[33] In Denmark, cooperatives, especially in the form of dairy and bacon factories, played a pivotal role in the modernization and industrialization of the economy in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Here, we are specifically talking about agricultural producer cooperatives, not consumer or housing cooperatives which are also prevalent in Denmark. According to the dominant narrative of Danish history, these agricultural producer cooperatives became the economic backbone of Denmark.[34] They were central in the transition of the Danish agricultural sector from grain to animal product for exports, primarily to the British market. Beyond their economic function, the cooperatives are also today generally perceived as democratic entities rooted in local communities, being just as much part of civil society as commercial actors.[35]

Understanding this duality of cooperatives, i.e. the perception of them as both economic and democratic entities, requires distinguishing between their formal organizational structures and their cultural and narrative constructions. In contrast to the corporations, which as described were regulated in the corporate law of 1917, there has never been cooperative legislation introduced in Denmark. However, in its formal structure, a cooperative can be defined as an economic association where a group of people voluntarily agree to cooperate by sharing investments, responsibilities, and profits. This does not necessarily indicate an initiative with a social agenda or responsibility or a pronounced democratic profile. Still, the common cultural and narrative definition sees cooperatives not merely as economic entities but as socially responsible and democratically oriented organizations, in contrast to corporations oriented towards creating profit for owners. Thus, there is an inherent ambiguity between cooperatives as economic enterprises on the one hand, and as part of a social and democratic movement on the other.

In Denmark, the breakthrough of the cooperatives was followed by an almost explosive growth in such associations. The establishment of the first cooperative dairy in Hjedding in 1882 is usually mentioned as the first time the cooperative form was used in Denmark in manufacturing and production.[36] Ten years later, 1,100 co-dairy plants had been established.[37] The first cooperative slaughterhouse opened in Horsens in 1887, and likewise, it soon proved to be a model that could compete with the privately owned corporations.[38] From here the cooperative model spread rapidly to a wide range of other industries related to farming such as grain,

feed businesses, manure, eggs, transport, and insurance. Later it was estimated that in 1917 more than 4,000 cooperatives existed in Denmark.[39] Cooperatives had become the dominant way of organizing business in the rural areas. Not least because the cooperative form showed itself to be a way of organizing business which proved competitive on the global market.[40]

The cooperatives of that time were organized locally with the purpose of processing and marketing animal products for export. An economic reason for the farmers to choose the cooperative form was that it made it possible for them to collect the necessary amount of capital to establish the dairies and slaughterhouses. The farmers who took the initiative to establish the cooperatives were typically farmers with medium-sized farms. It was a bottom-up process that was built on established organizational traditions and skills and a relatively high level of education among farmers.[41] The farmers shared for the most part a liberal ideology and saw the market as the only way of creating an income.[42]

There is a lot of evidence in the nineteenth-century sources for the economic rationalities and advantages of establishing the cooperatives, but few indications of an idea focused on a broader civil society. This shows that the later common idea of cooperatives as a social and democratic movement first gained prominence after the initial breakthrough. In 1899, the Cooperative Committee, a cooperative umbrella organization, was founded. It came to play a key role in shaping the narrative of cooperatives as a movement. The term "cooperative movement" was first used in the Cooperative Magazine, published by the Cooperative Committee. This narrative positioned cooperatives as a social, cultural, and national movement, representing the best aspects of the Danish national character. In this narrative, the farmers and the cooperatives were the heroes who saved Denmark after the defeat in the war in 1864, while the villains were the capitalists and corporations.[43] The cooperative movement in Denmark became thus established on a nationalistic ideological foundation. The paradox is, however, that the cooperative bacon and butter production not only played a huge role in lifting Denmark out of the economic crises after the defeat in 1864 but it also integrated Denmark into a globalized economy, with Britain as the main market.[44]

1990 to the Present: From Local Cooperatives to Global Enterprises

From 1990 to the present, globalization and increased competition has led to significant structural changes in Danish cooperatives. The dairy and bacon production sectors witnessed a shift from local cooperatives to global enterprises and are today, as mentioned above, dominated by two giants—Arla and Danish Crown—making the agricultural sector one of the most centralized sectors in Denmark. The structural centralization was a response to the evolving global economy, challenging cooperatives to remain competitive. However, this centralization posed a threat to the cooperative identity and narrative, which emphasized local organization, democratic ideals, and resistance against monopolies. The legitimacy of cooperative enterprises faced challenges as they became larger and more centralized, deviating from the traditional cooperative narrative. Even though Arla and Danish Crown are

still formally organized as cooperatives, they have become everything the cooperative narrative traditionally had distanced itself from—industrial multinationals with monopolistic attitudes resembling the business practices of their capitalist opponents. Thus, they are now perceived more as market actors akin to corporations than representing an alternative third way of organizing.

Savings Banks

From Philanthropic Ideas to Financial Intermediaries—Savings *Banks before 1900*

When the first savings banks in Denmark were formed in the 1810s and 1820s, they had a focus on savings, not on credit. The reputable people from the elite taking the initiative wanted to educate the poor to become morally responsible citizens who understood the need to save. Thus, the aim was philanthropic, the flavor patriarchal, and the customers meant to be from the lower classes.[45] In contradistinction to the cooperatives, it was a top-down process. The poor should be brought up to save for days of misfortune instead of spending on booze and luxuries such as coffee. The idea was to avoid a societal burden, not to accumulate profit, and retained earnings should be given back to the society, especially to the local community, as charitable grants when equity had been accumulated.[46] In this way, the original savings bank idea resembles an understanding of civil society associations as based on social motives and the idea of working for the common good.

However, the savings banks quickly became hybrid organizations giving credit and emphasizing economic goals, not least when the number of savings banks grew rapidly from the 1860s. At this time, two new types of savings banks had emerged that reflected a need for financial intermediaries in the developing capitalist society. One was small parish savings banks based on the same moralizing ideas as the first savings banks. The other was farmers' savings banks, acting as part of the farmers' movement and contributing to its goal, the equality and independence of the farmers, among other things by lending to the new cooperative dairies and slaughterhouses.[47] Generally, the savings banks got a broader customer base than initially intended and more focus on lending.[48] Despite this development, savings were still promoted as the core business, and lending was downplayed in a narrative that continued to posit the savings banks as philanthropic organizations safekeeping the savings of the poor and encouraging them to save.[49] This, however, was more a grand narrative than a lived praxis.

Each savings bank covered a limited local area, but commonly they soon became of national economic importance.[50] For the customers and the society at large, it was undesirable for important economic organizations to be based on voluntary work and without proper financial security. Thus, to keep the trust in the savings banks high, legislation was set up in 1880. It aimed at professionalizing and controlling the administration and introduced a distinction between commercial banks and savings banks, based on the idea that savings banks should stick to risk-averse banking. Concretely, it did not allow organizations that discounted bills or aimed to generate profit for founders or shareholders to be called savings banks.[51] The debate

in journals and parliament leading to the legislation centered around the mismatch between the initial philanthropic idea, still narrated as the core, and the practice of the savings banks that more resembled commercial banking. Some claimed that savings banks should only receive, secure, and pay interest on savings, not strive for growth and profit.[52] However, the savings banks continued to develop more as financial intermediaries than as philanthropic associations, perceived and narrated as civil society associations but primarily acting as market actors.[53]

1989 Onwards: From the Emphasis on Risk-averse Banking to Full-fledged Banks

When Danish society transformed from an agricultural to an industrial society after WWII, the savings banks were generally too small and limited in their business to meet the needs of advanced business customers and lost market shares.[54] The answer to the problem was deregulation that from 1975 removed the prohibition of several banking practices in savings banks and left only one legislative difference to commercial banks, namely that savings banks should be self-owned organizations and commercial banks public limited companies.[55] Another answer was mergers, and the sector became dominated by big regional and two nationwide savings banks with the latter soon accounting for half of all deposits in the savings banks.[56] The centralization was considered necessary based on economic arguments. However, it conflicted with the narrative of savings banks as something supporting the local community. Thus, some savings bankers opposed the trend by considering "real" savings banks as small and local, not big businesses aiming for growth and profit, and they were generally against what others called necessary modernization to keep up with the needs of the customers and remain competitive. They interpreted the development as one of the associations working for the common good degenerating into for-profit businesses.[57]

Despite this counternarrative, the emphasis on economic motives continued, and by the end of the 1980s, new legislation allowed savings banks to become corporations to secure growth and competitiveness. As part of this process, new commercial foundations were endowed with the accumulated profits in the savings banks. However, the savings bankers had no wish to lose control over their equity and ensured the foundations had no influence over the banking business, despite being the largest shareholder. The compulsory purpose of the foundations according to the legislation was to secure the savings bank as a thriving business. In addition, most of them got a secondary purpose of working for the common good, thereby inheriting the local gift-giving practices from the savings banks. Thus, the foundations became a new form of hybrids imbued with a tension between for-profit and nonprofit goals.[58]

In the discussion leading up to the new legislation, left-wing politicians identified savings banks as the outcome of a community-based nonprofit movement built up for the sake of the common good. They perceived savings banks as representing important social values such as solidarity, and found it unacceptable to give the accumulated profits, "the region's money", to future shareholders. The Social-Democrat Bjørn Westh, for example, said that the savings banks were rather

romantic as a movement, comparable to the cooperative movement and the folk high schools and representing what he felt was the lifeblood of the so-called Danish model, which to him meant a better welfare society than anywhere else. As the answer to a Denmark in crisis, they had been a way to solve things jointly and create common value.[59] However, most of the accumulated profits were now in the hands of savings bankers aiming for growth, profit, and competitiveness in a situation where fierce competition was expected. On their agenda were overseas activities, investment banking, and dreams of financial supermarkets delivering mortgages, insurance, and all kinds of banking products. Thus, the savings banks had moved far from the tale of risk-averse organizations using their surplus for the benefit of the local community, and it had become impossible to distinguish their local giving from the sponsorships and CSR practices of commercial banks.[60] In the following years, several savings banks merged with commercial banks, and when the financial crisis hit in 2008, it became obvious that many previous or current savings banks had not acted according to the idea of risk-averse banking. Among them were both savings banks that had become public limited companies and some that had stayed as self-owned companies.[61] Just as the cooperatives had moved far from the traditional narrative, so had the savings banks.

Hybridity in Action

We have in this chapter taken an associational point of departure in our analyses of organizations that are at the intersection of civil societies and markets. As demonstrated in the empirical section, corporations, cooperatives, and savings banks are hybrid organizations at the intersection of civil societies and markets and have as such acted in accordance with different logics and expectations from external stakeholders, as well as from their internal stakeholders like members and owners. In this way, our cases challenge the two main discourses and approaches to the study of civil society. The first pivots around the idea of civil society as the core element in creating good and democratic societies and perceives civil society as essential in creating cohesion and the common good of society, sometimes mentioned as a normative perception. The second is often seen as more descriptive and structural, focusing on the civil society as the third sector, or the sector between the market and the state. Both approaches thereby isolate civil society as a specific realm, separated from state and market.

In this section we discuss how the cases of cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations in Denmark challenge these perceptions of civil society from an associational perspective. We discuss how the sectorial approach is challenged by the hybrid character of the three cases, and how the concept of civil society as contributing to democracy and the common good implies that someone defines who to include in the common and what to consider good. In other words, what the common good is, and who is included, is a subject of historical and political struggle and not something that a priori can be assessed or identified with a particular sector of society.[62] The state is a central actor in those struggles, and one way the state's actions become visible is through legislation. We therefore exemplify the shifting

and different perceptions of the three hybrids by focusing on legislation, before we point to some of the changes over time.

Despite narratives that sometimes have suggested otherwise, our cases emerged as part of the economic sphere and the market. The savings banks were founded based on an help-to-self-help idea. However, they, despite being for long narrated as nonprofit associations, quickly became an integrated part of the market, competing with other financial institutions on market terms. In contrast, the Danish corporations and producer-cooperatives emerged with the purpose of doing business. They both from the very beginning competed in markets with the purpose of making profit for the owners.

The main difference between the corporations and the cooperatives was ownership. The cooperatives had, as described, member-based ownership, while the corporations had a share-based ownership. The member-based organizing of the cooperatives might have contributed to cultivating democratic experience and organizing associations. However, during the breakthrough in the 1880s and 1890s, this was only a side effect, not a part of the purpose of the cooperatives. Their ambition was limited to the members, and they had no broader societal ambition. It was first after 1900 that the cooperatives began to act and narrate themselves as a movement with a broader purpose than being a market actor. And this was done very explicitly by contrasting it to the purely economic corporations.

The main difference between the cooperatives and savings banks on the one side and corporations on the other was on the narrative level and how they argued for contributing to the common good. While in practice being and acting as market actors, both savings banks and cooperatives came to narrate themselves as associations with a larger purpose and both got a prominent role in the image of the Danish society as a society built up around social movements and organizations working for the common good, rather than a capitalistic industrial society. A central element in these narratives was a way of constructing the plot so the corporations were narrated as the profit-seeking villains not contributing to society at large, despite corporations being central in bringing in capital both domestically and from abroad, that also helped the cooperatives. The traditional answer from corporations rooted in a liberal ideology resting on Adam Smith's argument of "the invisible hand"—that economic activity brings wealth to the whole nation—did not gain any influence in Denmark at that time. Despite a much more common practice than the dichotomies of profit/altruism, big/small and corporation/association suggested, the cooperative movement managed to sell an image of itself as voluntary, self-governing, and democratic, in contradistinction to the impersonal capitalist corporations. The same goes for the savings banks. They successfully narrated themselves as more democratic and nonprofit than commercial banks.

Besides the framing of the corporations as villains, neither the savings banks nor the cooperatives could easily explain how they contributed to the common good—and why the corporations were all that different. For the cooperatives, the narrated "common" was a general idea of the Danish nation, and the "good" was that they had created a model that brought prosperity to the nation in a time of

political and economic uncertainty. For the savings banks, "the good" was the idea of teaching the common man the bourgeois deeds of saving, thereby creating a sound economic practice which benefitted both the individual and the society at large. However, their focus was the local community, and the "common" became in practice reduced to the local community.

Legislation of the savings banks, corporations, and cooperatives offers an insight into how society and the state perceived the different organizations at specific points in time and to what degree they were seen as purely market actors or associations with a larger purpose. The savings banks were first to get legislation in 1880 when a law was issued that institutionalized the purpose and practices of the savings banks. The background was their substantial role as market actors that made it necessary to professionalize the administrative practices to keep trust in the institutions high and to protect the customers from being exploited/cheated and ultimately losing their savings. The law thus described the practices of how the savings banks should operate to moderate financial risks, and the basic idea can be summarized as to protect the customers from an insecure market.

The background for the first corporate law in 1917 was a series of bankruptcies, where the owners of the corporations could not be held responsible for losses. This contributed to distrust of the market as such, and the purpose of the legislation was to create trust and security for the shareholders and customers by regulating corporations. The corporations tried to argue that if they had to be regulated, the cooperatives should be regulated as well. However, the response from the cooperatives was that they did not need regulation because they, in contrast to the corporations, were associations and part of the (civil) society. They successfully narrated themselves as associations with a higher purpose, and thus for a very long time avoided being regulated, which in fact gave them a competitive advantage compared to the corporations. Narrated as already democratic, there was no need for democratic regulation.

The legislation thus shows how the state used regulation to deal with the associations in different ways, but also that there was a significant struggle among the different associations about influencing politics and regulation. The savings banks got a law to protect the idea of the common good from the market, the corporations were regulated to protect the society from the market (and from the corporations themselves), and the cooperatives avoided being regulated by narrating themselves as civil society and producers of the common good.

All three forms of associations emerged as part of the rise of capitalism and the market-based economy. They transformed with developments in capitalism, and the associations of the late nineteenth century were very different from those of the late twentieth century. Structural changes, neo-liberal ideas, and globalization all had a severe impact on the hybrid associational form of the cooperatives, savings banks, and corporations as described in the empirical section. Generally, all three went through a process of centralization and not least the cooperatives and the savings banks became fewer, larger, and more powerful units. For the savings banks, this undermined the idea of being the local community's association and

blurred the distinction between the banks and savings banks even more, so they became hard to distinguish.

For the cooperatives, the early twentieth-century narrative of the cooperatives as a democratic and associational form of organizing began to backfire. It was established based on the original decentralized structure of the sector with more than 1,300 individual cooperatives spread over the country. By the end of the century, these had, as mentioned above, transformed into global giants. Formally these are still organized as cooperatives, but they came to fit badly with the narrative of being part of the civil society and working for the common good. Thus, Arla and Danish Crown became, in the media and public eyes, perceived as greedy associations using their size to bully and crush competitors. Due to their own storytelling that had emphasized the badness of the big and profit-oriented corporations, they became portrayed as the greedy villain rather than heroes of civil society.

The corporations have also, as shown, gone through a structural development, where the largest of them have gained a size and influence which is comparable to nations. The tale of Denmark as a nation of small- and medium-sized enterprises has become harder to uphold.[63] Corporations have also, through push as well as pull effects, become more integrated in discussions of doing something for the common good. This is often framed as a transformation from a focus on shareholder value to the broader scope of the stakeholder value. However, our argument is not that corporations have become civil society actors working for the common good. The debate about CSR-washing, green-washing, or pink-washing is ongoing both in public and in academia. Our argument in this chapter has rather been that the concept of civil society creates dichotomies that establish a far too sharp distinction between the state, the market, and the civil society. The borders have always been blurred and shifting over time. By introducing the less normative concept of association, we have given examples that show how different associations, often perceived as either market actors (corporations) or civil society associations (cooperatives and savings banks), have acted as hybrids blurring the borders between those categories.

The cases we have used in this chapter are Danish. Had we had a broader Nordic perspective, there would have been differences. This does not alter the argument put forward in this chapter—that civil society is an ideal type rather than an empirical category. Most associations are placed at the intersection between market and state, and a focus on this hybridity is important for our understanding of the development of all the Nordic societies.

Notes

1 Mossin, "The Modern Conceptual History of Civil Society;" Kocka, "Civil Society from a Historical Perspective."

2 Egholm and Kaspersen, "A Processual-Relational Approach to Civil Society."

3 Kjærgaard, "Gårdmandslinjen i dansk historieskrivning"; Mordhorst, "Arla and Danish National Identity."

4 Popp-Madsen, Jessen, and Mulvad, "The Spirits of Democratic Enterprise."
5 Hilson, *The International Cooperative Alliance and the Consumer Cooperative Movement*; Marjanen et al., *Contesting Nordicness*; Byrkjeflot et al., *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images*.
6 Lund, Byrkjeflot, and Christensen, eds, *Associative Governance in Scandinavia*.
7 Jessen, "Governing Economic Life."
8 Dübeck, *Aktieselskabernes retshistorie*, 41–51.
9 Iversen and Andersen, "Co-operative Liberalism," 276.
10 Jessen, "Governing Economic Life."
11 Danish corporate law, 1917, § 1, cited in Herschend, *Lov om aktieselskaber* (own translation).
12 Boje, *Vejen til velstand, Tiden 1730–1850*, 267–68.
13 Dübeck, *Aktieselskabernes retshistorie*, 21. This development was especially championed by C.F. Tietgen, see Lange, *Stormogulen*, 159.
14 Boje, *Vejen til velstand, Tiden 1850–1930*, 147–54.
15 Boje, *Vejen til velstand, Tiden 1850–1930*, 146.
16 Dübeck, *Aktieselskabernes retshistorie*, 119.
17 Boje, *Vejen til velstand, Tiden 1850–1930*, 340.
18 Boje, *Vejen til velstand, Tiden 1850–1930*; Iversen, "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder."
19 Iversen, "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder," Iversen and Andersen, "Co-operative Liberalism."
20 Ibid., 220–21, Poulsen and Skovrind Pedersen, "Ejerskab og magt i dansk erhvervsliv", 31.
21 Iversen, "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder," 21.
22 Iversen, "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder," 20–21.
23 Kolstrup, *Forandringens årti*, 384.
24 Pedersen, *Konkurrencestaten*.
25 Lundkvist, *Dansk kapitalisme*, 221.
26 Thomsen, *The Danish Industrial Foundations*.
27 Lundkvist, *Dansk kapitalisme*, 103, 15.
28 Epstein, *Financialization and the World Economy*; Hansen, "From Finance Capitalism to Financialization."
29 Freeman & Moutchnik, "Stakeholder Management and CSR."
30 Lund, *Dansk fondshistorie*.
31 Skyggebjerg, "Knowledge Making and Corporate Environmentalism."
32 The term was coined in the 1990s (Elkington, "Accounting for the Triple Bottom Line").
33 Hilson, *Cooperative Alliance*; Byrkjeflot et al., *Making and Circulation*.
34 Bjørn, *Dengang Danmark*.
35 Dragsted, *Nordisk socialisme*.
36 Bjørn, *Dansk Mejeribrug*, 121.
37 Bjørn, *Dengang Danmark*, 372.
38 Drejer, *Andels-Svineslagterierne*, 226; Higgins and Mordhorst "Bringing Home," 149–50.
39 Drejer, *Den Danske Andelsbevægelse*.
40 Higgins and Mordhorst, "Danish Butter Exports and the British Market c. 1880–1914."
41 Sørensen and Mordhorst, "Being Strong Together."
42 Nielsen, *Andelsbevægelsen*.; Kjærgaard, "Gårdmandslinien."
43 Mordhorst, "From Counterfactual History."
44 Higgins and Mordhorst, "Danish Butter Exports and the British Market c. 1880–1914."

45 Bisgaard and Schiødt, *Danmarks Sparekasser*; Clemmensen, *Sparekassebevægelsen*.
46 Bisgaard and Schiødt, *Danmarks Sparekasser*; Clemmensen, *Sparekassebevægelsen*.
47 Nielsen, *De danske sognesparekasser*; Skrubbeltrang, *Den Sjællandske Bondestands Sparekasse*.
48 Levy, "Betænkning Afgiven;" Bisgaard and Schiødt, *Danmarks Sparekasser*.
49 Hansen, "Bank Regulation."
50 Falbe-Hansen, *Vore Sparekasser*.
51 Rigsdagen, "Rigsdagstidende: Betænkning."
52 Hein, "Til Sparekassesagen." See also Rubin, "De Danske Sparekasser."
53 Bisgaard and Schiødt, *Danmarks Sparekasser*.
54 Hansen, *Da sparekasserne mistede*; Boding, "Sparekasernes Målsætning;" Danmarks Sparekasseforening, "Sparekassernes Målsætning."
55 Hansen, *Da sparekasserne mistede*.
56 Nielsen, *Fra sognesparekasse*.
57 Hansen, *Da sparekasserne mistede*.
58 Skyggebjerg, "Governing Savings Banks."
59 Folketinget, "Folketingstidende, behandling af lovforslag 27;" Folketinget, "Folketingstidende, behandling af lovforslag 186."
60 Skyggebjerg, "Governing Savings Banks."
61 Rangvid, "Den finansielle krise."
62 Egholm, "Practising the Common Good."
63 Iversen, "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder."

Bibliography

Bisgaard, H. I., and Johs. Schiødt. *Danmarks Sparekasser: Deres Udvikling Gennem 100 Aar*. Vejle: Schweitzers Bogtrykkeri, 1910.

Boding, M. "Sparekassernes Målsætning. Foredrag Ved Nordisk Kursus for Sparekassefunktionærer 14–18 September 1970." Unpublished source from Rigsarkivet (Danish National Archives): Danmarks Sparekasseforenings Arkiv (no. 06723). Journalsager 1932–1990.

Boje, P. *Vejen til velstand—Marked, stat og utopi: Om dansk kapitalismes mange former gennem 300 år: Tiden 1730–1850*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2014.

———. *Vejen til velstand—Marked, stat og utopi: Hvorfor blev Danmark rigt-og ikke rigere? Tiden 1850–1930*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2020.

Bjørn, C. *Dansk Mejeribrug 1882–2000*. København: Danske Mejeriers Fællesorganisatin, 1982.

———. *Dengang Danmark blev moderne eller historien om den virkelige danske utopi*. København: SAGA Egmont, 1998.

Byrkjeflot, H., L. Mjøset, M. Mordhorst, and K. Petersen, eds. *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images* (1st edn). London: Routledge, 2021. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003156925.

Clemmensen, N. *Sparekassebevægelsen i Danmark 1810–1914*. København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag, 1985.

Danmarks Sparekasseforening. "Sparekassernes Målsætning." 1969.

Dragsted, P. *Nordisk socialisme: på vej mod en demokratisk økonomi*. København: Gyldendal, 2021.

Drejer, A. A. *Den Danske Andelsbevægelse*. København: Martin, 1952.

———. *Andels-Svineslagterierne i Danmark 1887–1962*. København: De Samvirkende danske Andels-Svineslagterier, 1962.
Dübeck, I. *Aktieselskabernes retshistorie*. København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets forlag, 1991.
Egholm, L. "Practising the Common Good: Philanthropic Practices in Twentieth-Century Denmark." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 34(2) (2021): 237–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-020-09374-4.
Egholm, L., and L. B. Kaspersen. "A Processual-Relational Approach to Civil Society." In *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*, edited by L. Egholm and L. B. Kaspersen, 3–30. London: Routledge, 2021.
Elkington, J. "Accounting for the Triple Bottom Line." *Measuring Business Excellence* 2(3) (1998): 18–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb025539.
Epstein, G. A., ed. *Financialization and the World Economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2005.
Falbe-Hansen, V. A. *Vore Sparekasser og Deres Virkemaade*. København: G.E.C. Gad, 1878.
Freeman, R. E., and A. Moutchnik. 2013. "Stakeholder Management and CSR: Questions and Answers." *UmweltWirtschaftsForum* 21(1) (2013): 5–9. doi:10.1007/s00550-013-0266-3. *S2CID 154210736*.
Folketinget. "Folketingstidende: Behandling Af Lovforslag 27 Fremsat 5/10 1988." København: Folketinget, 1988. folketingstidende.dk.
———. "Folketingstidende: Behandling Af Lovforslag 186 Fremsat 19/1 1989." København: Folketinget, 1989. www.folketingstidende.dk.
Hansen, P. H. "Bank Regulation in Denmark from 1880 to World War Two: Public Interests and Private Interests." *Business History* 43(1) (2001): 43–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/713999204.
———. *Da Sparekasserne Mistede Deres Uskyld: En Historie om Sparekasser og Samfund i Opbrud 1965–1990*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 2001.
———. "From Finance Capitalism to Financialization: A Cultural and Narrative Perspective on 150 Years of Financial History." *Enterprise and Society* 15(4) (2014): 605–42. https://doi.org/10.1093/es/khu047.
Hein, A. "Til Sparekassesagen: Nogle Bemærkninger til Sparekassekommissionens Betænkning." *Nationaløkonomisk Tidende* 12 (1878): 308–25.
Herschend, P. *Lov om aktieselskaber: Af 29. september 1917*. København: Henrik Koppels Forlag, 1917.
Higgins, D., and M. Mordhorst. "Reputation and Export Performance: Danish Butter Exports and the British Market c. 1880–1914." *Business History* 50(2) (2008): 185–204.
———. "Bringing Home the 'Danish' Bacon: Food Chains, National Branding and Danish Supremacy over the British Bacon Market, c. 1900–1938." *Enterprise & Society* 16(1) (2015): 141–85. https://doi.org/10.1017/eso.2014.14.
Hilson, M. *The International Cooperative Alliance and the Consumer Cooperative Movement in Northern Europe, c.1860–1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018.
Iversen, M. J. "Danmark – landet med de store virksomheder." *Økonomi og politik* 3–4 (2022): 16–26.
Iversen, M. J., and S. Andersen. "Co-Operative Liberalism: Denmark from 1857 to 2007." In *Creating Nordic Capitalism: The Business History of a Competitive Periphery*, edited by S. Fellman, M. J. Iversen, H. Sjögren, and L. Thue, 265–334. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Jessen, M. H. “Governing Economic Life.” In *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by “Combining Together”*, edited by A. B. Lund, H. Byrkjeflot, and S. Christensen, 223–54. New York: Routledge, 2024.

Kjærgaard, T. Gårdmandslinjen i dansk historieskrivning.” *Fortid og Nutid* 28 (1980): 178–91.

Kocka, J. “Civil Society from a Historical Perspective.” *European Review* 12(1) (2004): 65–79.

Kolstrup, S. *Forandringens årti – mellem velfærd og nyliberalisme 1990–2001*. Frederiksberg: Frydenlund, 2022.

Lange, O. *Stormogulen: C.F. Tietgen – en finansmand, hans imperium og hans tid 1829–1901*. København: Gyldendal, 2006.

Levy, M. “Betænkning Afgiven af den at Indenrigsministeriet under 18de Juni 1878 nedsatte Kommission Angaaende Tilvejebringelsen af Tilsyn Med de Heri Landet Værende Sparekasser.” *Ministerialtidenden for 1878* 40 (1878): 577–604.

Lund, A. B., and C. E. Berg. *Dansk fondshistorie*. København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag, 2016.

Lund, A. B., H. Byrkjeflot, and S. Christensen, eds. *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by “Combining Together”*. New York: Routledge, 2024.

Lundkvist, A. *Dansk kapitalisme: Gennembrud, storhed og stagnation*. [Gjern]: Hovedland, 2017.

Marjanen, J., J. Strang, and M. Hilson. *Contesting Nordicness: From Scandinavianism to the Nordic Brand*. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110730104.

Mordhorst, M. “From Counterfactual History to Counternarrative History.” *Management & Organizational History* 3(1) (2008): 5–26.

———. “Arla and Danish National Identity – Business History as Cultural History.” *Business History*, 56(1) (2014): 116–33.

Mordhorst, M., and K. Jensen. “Co-operatives.” In *The Routledge Companion to the Makers of Global Business*, edited by T. S. Lopes, C. Lubinski, and H. J. S. Twore, 217–33. New York: Routledge, 2020.

Mossin, C. “The Modern Conceptual History of Civil Society.” In *Civil Society: Between Concepts and Empirical Grounds*, edited by L. Egholm and L. B. Kaspersen, 31–47. New York: Routledge, 2021.

Nielsen, A. *Andelsebevægelsen*. Århus: De forenende bogtrykkerier, 1910.

Nielsen, O. Blinkenberg. *De Danske Sognesparekasser 1865–1914*. København: Sparevirkes Forlag, 1950.

Nielsen, P. B. *Fra Sognesparekasse Til Landssparekasse: Sammenslutninger i Sparekassesektoren 1960–1973*. Ballerup: Sparekassernes Datacenter. 1997.

Pedersen, O. K. *Konkurrencestaten*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2011.

Popp-Madsen, B., M. H. Jessen, and A. Mulvad. “The Spirits of Democratic Enterprise: Insights from the Case of Denmark.” *Management & Organizational History* 17(5) (2022): 1–19.

Poulsen, T., and M. Skovrind Pedersen. “Ejerskab og magt i dansk erhvervsliv.” *Økonomi og politik* 3–4 (2022): 27–38.

Rangvid, J. *Den Finansielle Krise i Danmark – Årsager, Konsekvenser Og Læring*. København: Erhvervs- og Vækstministeriet, 2013.

Rigsdagen. “Rigsdagstidende: Betænkning over Forslag til Lov Om Sparekasser. Afgiven af Folkethingets Udvalg den 17de Februar 1880.” 1880. www.folketingstidende.dk.

Rubin, M. “De Danske Sparekasser.” *Nationaløkonomisk Tidende* 5 (1875): 297–317.

Skrubbeltrang, F. *Den Sjællandske Bondestands Sparekasse 1856–1958*. [København]: Sparekassens Tilsynsråd, 1959.

Skyggebjerg, L. K. "Knowledge Making and Corporate Environmentalism from the Perspective of the Egg Tray." *History and Technology* 35(1) (2019): 31–57.

———. "Governing Savings Banks." In *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by "Combining Together"*, edited by A. B. Lund, H. Byrkjeflot, and S. Christensen, 190–222. New York: Routledge, 2024.

Sørensen, E. B., and M. Mordhorst. "Being Strong Together: Cooperative Farmer Organizing in Scandinavia." In *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by "Combining Together"*, edited by A. B. Lund, H. Byrkjeflot, and S. Christensen, 120–49. New York: Routledge, 2024.

Thomsen, S. *The Danish Industrial Foundations*. København: Djøf Forlag, 2017.

8 A Relationship Shaped by Interdependence

The Norwegian Refugee Council and the Norwegian State

Mikkel Witt Syberg

Introduction

This chapter examines the entangled relationship between the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) (*Det Norske Flyktningeråd*, today *Flyktninghjelpen*)—and the Norwegian state, from 1952 to the end of the decade. The study uses the concept of legitimacy as a lens to investigate how both entities mutually benefitted from their collaboration and how this affected the development of their relationship. The research question guiding the chapter revolves around how the NRC and the Norwegian state provided each other with legitimacy in the 1950s and how this mutual dependency impacted their relationship.

The central argument of the chapter is based on the neo-Hegelian conception of the Scandinavian civil society–state relation, characterized by civil society and the state as being partners, rather than opponents.[1] The analysis shows that by examining the civil society–state relationship with the neo-Hegelian conception and analyzing it through the lens of legitimacy, it becomes clear that both the NRC and the Norwegian state relied on each other to maintain their legitimacy, in the perception of their primary constituents. In this chapter I argue that this interdependence significantly influenced the development of their relationship and the distribution of roles between the NRC and the state in the Norwegian refugee relief.

The focus on mutual dependency distinguishes the analytical approach from much literature on the state–civil society nexus within the humanitarian sector. This literature often perceives the relationship as one-directional, emphasizing how the relationship is characterized by an imbalance, where humanitarian CSOs are dependent on the financial resources from the state, whereas the state to a lesser extent relies on the CSOs. According to this scholarly field, the CSOs' dependence on financial resources causes goal displacement and diminishes the organizations' independence.[2]

However, this argument relies on a different conception of the civil society–state relationship, which does not fit very well within the Scandinavian context. As mentioned, these studies mainly analyse Anglo-American geographical contexts, in which a Tocquevillian perception of the civil society–state relationship is dominant.[3] In the Tocquevillian conception, the state is viewed with suspicion and

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-10
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

the role of civil society organizations is to serve as a bulwark against the state's interference, thus protecting the emancipation of the individual.[4] The contrasting neo-Hegelian perspective, which I argue is applicable in the Scandinavian context, considers the state as crucial for individual freedom. This conception emphasizes how civil society and the state operate in collaboration with each other in securing individual freedom.[5] Accordingly, the civil society–state relationship is characterized by consensus, co-existence, and a deep interconnection,[6] rather than conflict.[7] Such a context enables civil society organizations to align themselves with the state and thereby gain legitimacy from much of its constituencies. Whereas this provides legitimacy for the CSO, this chapter additionally argues that it simultaneously can provide legitimacy for the state. The close affiliation between the two accordingly generates a mutual dependency, which this chapter argues is important when explaining how the civil society–state relation on humanitarian relief has developed after the Second World War in Norway. The period from 1952 to the end of the decade was characterized by a shifting emphasis on refugees in Europe. Until the Hungarian Crisis in 1956, the focus on refugees decreased, as the refugee issue that had arisen against the backdrop of the Second World War gradually diminished. The decreasing attention to the issue threatened the NRC's ability to remain relevant. Accordingly, this period provides an interesting case to study how the organization attempted to maintain its relevance in Norwegian society.

This chapter presents a case study focusing on how the interdependency between the NRC and the state shaped the role distribution between the two entities in Norway. The argument may be relevant to the other Scandinavian countries, as the central premise rests on two key prerequisites, which according to the historiography of the Scandinavian civil society–state relationship, are applicable in both Denmark and Sweden. These prerequisites are, namely, a high level of trust in state authorities among the population and the neo-Hegelian conception of the CSO-state relationship as characterized by consensus and collaboration.[8]

The chapter commences with a brief overview of its position within the literature on the civil society–state relationship. This is followed by an introduction to the NRC as the case organization. Subsequently, the analysis explores how the state has relied on the NRC, both domestically and internationally, to uphold Norway's national brand and international standing. Conversely, the focus shifts to the NRC's dependence on the Norwegian state. Finally, the chapter argues for the crucial role of mutual dependence in understanding the state–civil society relationship in Norwegian humanitarian relief after 1945.

Civil Society and Legitimacy

The concept of legitimacy holds a prominent position in the scholarly field concerning civil society organizations, featuring various conceptualizations.[9] In this chapter, I draw upon Mark C. Suchman's three distinct types of legitimacy: pragmatic, moral, and cognitive. These classifications reflect the assumption that legitimacy is a socially constructed phenomenon that depends on how a collective audience perceives an organization's legitimacy.

Pragmatic legitimacy revolves around the ability of the organization to provide value for its nearest audience, which are actors who interact with it. The assumption is that regardless of the normative actions of the organization, the audience may perceive it as pragmatically legitimate, if the audience receives immediate benefits or value from the organization. Another form of legitimacy is moral legitimacy, which relies on the audience's perception of the organization's actions as inherently "the right thing to do", irrespective of any direct benefits received in return. Finally, a third type of legitimacy, labelled cognitive legitimacy, centers on the observer accepting an organization's legitimacy without even questioning it, considering the organization as "taken-for-granted".[10] These types of legitimacy are not mutually exclusive; hence an organization can be perceived as legitimate in pragmatic, moral, and cognitive terms.

The primary focus throughout the chapter lies on exploring the pragmatic and moral types of legitimacy, as the cognitive aspect does not apply to the case under examination.

The Norwegian Refugee Council

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) was initially established in 1951 by the Department of Social Affairs, stemming from a public debate in the early 1950s concerning the Norwegian state's role in refugee relief, culminating in state engagement through the organization's inception. The earliest version of the NRC was thus purely state-driven. However, in the following years, civil society organizations became involved in the initiative. Organizations formerly involved in the "European Relief", which had provided relief to victims of the Second World War, agreed with the Department of Social Affairs that their efforts to provide relief to European citizens were obsolete. Accordingly, the European Relief was shut down in 1953 and the organizations instead were incorporated in the NRC from 1 January 1953. From 1953, the NRC consisted of twelve humanitarian organizations,[11] which each had a representative at the board, together with three representatives from the Department of Social Affairs.[12]

The primary objectives of the newly formed NRC were to centralize and coordinate refugee relief provided by its affiliated organizations, act as an advisory body to the Norwegian state on refugee-related matters, and manage both domestic and foreign relief for refugees.[13]

Accordingly, the NRC from its inception has been closely affiliated with the state. The organization received substantial financial support from the Department of Social Affairs (DSA), which also occupied two of nine seats on the board and three of fifteen seats on the council.[14] The NRC carried out both domestic and international refugee relief efforts. The domestic relief was fully funded by the state, whereas the international relief was funded by the affiliated organizations' public collection campaigns.[15] Consequently, the DSA primarily emphasized the domestic relief within the organization, which evoked contrasting interests. Additionally, the involvement of both state and organizational representatives in the leadership caused uncertainty within the organization about the task distribution. This was

illustrated by the "working committee", who found themselves compelled to invite a representative of the DSA to take part in all their meetings because "things are hard to separate", meaning that it was unclear to the working committee as to who they needed to include in decision-making regarding various issues.[16]

As the 1950s progressed, most European refugees had been resettled, leading to declining attention on refugees as an important matter in the public debate.[17] Consequently, the prevailing perception in the public media and within the state departments, was that refugee concerns were confined to Europe and could be resolved within a few years.[18] Accordingly, from 1955 to 1959, the Department of Social Affairs raised doubts about the necessity of the NRC. Thus, the legitimacy of the NRC was suddenly contested.

The negotiations between the NRC and the Department of Social Affairs during this period illuminate how both actors were mutually dependent on each other to secure their legitimacy in the eyes of their various constituencies. The NRC and its affiliated organizations were accountable to their respective individual members. In contrast, the DSA representatives were accountable to the government, whose primary goal was to secure public support to get re-elected. As a result, the DSA's representatives' primary concern was the domestic refugee relief. The conflict between the DSA's representatives and the CSO's representatives, and the attempt by the CSOs to maintain their legitimacy both towards the state and towards its individual members, is the focal point of investigation in this chapter.

The Norwegian State's dependence on the Norwegian Refugee Council

The following section outlines the interdependent relationship between the Norwegian state and the NRC by focusing on how the Norwegian state's legitimacy depended on the NRC's capabilities. The analysis elaborates on the link between the capabilities of the NRC to provide international and domestic relief and the ability of the Norwegian state to remain legitimate in the public perception. Through sources of the NRC's accounting, this section outlines how its ability to collect funds was instrumental for the state in maintaining its legacy, which was considered an important asset for the Norwegian state.

International Legitimacy

After the Second World War, the Scandinavian countries, including Norway, found themselves in relatively favorable conditions compared to other European nations, as the war had damaged the Scandinavian territories to a lesser extent than much of the rest of Europe.[19] This enabled them to provide significant humanitarian support to other European countries in the immediate post-war period. As a result of close collaboration, the Scandinavian countries managed to gain influential positions at the newly established international bodies such as the World Bank and the Economic and Social Council, ECOSOC.[20] However, as the 1950s progressed, challenges arose due to the admission of new nations into the UN system, which caused the Scandinavian countries as a geographic entity to lose influence. To

safeguard their influence, the Scandinavian countries, through the establishment of a committee to coordinate their development aid, increased their collaboration to maintain their positions on the international stage. The Scandinavian collaboration successfully created an international perception of the Nordic countries as an entity, which thereby managed to maintain some of the seats at influential boards and committees.[21]

In Norway, the legacy of the Nobel Peace Prize laureate and High Commissioner for Refugees, Fridtjof Nansen, made the moral obligation to provide relief for refugees even stronger. However, the Norwegian perception as a nation that welcomed refugees in need could hardly be credited to the Norwegian state. Despite its legacy from Fridtjof Nansen, the Norwegian state was hesitant in providing state funding for foreign relief. Accordingly, the primary reason for why the Scandinavian governments to some degree could uphold their international legitimacy relied on the civil society organizations' (CSOs) ability to collect funding.

The main part of the refugee relief from Norway to Europe was performed by CSOs in the 1940s and 1950s.[22] The NRC organized three public collections in 1952, 1955, and during the international refugee year of 1959, raising a substantial sum of 16.3 million NOK.[23] In comparison, the state's contribution to the NRC's relief efforts totalled 7 million NOK during the 1950s, 3.3 million NOK of which was specifically earmarked for relief during the Hungarian Crisis in October 1956.[24] As the major humanitarian organizations were affiliated to the NRC, it coordinated all efforts to provide support for refugees. Accordingly, the NRC in practice functioned as the state authority on refugee relief both domestically and internationally, highlighting its centrality.

The Norwegian state relied on the NRC's experience, organizational structure, and international network to deliver refugee relief effectively to countries such as Italy, Germany, and Austria. The NRC's foreign relief operations were coordinated through an office in Vienna,[25] which proved vital during the Hungarian Crisis. The NRC's presence in Austria enabled the immediate delivery of assistance to a large number of Hungarian refugees, leading the Norwegian state to channel its entire 3.3 million NOK donation through the NRC.[26]

Underlining the international importance of the NRC's foreign efforts were the direct connections between the UNHCR and the NRC. In 1957, the NRC board held a meeting with the High Commissioner for Refugees during his visit to Oslo. The High Commissioner's decision, in itself, to engage in a meeting with the organization underlines its importance. However, the agenda of the meeting likewise reveals the international acknowledgement of the organization. The primary purpose of the High Commissioner was to request further funding, however, instead of appealing to the Norwegian government for additional funding, he requested the NRC to initiate a collection campaign.[27]

Thus, the Norwegian state's dependence on the NRC was characterized by a pragmatic form of legitimacy regarding foreign affairs. The state's ability to raise funds and deliver refugee relief abroad hinged on the NRC's endeavors. The ability of the Norwegian state to maintain its legacy from Fridtjof Nansen as a nation that

supported and welcomed refugees was thereby dependent on the NRC's public collection campaigns and its ability to deliver international relief.

Domestic Dependency

Domestically, the Norwegian government relied on the NRC to maintain its moral legitimacy. As the following will outline, there was a perception in the public media that Norway had a moral obligation to provide relief for refugees. The NRC indirectly utilized this dependency to encourage continued state support for refugee relief.

For instance, in late 1957, after the Hungarian Crisis had subsided, the Department of Social Affairs revived efforts to dismantle state support for the NRC. Kaare Salvesen, representative of the Department of Social Affairs on the NRC board, outlined the departments' main viewpoint on the future of the organization. Here he suggested that the NRC secretariat for domestic relief was superfluous and furthermore hinted that the department likewise considered the need for a secretariat for foreign relief as obsolete. In sum, the government suggested dismantling the organization by 1 July 1958.[28]

The NRC acted in response by inviting the press to a council meeting where all member organizations discussed the organization's future. Several newspapers referred to the meeting the day after, highlighting a speech by Arne Torgersen, who had become a prominent public figure due to his role as the NRC representative in Vienna during the Hungarian Crisis.[29] In his speech he refrained from directly criticizing the department's proposal to dismantle the NRC. Instead, Torgersen stated that "Norway has a moral obligation to continue our work for the refugees", emphasizing the country's previous efforts and contributions to supporting refugees.[30]

By framing the future of the NRC as connected to Norway's humanitarian legacy, Torgersen effectively raised public awareness for the NRC. The newspaper *Morgenbladet* gave a summary of the speech, framing it as a moral disgrace for Norway if it would dismantle its efforts in international refugee relief.[31] The editorial of the same newspaper under the headline "We must not relax" criticized the departmental considerations of dissolving the NRC, emphasizing how the UNHCR had recently announced an ambition to dismantle all refugee camps in Europe before 1960, which made it "shameful that Norway in all seriousness had considered a dissolution of the NRC".[32] The newspaper *Nationen* seconded this position.[33] Notably, these newspapers were conservative newspapers. Preceding the meeting, the NRC sent a letter to the Minister of Social Affairs in which the NRC outlined its previous humanitarian efforts. Responding to the proposal to dismantle the organization, the NRC highlighted the High Commissioner's request for support by the NRC in his efforts to close the last refugee camps in Europe.[34] On 21 November, the day after the council meeting, the Minister of Social Affairs sent a letter in which he accepted the NRC's proposals and thereby its continued existence. In the letter he maintained the viewpoint that the domestic work was depending on parliamentary decisions, however, he declared that the department would continue its financial support of the administration of the NRC. Accordingly,

the minister accepted some continued funding of the organization and maintained the departmental representation on the board.[35]

Torgersen's approach showcased how the NRC utilized the government's dependence on moral legitimacy in the public perception, which was intricately linked to the continued existence of the NRC. The NRC's ability to connect Norway's nation brand with the future of refugee relief influenced the government's decision-making and endangered its moral legitimacy if it chose to withdraw support for the organization.

The political decision to maintain a certain level of financial support for the NRC suggests that the Norwegian government acknowledged the potential risk of loss of moral legitimacy associated with a complete withdrawal of support. This implies a connection between the moral legitimacy of the Norwegian state and the continued existence of the NRC. In the next section, the focus turns to the inverse dependence relationship.

The NRC's Dependence on the Norwegian State

In this section, the dependency relationship is turned on its head, as it analyses how the NRC was dependent on the Norwegian state. Initially, the section outlines how the NRC perceived its legitimacy in the public as existential, and subsequently, it shows how the NRC's legitimacy was dependent on its affiliation to the Norwegian state.

The NRC continuously maintained its legitimacy in the public perception by ensuring the proper use of funding for relief efforts across Europe. To ensure that the spending was used in accordance with the intended purposes, the organization conducted numerous delegations across Europe to control the relief efforts.[36] The organization was aware of remaining visible in the public, illustrated by their communication strategy which emphasized the Secretary General's responsibility for issuing press releases regularly and handling all press inquiries.[37] An incident that exemplifies the NRC's strategy to maintain its legitimacy occurred in 1958 in relation to the Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Father Pire, who in a speech at the University of Oslo (to the surprise of the NRC) proposed the establishment of an "Anne Frank" refugee village in Norway.[38] The idea of a refugee village opposed the normal procedure of how the NRC had previously integrated refugees into Norwegian society. Accordingly, to Father Pire's regret, the NRC refused the proposal. The public debate that ensued raised some criticism of the rejection, as in some newspaper editorials it was considered inappropriate that two parties who worked for the same cause had come into controversy.[39] In response, the NRC with its chair, Sigurd Halvorsen, argued that it would be counterproductive for the Norwegian reception of refugees which had a parallel, yet very different refugee reception programme.[40] A report from the NRC board to the Department of Social Affairs offered solutions to the dispute, displaying the situation as a great concern to both the NRC and the state administration, as they expected that a rejection of a Nobel Prize laureate might be considered inappropriate in the public perception.[41] In his account of the NRC's activities in 1958, Sigurd Halvorsen emphasized the

need to "clarify the many misunderstandings that had emerged" during "the significant publicity the case had received in the media".[42]

The case highlights how the NRC carefully worked to maintain its public legitimacy. Through the public distribution of the comprehensive report on the Father Pire case[43] and by a public resolution, the NRC was significantly present in the public newspapers in the subsequent months to diffuse the situation.[44] The NRC managed to resolve the issue by pledging financial support for a refugee village elsewhere in Europe.[45]

As has already been shown, the organizational structure in which both the affiliated organizations and the department were represented at the board involved contrasting interests. Whereas the affiliated organizations emphasized the foreign relief, the department was concerned with the domestic tasks. This entanglement led to internal debates between the departmental representatives and the organizational representatives. Despite the challenges, the affiliated organizations perceived their close affiliation with the state as essential for providing legitimacy in the public's perception. This was illustrated by their request of the department to maintain their representation on the council and board of the organization, despite its endeavors to dismantle the organization in 1957.[46] It is difficult to measure whether the NRC gained legitimacy from its close collaboration with the state or not. Nevertheless, the NRC was willing to stretch far to secure a good relationship with the department, indicating that it considered it something worth maintaining. In 1955, in response to one of several proposals from the government to cut the state subsidies of the refugee fund, the NRC presented a new foreign affairs mandate. The new mandate limited the NRC's maneuver room by specifying which tasks it should engage in. In a letter, two organizational representatives of the NRC board encouraged the other organizations to support the new mandate, believing that the NRC should stretch as far as possible to "calm the matter down" referring to the Minister of Social Affair's intention of ending the state funding of the NRC.[47] The mandate was adopted by the council, reflecting a willingness to limit its mandate to maintain its public funding and good relationship with the state authorities.

The NRC's close affiliation to the department was important in two regards. The close affiliation to the state provided legitimacy for the NRC's public collections, as well as allowing a direct connection to decision-makers, which the NRC depended on when it attempted to solve pressing political issues.

As most of the NRC's funding was acquired through public collections, it was crucial for the NRC to maintain its public legitimacy. Because the state funding was spent to cover the organization's administrative expenses, it allowed the NRC to allocate the collected funds exclusively to humanitarian aid.[48] Thus, despite its relatively small proportion compared to the collected funds, the state subsidies were perceived as crucial by the NRC for maintaining the legitimacy of the public collection campaigns.

Accordingly, in relation to yet another attempt from the government to cut the state subsidies in 1956,[49] minutes of a meeting between the Department of Social Affairs and the NRC show a fierce reaction from the organizational representatives towards the departmental considerations. The chair and vice-chair of the board

emphasized that the move towards removing the state subsidies raised doubts about the NRC's future existence, as its budgets relied on the expectation of future funding from the state.[50] If state subsidies were discontinued, the NRC would have to allocate additional collected funds for administrative costs, which they perceived would endanger the NRC's legitimacy as a trustworthy manager of the private donations in the public perception.

The dependence was also evident relating to the NRC's ability to achieve political influence. Since its establishment, due to the state's official involvement in the organization, the NRC enjoyed a privileged position with close connections to the Norwegian state administration. On several occasions the NRC, despite its opposition to the consideration of cutting the state subsidies, opted not to express their discontent publicly. This is evident in the previously mentioned example where Arne Torgersen refrained from directly criticizing the state despite its attempt to dismantle the organization in 1957.[51] Similarly, the period preceding the Hungarian Crisis serves as an example of the strategy of avoiding the use of public media to proclaim their discontent. Despite the above-outlined proposals by the government to cut the state subsidies in the preceding year, the only presence in the media of the NRC before the crisis was a brief notice on August 6. This article also demonstrated the NRC's restraint in criticizing the state, even though the Department of Social Affairs had threatened to withdraw its support in the preceding years. In the article, the NRC's Secretary General, Arne Fjellbu, commended the public authorities for their efforts in accommodating approximately 2000 refugees and highlighted the Norwegian policies for granting the new citizens "the same social benefits as the nation's own citizens".[52] Even though there were political considerations of dismantling the NRC by cutting its subsidies, the organization refrained from public criticism to protect the good relationship with the state.

A plausible reason for why the NRC refrained from criticizing the government's proposals of cutting the subsidies may be found in their privileged access to the state administration, which required a good relationship to the state. Several times, the NRC utilized its close connections to the state administration and the government to solve its political issues. The most frequent reaction from the NRC, when facing political issues, was to contact the departmental administration, in some circumstances the minister directly, to get things cleared at the governmental level. An example of this was a letter from the chair of the NRC board, Erling Steen, sent directly to the Minister of Social Affairs on 23 July 1956. The letter was a response to a note from the National Audit Office, in which they criticized the NRC for using collected funds domestically in anticipation that the forthcoming years' subsidies from the state would cover these investments. In the letter, Steen requested an assurance from the minister that the NRC could expect the allocation of the refugee fund to be exclusively for the NRC.[53] Similarly, the immediate response to the previously mentioned departmental proposal of cutting the state subsidies in 1955, was for the NRC secretariat to arrange a meeting with the Minister of Social Affairs to "clarify his point of view".[54]

The above analysis outlines the NRC's actions to enhance its relationship to the state administration and the government in maintaining its ability to utilize its direct

connections to gain influence over the political and budgetary decisions regarding refugee relief. Overall, the interdependent relationship between the Norwegian state and the NRC was characterized by mutual reliance on legitimacy, funding, and political influence. Both entities understood the importance of maintaining this relationship to achieve their respective objectives and secure their standing in the public perception.

Interdependency Shaped the Role of the NRC

In this concluding section, the NRC's negotiations with the state in the period between 1955 and 1958 regarding the future role of the NRC in Norwegian refugee relief are outlined. The process and agreement they reached illustrate how both entities perceived as crucial the legitimacy that each could provide.

In 1955, the Department of Social Affairs worked to reduce the budgets and responsibilities of the NRC. However, the Hungarian Crisis in 1956 had underscored the continuing relevance of the NRC. Yet, as the crisis abated by the summer of 1957 and the number of refugees decreased, the government once again perceived the refugee issue as less urgent and resumed its attempts to dismantle the NRC. The intertwined relationship between the department and the NRC influenced how the government sought to change the NRC. Some actors within the Department of Social Affairs considered the NRC completely superfluous and suggested withdrawing the representatives from the organization and cutting the subsidies.[55]

Accordingly, in September 1957 the government presented three proposals for the future of the NRC. First, it suggested transforming the NRC into a counselling body, primarily focusing on advising the authorities regarding foreign refugee relief. Second, it proposed redistributing all the NRC's current domestic tasks to various public authorities. Finally, it suggested closing the NRC secretariat by 1 July 1958.[56] These proposals initiated a negotiation process between the two entities, which continued until the final agreement was made on 1 March 1958. While these were the official proposals by the government, the chair of the domestic committee of the NRC, Kaare Salvesen (who was employed at the department), suggested a compromise emphasizing the practical benefits that the organizations affiliated with the NRC could contribute to the future, thus making complete detachment problematic.[57]

The urgency of the refugee issue was also debated within the organization. Some representatives of the affiliated organizations on the NRC board agreed with the departmental viewpoints, arguing that the refugee problem was no longer apparent in the public agenda and that appealing for private donations would be challenging. However, others pointed to the UNHCR's recent extension of the mandate and requested the NRC to support dismantling the remaining refugee camps in Europe.[58]

As the NRC board was unable to reach an agreement, a committee was established to develop ideas on how to respond to the government's proposals. The committee recommended the NRC to comply with almost all the proposals, including transferring all domestic tasks to state authorities and acting as a counselling body on

domestic affairs. However, it opposed the need to liquidate the organization, citing the importance of the NRC in coordinating refugee relief during emergencies abroad. The committee suggested that the NRC could argue for its continued existence by providing relief abroad, aligning with Norway's obligation to contribute to the UNHCR's goal of dismantling the remaining refugee camps in Europe.[59] The board accepted the proposals and supported the idea of pursuing a new collection in the autumn of 1958, with the final decision to be made at a council meeting in March 1958.

Before the council meeting, the NRC became more active in the public debate. The most influential of these appearances was a speech by the aforementioned Arne Torgersen, which was transcribed into a chronicle published over two days, on 22 and 24 February 1958, headlined "What is a refugee?".[60] On the surface the speech explained the criteria for being granted refugee status, however, Torgersen—while still avoiding criticism—mentioned the departmental considerations of cutting the state subsidies for the NRC. The day after, two newspaper editorials picked up the speech to criticize the DSA for abandoning its support of the NRC.[61] Through these appearances, the NRC managed to mobilize some newspaper editors in favor of refugee issues, thereby raising some public attention on the matter, which made it more difficult for the state to refrain from supporting the NRC.

At the council meeting on 1 March 1958, the CSO representatives accepted the need to change the organization's focus towards refugee relief abroad and acknowledged domestic relief as a state domain. The Minister of Social Affairs, Gudmund Harlem, approved the decision, stating that "the NRC will not be assigned tasks for which the department cannot provide financial coverage". However, he emphasized that the NRC had to consider how to complete its tasks within a year, thereby stating that he maintained his stance for dissolving the organization. Furthermore, the minister agreed to cover half the salary of three employees at the NRC secretariat.[62]

The agreement raised the question of whether the department should continue to be represented at the board or serve as an observer. In its attempts to maintain access to political influence through direct connections to state administration, the board suggested that the department could decide its preferred status.[63] The ministry agreed to nominate a representative entitled to vote at the board meetings, affirming the state's continued involvement and support, which the NRC considered crucial for maintaining its public collections.

By leveraging its public legitimacy and influencing public opinion in its favor, the NRC managed to focus public attention on refugees. Underlining the attention to refugees as an important issue, King Olav's New Year's speech in December 1958 emphasized Norway's obligations as a humanitarian actor, "where Norway have so many good traditions".[64] Through the agreement with the Department of Social Affairs, the NRC managed to maintain the two fundamental prerequisites for its legitimacy, its close connection to the state, and the coverage of administrative costs. The NRC accepted the need for making compromises and adjustments to secure its survival.

However, the board recognized that the abandonment of domestic affairs necessitated another legitimate cause. It therefore redirected its attention to align itself with the UNHCR.[65] The emphasis on the importance of the UNHCR indicated a shift in how the NRC sought to establish and maintain its legitimacy in the public's perception. By aligning themselves with the UNHCR, the NRC aimed to maintain its public legitimacy through an affiliation with international bodies in addition to the Norwegian state. Thus, the key elements for the board were securing the legitimacy of the organization, which the affiliation to the UNHCR contributed to, and maintaining a close relationship with state authorities, which ensured its survival and political influence.

Conclusion

The entangled relationship between the NRC and the Norwegian state resulted in a mutual dependency where each entity provided legitimacy for the other. The interdependence between the two entities shaped the development of the organization in subsequent years. The NRC relied on the legitimacy derived from its close affiliation with the state, and the state subsidies ensured that privately collected funds were used exclusively for relief efforts, thus legitimating the public collections. Simultaneously, the state relied on the NRC to uphold its public reputation, as the humanitarian efforts carried out by the organization reflected positively on the Norwegian population's perception of Norway as a nation which welcomed refugees.

During the late 1950s negotiations, the NRC skilfully utilized this interdependency to its advantage. Through the abandoning of its domestic measures combined with its public presence to gain public support for its existence, the NRC managed to secure its survival and close affiliation with the state. With the diminishing emphasis on domestic relief efforts, the NRC redirected its attention to foreign affairs, seeking legitimacy through close cooperation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

This study highlights the significance of examining the civil society–state relationship as interdependent, wherein both parties impact each other's development. The mutual dependence, and the NRC's continuous maintenance of the positive relationship and close affiliation to the Norwegian state, could only develop in such a way in a Scandinavian society. The positive perception of the state, which characterized the Scandinavian societies in the twentieth century,[66] enabled the NRC to gain legitimacy in the public perception by affiliating itself with the state. This contrasts with other Western societies, where the Tocquevillian perception of the state as a threat to individual emancipation prevails. Here, it is likely that the NRC would have distanced itself more from the state, as the close affiliation would risk its legitimacy.

Many studies on the civil society–state relationship have been conducted in the Anglo-American context, leading them to depict the relationship as one-directional, where civil society organizations are becoming increasingly dependent on the state. Here state subsidies are perceived as compromising the independence

and legitimacy of CSOs. This chapter demonstrates how the Scandinavian context, where the neo-Hegelian conception of the civil society–state relationship is applicable, enabled a reciprocal nature of dependency between state and civil society. The consequence of the possible interdependence between state and civil society allows the civil society organizations to cooperate closely with the state without compromising their public legitimacy.

In conclusion, the examination of the NRC's interdependent relationship with the Norwegian state offers valuable insights into the dynamics of the Scandinavian civil society–state relationship. The case study illustrates how mutual dependency has significantly impacted the evolution of the relationship between the NRC and the state during 1955 and 1959. By exploring and understanding this interplay, we gain a deeper understanding of the complexities that govern the interaction between civil society organizations and the state, particularly in the Scandinavian context.

Notes

1 Trägårdh, "Rethinking the Nordic Welfare State," 236. See also Byrkjeflot's and Sand's contributions to this volume.
2 Brass et al., "NGOs and International Development," 143; Banks, Hulme, and Edwards, "NGOs, States, and Donors Revisited," 710; Hulme and Edwards, *NGOs, States and Donors – Too Close for Comfort?* 969; Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff, "Partnerships between International Donors and Non-Governmental Development Organizations," 263.
3 Iriye, "A Century of NGOs."
4 Mouritsen, "What's the Civil in Civil Society?" 653.
5 Trägårdh, *State and Civil Society in Northern Europe*, 13.
6 Trägårdh, "Rethinking the Nordic Welfare State," 236.
7 Kuhnle and Selle, "Meeting Needs in a Welfare State."
8 Kuhnle and Selle, "Meeting Needs in a Welfare State;" Klausen and Selle, "The Third Sector in Scandinavia;" Klaudi Klausen, "Et historisk rids over den tredje sektors udvikling i Danmark;" Klaudi Klausen and Selle, *Frivillig organisering i Norden*; Trägårdh, *State and Civil Society in Northern Europe*; Trägårdh, "Rethinking the Nordic Welfare State."
9 Egholm, Heyse, and Mourey, "Civil Society Organizations," 1–2.
10 Suchman, "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches," 577–85.
11 The Norwegian Red Cross, Norwegian People's Aid, Norwegian Women's Public Health Association, National Association for Public Health, Norwegian Church Aid, the Norwegian Spain Committee, Save the Children Norway, Friends of Refugees, Norwegian Czechoslovakian Aid Association, the Jewish Social Board, the Students' Joint Committee, the Committee for Catholic Refugee Aid.
12 Øystå, "Norsk Flyktningehjelp gjennom 20 år," 17–22.
13 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, St. prp. No. 38 — About state subsidy for refugee measures.
14 Øystå, "Norsk Flyktningehjelp gjennom 20 år," 22.
15 Egeland, *75 År for Mennsker På Flukt - Flyktninghjelpen 1946–2021*, 19–20.
16 Arb-Ark, EB-0018, Minutes of first Working Committee meeting 1952.
17 Egeland, *75 År for Mennsker På Flukt - Flyktninghjelpen 1946–2021*, 20.
18 Roll-Hansen, *Hjelp og beskyttelse*.
19 Brunbech, "Early Danish Development Assistence Policy, 1945–1962."

20 Friis Bach et al., *Idealer Og Realiteter - Dansk Udviklingspolitiks Historie 1945–2005*, 30.
21 Friis Bach et al., 106–8.
22 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Statement on NRC's work in 1958.
23 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Norsk Flyktningehjelp Gjennom 20 år p. 30.
24 Arb-Ark. EB-0020, Financial Accounting, The Norwegian State Refugee Fund 1-7-1956 – 31-3-1957.
25 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Instruks for Det Norske Flyktningeråds Wienkontor, 06-08-1956.
26 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Social Trygd, Norway's work for Hungarian Refugees.
27 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Minutes of extraordinary meeting with the High Commissioner for Refugees, 26 June 1957.
28 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Memo on the reorganization of the NRC – Main viewpoints of the Department of Social Affairs, Kaare Salvesen, 10 September 1957.
29 *Morgenposten*, *Aftenposten*, *Morgenbladet* and *Nationen*.
30 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, *Morgenbladet*, 21 November 1957, "Norge moralsk forpliktet til å fortsette flyktningehjelpen."
31 *Morgenbladet*, 21 November 1957, 'Unknown future for the refugee council's work'.
32 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, *Morgenbladet* Editorial, 21 November 1957. 'Vi må ikke slappe av'.
33 'Nationen', 22 November 1957, p. 3.
34 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Notice on the future work of the NRC, 25 October 1957.
35 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Response from Minister of Social Affairs Gudmund Harlem, 21 November 1957.
36 E.g., Arb-Ark, EB-0018, Report from Mobile Dental Ambulance, Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Notice on the NRC's activities 1956.
37 Arb-Ark, EB-0018, Protocol of board meeting, 12 November 1952.
38 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Father Pire speech, 21 October 1958, University of Oslo.
39 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, *Morgenbladet*, 12 January 1959, *Morgenposten*, 12 January 1959.
40 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Report on the NRC's work in 1958, by NRC chair, Sigurd Halvorsen. Date unknown, late 1958.
41 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Memo to the Department of Social Affairs on Father Pires' refugee village in Norway.
42 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Account of the NRC activities in 1958, by Sigurd Halvorsen.
43 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Memo to the Department of Social Affairs on Father Pires' refugee village in Norway.
44 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, *Aftenposten*, 12 January 1959. *Morgenposten*, 12 January 1959. *Morgenbladet*, 12 January 1959.
45 Arb-Ark, EB-0022, Statement on NRC's work in 1958.
46 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Notice on the future tasks of the NRC, 25 October 1957.
47 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Letter from the NRC to Norwegian People's Aid, 20 January 1956.
48 Egeland, *75 År for Mennsker På Flukt - Flyktninghjelpen 1946–2021*, 19.
49 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Riksrevisionens antegnelser til Flyktningerådets regnskab.
50 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Minute of NRC board meeting Tuesday 25 September 1956.
51 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, *Morgenbladet*, 21 November 1957, 'Norge moralsk forpliktet til å fortsette flyktningehjelpen'.
52 *Dagbladet*, 4 August 1956, p. 4.
53 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Riksrevisionens antegnelser til Flyktningerådets regnskab.
54 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Memo of Conference on the future of the NRC and the role of the authorities.
55 Roll-Hansen, *Hjelp og beskyttelse*.

56 Arb-Ark, EB-0020, Notice on the NRC restructuring – Main viewpoints of the Department of Social Affairs.
57 Roll-Hansen, *Hjelp og beskyttelse*.
58 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Letter for NRC affiliated voluntary organisations, 31 October 1957.
59 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Notice on the future tasks of the NRC, 25 October 1957.
60 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, *Aftenposten*, 22 and 24 February 1958. "Hva er en flyktning?" Arne Torgersen.
61 Aftenposten editorial "A Moral Obligation," 25 February 1958, *Vårt Land*, 26 February 1958.
62 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Letter for NRC from the Minister of Social Affairs Gudmund Harlem, 21 November 1957.
63 Arb-Ark, EB-0019, Protocol NRC Board meeting, 23 October 1957.
64 King Olav New Year's speech, 31 December 1958. www.kongehuset.no/tale.html?tid=72845&scope=0.
65 Roll-Hansen, *Hjelp og beskyttelse*.
Friis Bach et al., *Idealer Og Realiteter - Dansk Udviklingspolitiks Historie 1945–2005*, 36.
66 Kuhnle and Selle, "Meeting Needs in a Welfare State: Relations Between Government and Voluntary Organizations in Norway."

Sources

Archives

The Norwegian Labour Movement Archives and Library (Arb-Ark)
EB-0018-0022.

Websites

www.kongehuset.no/tale.html?tid=72845&scope=0 (accessed 27 June 2024).

Bibliography

Banks, Nicola, David Hulme, and Michael Edwards. "NGOs, States, and Donors Revisited: Still Too Close for Comfort?" *World Development* 66 (February 2015): 707–18.

Brass, Jennifer N., Wesley Longhofer, Rachel S. Robinson, and Allison Schnable. "NGOs and International Development: A Review of Thirty-Five Years of Scholarship." *World Development* 112 (December 2018): 136–49.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W., and Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff. "Partnerships Between International Donors and Non-Governmental Development Organizations: Opportunities and Constraints." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 70(2) (June 2004): 253–70.

Brunbech, Peter. "Early Danish Development Assistance Policy, 1945–1962." In *The Aid Rush, Volume 1*, edited by Helge Ø. Pharo and Monika Pohle Fraser, 285–314. Oslo: Oslo Academic Press, Unipub Norway, 2008.

Egeland, Jan, ed. *75 År for Mennsker På Flukt – Flyktninghjelpen 1946–2021*, *2 Opplag,* 2021.

Egholm, Liv, Liesbet Heyse, and Damien Mourey. "Civil Society Organizations: The Site of Legitimizing the Common Good – A Literature Review." *VOLUNTAS: International*

Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations 31(1) (February 2020): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00171-y.

Friis Bach, Christian, Thorsten Borring Olesen, Sune Kaur-Pedersen, and Jan Pedersen. *Idealer og Realiteter – Dansk Udviklingspolitiks Historie 1945–2005*. København: Gyldendal, 2008.

Hulme, David, and Michael Edwards. *NGOs, States and Donors – Too Close for Comfort?* London: Macmillan Press, 1997.

Iriye, Akira. "A Century of NGOs." *Diplomatic History* 23(3) (1999): 421–35.

Klaudi Klausen, Kurt. "Et historisk rids over den tredje sektors udvikling i Danmark." In *Frivillig organisering i Norden*, edited by Kurt Klaudi Klausen and Per Selle. Oslo: Tano, 1995.

Klaudi Klausen, Kurt, and Per Selle, eds. *Frivillig organisering i Norden: Frivillig organisering i Norden*. Oslo: Tano, 1995.

———. "The Third Sector in Scandinavia." *Voluntas* 7(2) (June 1996): 99–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02354107.

———. "Meeting Needs in a Welfare State: Relations Between Government and Voluntary Organizations in Norway." In *Needs and Welfare*, edited by A. Ware, R. E. Goodin, and European Consortium for Political Research. Sage Modern Political Series 26. London: SAGE Publications, 1990.

Mouritsen, Per. "What's the Civil in Civil Society? Robert Putnam, Italy and the Republican Tradition." *Political Studies* 51(4) (December 2003): 650–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0032-3217.2003.0 0451.x.

Øystå, Øystein. *Norsk Flyktningehjelp gjennom 20 år*. Oslo: The Norwegian Refugee Council, 1966.

Roll-Hansen, Hege. *Hjelp og beskyttelse*: *Flyktningerådet, 1946–1996*. Oslo: Flyktningerådet, 1996.

Suchman, Mark C. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20(3) (1995): 571.

Trägårdh, Lars. "Rethinking the Nordic Welfare State Through a Neo-Hegelian Theory of State and Civil Society." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 15(3) (October 2010): 227–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2010.513853.

———, ed. *State and Civil Society in Northern Europe: The Swedish Model Reconsidered*. European Civil Society, vol. 3. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007. JN7945. S72 2007.

9 Sámi Art and Literature as Peaceful Pillar of Sámi Civil Society

Suze van der Poll

Introduction

The relation between the indigenous Sámi people and the Scandinavian states (in various and changing constitutions) has for centuries been of the ambiguous variety. After a long period of marginalization and assimilation, post–Second World War decolonization processes and international treaties like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) paved the way for a rethinking of Sámi policy.[1] Assimilation policy was phased out in the 1960s and 1970s, Sámi parliaments were installed in Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and in 1997 the Norwegian King Harald V publicly apologized to the Sámi and stated that the "Norwegian state is founded upon the territories of two people—the Norwegians and the Sámi [and that] Sámi history is interwoven with Norwegian history".[2] The Sámi have been recognized as indigenous people and/or a national minority in the Fennoscandian nation-states,[3] and recently Norway, Finland, and Sweden have installed Truth (and reconciliation) committees[4] that will map out and review the history of state assimilation policy and its consequences for Sámi people and communities in the past and the present. Even so, Sámi people still experience discrimination by the majority population, and exploitation of natural resources in Sápmi, the areas where Sámi people traditionally have lived, continues in all Fennoscandian nation-states.

The ambivalence between recognition and continued disparagement was clearly illustrated at the 59th International Art Biennale in Venice in 2022. The transformation of the Nordic Pavilion into a Sámi Pavilion could, according to the pavilion's commissioner and co-curator Katya García-Antón, be seen as "a historic moment of decolonization". Yet, she added that "[i]t's also a very strong story about the ongoing struggles that Sámi society is experiencing today".[5]

Only three months after the Biennale in Venice closed its doors, (inter)national media shared news about (young) Sámi protesters, who in an act of civil disobedience, with the support of climate activists, blocked the entrance to the Norwegian energy ministry. The protesters urged the Norwegian government to follow up the Norwegian Supreme Court's decision in the so-called Fosen Conflict. It had been 500 days since the Supreme Court in October 2021 had concluded that windfarms on the Fosen peninsula, an area used by Sámi to herd their reindeer, violated Article 27

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-11
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

of the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that aims to protect indigenous peoples' cultural practices—in this particular case, the reindeer herders' rights.[6] It would take 377 more days (and several more acts of civil disobedience) before the Norwegian government and the Sámi finally reached an agreement. The outcome of the agreement in March 2024 was that 151 wind turbines would stay in operation, and the Sámi received compensation in return. They were compensated financially, including a share in the energy produced. And along with a new winter grazing area, they were granted 5,000,000 kroner to strengthen Sámi culture.

The Fosen Conflict might be seen as emblematic for the relation between the Sámi and the modern Fennoscandian welfare states, and of Sámi civil society protests against the states. It shows similarities with the "Girjas" case in Sweden (2009–20) in which the Girjas Sami District, after more than ten years of proceeding against the Swedish state over the meaning of property rights with regard to land within Sápmi, won their case. The case also echoes the Alta Conflict (1968–82) which is often seen as the most important Sámi political issue in the twentieth century, and which illustrates the (ongoing) tension between Sámi rights versus majority population or state (economic welfare) interests.[7]

One could argue that the Alta Conflict served as the culmination of civil society protests led by a new generation of Sámi in the post–Second World War period. Thanks to educational reforms in all Nordic countries, an increasing number of Sámi had received higher education, and contacts built in school helped to create a political platform through which they criticized the Finnish, Swedish, and Norwegian states respectively for oppressing the Sámi.[8] This generation played an important role in (the establishment of) national Sámi civil society organizations like the Swedish Sami National Association (*Svenska Samernas Riksförbund*, SSR) (1950), the Norwegian Saami Association (*Norske Samers Riksforbund*, NSR) (1968), and the Finnish *Suoma Samii Riihkaseärvi* (SSRS, the Sami Association of Finland) (1971), but cooperated transnationally as well. The Nordic Saami Council was founded in 1956 (since 1992 when Russian Sámi joined: the Sami Council). In the wake of the first UN Environmental Conference in Stockholm (1972) and the Arctic Peoples Conference in Copenhagen (1973), contacts with representatives from other indigenous peoples were established and those contacts formed the starting point for transnational collaboration, resulting in the foundation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (1974). Yet, as Henry Minde wrote, at this point indigenous organizations were not taken seriously by Norwegian politicians, "and active Sami politicians found themselves walking a tightrope".[9]

The alignment of Sámi civil society's activists with transnational indigenous movements, and with (national) environmental movements did, however, lead to a broader support of Sámi interests, as was reflected in the Alta Conflict. Starting as a local protest in Máze against the development of the Alta-Kautokeino river, a protest in which artists (and later the environmental movement) participated, the protest expanded to be a people's movement with activists nationwide in the following years, and managed to strengthen transnational relations both within Scandinavia and beyond. Even though the activities did not succeed in stopping the government from building a hydroelectric power plant, the Alta Conflict was,

as Thomas Hylland Eriksen has stated, “a victory in disguise, marking a watershed in Indigenous politics in Norway”.[10]

Sámi Art and Literature as Vibrant Sámi Civil Society

Still, as the Fosen Conflict illustrates, changes in the legal and political system and the establishment of a Sámi parliament, brought about in the wake of the Alta Conflict, did not end the hierarchical power relations between the nation-state and the indigenous Sámi in Norway either—and the same goes for Sweden and Finland. This might raise a question as to what extent Sámi agents of civil society “can collectively debate issues of common concern, act in concert, assert new rights, and exercise influence on political (and potentially economic) society.”[11] The Sámi are a nation within a nation, and Sámi people thus relate to at least two nationally defined civil societies. Furthermore, the Sámi are not only a nation within a nation, but simultaneously a transnational nation, spread over four different nation-states. A Sámi civil society thus needs to relate to four different national systems. Additional difficulties in creating a viable civil society are the relatively limited size of the population[12] and its heterogeneity, both in an economic and linguistic sense. Not all who identify as Sámi speak Sámi, and of those who speak Sámi not all use the same Sámi language. Nor do all Sámi herd reindeer.

Yet, considering the recent successes achieved by the Sámi, Sámi civil society does not seem to lack power altogether. In this chapter I would like to focus on the role played by Sámi art and literature, not only as expression, but as an important foundation of civil society as well, by creating a platform where alternative thoughts considering issues of national importance are debated, particularly in recent decades.[13]

The idea that minority or migrant perspectives can revise narratives of nationality is supported by Homi Bhabha, who considers the nation as a contest between two narrative strategies: a pedagogical one that portrays the nation as homogeneous, excluding those that do not fit in—often seen as the elite perspective, what the people in power choose to tell their subjects—and a performative one. In the performative, the people operate as subjects and the nation becomes “a space that is *internally* marked by cultural difference”.[14]

In the early twenty-first century, Sámi artists and writers have been increasingly successful in presenting an alternative story about the Fennoscandian nation-states, and in calling attention to the hierarchical and paternalistic relation between the Sámi and the nation-states they are part of. In their works they have countered the national narrative that underpinned the Norwegian and Swedish assimilation policies during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and have addressed ongoing marginalization and discrimination practices. What is more, they have succeeded in making themselves heard by an (inter-)national audience, as is illustrated by the works exhibited at the International Art Biennale in Venice (2022). International exhibitions like this have come to function as a platform from which Sámi artists show the world the richness of Sámi indigenous life and culture and make the

audience aware that their culture is not sufficiently protected by Fennoscandian political and legal bodies.

A closer look at the works of the vast majority of Sámi artists and authors illustrates that they employ an internationally oriented political-juridical discourse, characterized by references to (supra-)national laws and covenants that are meant to protect indigenous people like the Sámi. In this context they also refer to the encroachments suffered by other indigenous peoples, thus indicating that the Sámi case is not a unique one, but illustrative of a global disparagement of indigenous cultures. Yet, this political-juridical discourse is combined with what Gerald Alfred has called an indigenous nationalist discourse, as they explore a Sámi national identity by rendering Sámi history, geography, and culture in their works as well.

The indigenous form of nationalism appropriates elements of nationalist discourse previously described by Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm, and Anthony Smith, like certain narrative forms (epic and novel) to render common history, and symbols to mark a sense of belonging. According to Alfred, indigenous nationalism should not be seen as an invented tradition that aims to create an imagined community. It is rather "the present manifestation of a continuous assertion of national self-determination".[15] In this manifestation, selected elements of indigenous culture and history are revitalized and adapted to a modern cultural and political reality. This can be illustrated in a Sámi context by the work of textile artist Britta Marakatt-Labba who uses duodji techniques (traditional handicraft) in modern embroidery that depicts Sámi mythology and history—including the political struggle with nation-state representatives and the effects of climate change.[16]

Aslak-Antti Oksanen maintains that it is this particular combination of indigenous nationalist discourse and the international set of norms and laws the Sámi appeal to, that accounts for the Sámi people's recent successes in articulating their political demands.[17] Yet, I argue that the impact of Sámi art and literature is strengthened because of the personal experiences used as a point of departure for the Sámi artists and writers, like Máret Ánne Sara, who exhibited at the *Pile o'Sápmi—There is no Postcolonial* festival in Oslo, asking attention for her brother's court case against the Norwegian state.[18] I believe it is this personal involvement that enables the majority population to become more receptive to the Sámi narrative(s) of the nation-state and to create a more inclusive understanding of the modern Fennoscandian welfare states.

A Modern Sámi Breakthrough?

Sámi art and literature have for a long time been used not only as an instrument to make Sámi life, culture, and history visible, but also to fight for Sámi rights. Yet, the mobilization and outreach of Sámi art and literature taking place since the 2010s is unprecedented. Or, as Arne Skaug Olsen wrote in his review of the *Pile ó Sápmi* festival in 2017: "Norway may never before have seen such a mobilization of art and culture linked to a contemporary political reality".[19]

In the following, I will argue that Sámi contemporary twenty-first-century art and literature, by articulating and sharing Sámi experience with a broad audience,

functions as a vital constituent of Sámi civil society. I hold that artists and writers do so not only by breaking the former normalized silence about the (consequences of) injustice and responding to concrete examples of encroachment or discrimination by the nation-state but also by effectively combining a personal with a more distanced, factual mode of narration. Following Ann Rigney who underscored “the role of the arts in creating the imaginative and affective conditions for public receptivity to new narratives and lines of affiliation”,[20] these cultural expressions not only enhance understanding and recognition of Sámi life, culture, and history in the Nordic countries, but also may contribute to create a more inclusive, solidary, and human imagination of the welfare states in the Nordic area.

I will start with a paragraph in which I analyze how two contemporary activist Sámi artworks, a music video by Sofia Jannok and Anders Sunna and an installation by Máret Ánne Sara, address in a more activist or confrontational manner the social injustice the Sámi have suffered by the Norwegian and Swedish colonial powers. Here, both Alfred’s concept of indigenous nationalism and Bhabha’s concept of the nation as narrative combining two opposing strategies will be applied.

In the main section Linnea Axelsson’s epic poem *Ædnan* (2018)[21] and Sigbjørn Skåden’s generational novel *Våke over dem som sover* (2014) will be analyzed, both written in a Scandinavian language.[22] Unlike the abovementioned art works, these literary works not only address the tensions between the Sámi and the majority population and the Fennoscandian nation-states but also the interconnectedness of the Sámi and the majority population, as well as the sometimes conflicting interests within the Sámi community.

Through a close analysis of the narrative structure, genre, and use of literary techniques like metaphors, intergenerational perspective, and intertextuality, I aim to highlight how they display perhaps less activist but no less powerful counter-narratives that have the ability to present and juxtapose different and at times contesting perspectives which reflect the heterogeneity and diversity both within majority society and Sámi society. The analyses will be followed by a shorter examination of the reception of the novels in order to get a better view of their impact and the discussions they have evoked.

Art as Protest

In 2016 Sofia Jannok and Anders Sunna released *WE ARE STILL HERE*, a music video in which they allude to the Girjas court case in order to make the world aware of the way in which the Swedish state treats Sámi rights to using land. The video opens with a recording from the state attorney’s intervention in the Gällivare Lappland district court. The attorney refutes that the Sámi have been subjected to discrimination by the Swedish state and questions that the Sámi should be considered an ethnic group, while debunking the relevance of the archeological evidence put forward by the Sámi in the court case and disputing the claim that the Sámi were present in the area before the year 1600. After these words by the representative of the Swedish state, which can be seen as an articulation of the narrative spread by the state about the Sámi and Sápmi, Sofia Jannok speaks out. She

addresses the brutal character of the encroachments by the Swedish state, which is depicted as murderous and greedy, and compares it to colonial practices in the USA: "Kill the bison, dig out the reindeer's land/ Gold and iron, blood on greedy hands/ Drown the lávvu, burn the teepee down". Her words however make clear that despite those practices, the Sámi people and culture have not been eradicated. She promises the Sámi will continue to be part of Sweden in the future: "We raise new ones, survivors we are now/ Because we are still here, we are still here/ We are still here, we are still here".

Alternating lyrics in English with Sámi *yoiks*, Jannok moves between an international indigenous and a national Sámi indigenous discourse to illustrate that the Sámi people do not stand alone. This collective perspective is strengthened by employing the plural personal pronoun "we", which can be interpreted as a collective, global indigenous voice opposing the representatives of authorities. Jannok's words are illustrated by the creation of a work of art. Anders Sunna is spraying texts and images reminiscent of activist graffiti art on a transparent plastic surface that is spread between two trees in a winterly landscape in the woods with reindeer in the background. On one he writes the words "YOU HAVE NOT BEEN IN THE AREA!", on another two women are portrayed, Elsa Laula Renberg (1877–1931) and the young Sámi debater Anne Karen Sara, both famous representatives of the Sámi civil society movement fighting for Sámi indigenous rights. On a third, the skeleton of a reindeer dressed in a traditional Sámi *kofte* is holding a lasso to a grinning cat wearing an orange suit and a golden crown, obviously symbolizing the nation-state authorities.

Though the video is processed in the periphery without an audience, by posting the music video on Youtube, Jannok and Sunna reached an audience of over 160,000 people (Spring 2024) thereby showing that they will not be silenced. In a modern global and highly digitalized world, the words spoken in a courtroom in Gällivare and the music video recorded in a remote forest no longer remain unknown to the world. *WE ARE STILL HERE* illustrates how the pedagogical-elitist narrative strategy, here expressed by the state attorney, is contested by the performative which renders the indigenous Sámi perspective, and is exposed as exclusionary, paternalistic, and discriminatory.

In 2017 Máret Ánne Sara presented *Pile o'Sapmi Supreme* (2017), part of her *Pile o'Sapmi* project to which over 40 artists contributed. According to Sara, art is the only way to get heard, as "no one in the media, the political and legal areas of the country were willing to discuss [the systematic attack on our culture]. This is why art became necessary since nothing else helped."[23] *Pile o'Sapmi Supreme* is a "tapestry" of reindeer skulls with bullet holes, symbolizing the Norwegian government's forced slaughter of Sámi reindeer. Like Jannok and Sunna, she makes use of strong images that may shock the audience whilst inscribing Sámi experiences in a global colonial debate. The title of Sara's work alludes to a historical photograph, *Pile O'Bones*, showing a pile of skulls of buffalos slaughtered by European settlers who aimed to drive out Native Americans. *Pile o'Sapmi Supreme* was shown at the international art exhibition Documenta 14, and later at a festival in Oslo to which several Sámi artists and activists contributed. As the festival was

held in a public space, Sara made visible a conflict that started in what, from a nation-state perspective, is often seen as the periphery. The purchase and exhibition of the work by the National Museum in Oslo in 2018 not only made Sara's work permanently visible but also signals that Sámi art is no longer seen as inferior but is considered to be a valuable part of Norwegian art history.

Sámi Literature: Sámi Culture and History and Protest

The Sámi "have to resort to the 'arts' of the others in order to be heard and taken seriously", the Sámi poet Paulus Utsi claimed.[24] Contemporary Sámi literature indeed employs a Western narrative tradition—not only is it written, it also makes use of established (Western) literary genres and refers intertextually to Western literature and art. But Sámi authors blend these Western traditions with indigenous Sámi (oral) narrative and cultural traditions like *yoiks*.

Resorting to the "arts" of others in contemporary Sámi literature has also caused several authors to choose to write in a Scandinavian language, which enables them to get their writings issued by major Scandinavian publishing houses and to become not only more widely read but also more widely discussed. In an interview with Tove Myhre, the Sámi Norwegian author Sigbjørn Skåden, who made his literary debut with a collection of poems in Sámi, was motivated to write his novel *Våke over dem som sover* in Norwegian to become part of a broader debate, as the Sámi literary milieu is rather limited.[25] In a later interview with Árdna, a Sámi cultural program broadcast by NRK Sápmi, he added that by writing in Norwegian he could give the Sámi people—as most Sámi do not read Sámi—this story and make the Norwegian audience familiar with Sámi culture and history, as literature is easier to read than history books, Skåden claimed.[26]

Unlike the works of art discussed above, the literary works analyzed in this chapter do not focus on a single event to highlight the relation between the nation-state(s) and the indigenous Sámi, but draw longer historical lines and concentrate on several moments of crisis. Their texts can be characterized as collective or family novels, as the family is central in the narratives rendered. I argue that the employment of a familiar (generic) form like the family novel make past and present Sámi experiences tangible for a Sámi and non-Sámi audience, thereby opening up cross-cultural understanding and communication.

As in Western realist literature since the nineteenth century, the family in Sámi indigenous literature can be read as a metaphor for community and even society. By following the family through several generations, and applying a multigenerational family perspective, the authors illustrate how the nation-state's marginalizing policy influences not only the lives of those directly involved but also the lives of their children and grandchildren. The diachronic approach also enables the authors to clarify that history often repeats itself: forced migrations occurred not only during the interwar period but, as Skåden describes, also in the 1970s when new reindeer herding acts were adopted. And though Sweden, Norway, and Finland have officially acknowledged the Sámi as an indigenous people in the late twentieth century, Axelsson's epic poem illustrates that "the

system of Sami rights is today in many ways similar to the one established over a century ago".[27]

Ædnan

Axelsson's epic poem *Ædnan* (2018) is structured around the personal experiences of three generations of Sámi. The narrative spans the period between 1913 and 2016 and starts with Ber-Joná and Ristin who migrate seasonally with their reindeer between Kvaløya in Norway and Sweden. Throughout the first part, Ber-Joná's and Ristin's detailed realist-poetic descriptions of daily life in Sápmi, the seasonal migration with their reindeer herd and the landscape are interspersed with reflections on (political) measures taken by the nation-state authorities, like the Reindeer Convention of 1919 between Norway and Sweden, which regulated access to grazing lands and limited Swedish Sámis rights to herd their reindeer on Norwegian grazing lands. From both Ber-Joná's and Ristin's perspective, the reader learns about the impact of those measures on the harmonious co-existence between the Sámi families, the animals, and the land. In these reflections a factual and an emotional register are combined,[28] as is illustrated when Ristin describes the bodily intrusions by representatives from the Swedish institute for racial biology: "the fingers of the Swedish men/ in my mouth// With royal ink drawing/ the racial animal" (148). The subjective perspective and detailed descriptions reveal previously overlooked or neglected elements of history and enable readers, including those that haven't been exposed to encroachments like these, to empathize with the Sámi.

In her description of the Sámi family and the struggles they experience, both personal and social, Axelsson plays with the classic epic genre. In the tenth chapter, Ber-Joná and Ristin's son Aslat, whose death formed an early dramatic climax in the epic, operates as the lyrical subject. The talking dead spirit calls to memory Homer's *Ulysses* and Vergil's *Aeneid*, in which dead spirits like Agamemnon and Anchises are used to expand the narrative's spatial and temporal scope. In Axelsson's *Ædnan*, the talking spirit of Aslat has a similar function, but simultaneously reflects the traditional intimate Sámi relationship with nature.[29] Aslat describes what happened to him after the accident and asks his parents and brother Nila if they have recognized him in the natural environment: "Nila did you notice/ I was in the motion/ under the boat// in the mountain lake where/ mother and you were fishing" (128). At the end of the chapter he, like Anchises in Vergil's *Aeneid*, tells his loved ones about the future: "I saw other mountains/ with rumbling rivers// And I flew over/ the boat and called out/ to you:/ There will be rain/ there will be rain" (129). These lines anticipate the future flooding of the land caused by electric power plants damming the rivers, as described later. The tenth chapter thus illustrates that Axelsson's narrative balances between two cultural traditions, both Sámi and Western, to address the disruptive consequences of the power hierarchy for traditional Sámi life and culture.

In the second part, Lise operates as the main lyrical subject. As in the first part, the narrative is centered around key crisis moments, but the temporal order is organized less chronologically and moves between the 1970s, 1950s, 2010s, 1990s,

and 1983. This might illustrate Lise's in-between identity, being both Sámi and Swedish, and the tensions that double identity causes at times. Yet, the disorderly temporal structure may also demonstrate the traumatic nature of past events that keep haunting her. Lise remembers how she, as a young child and separated from her parents, was unable to withstand the assimilation process at the boarding school she was sent to by the authorities. Ashamed of her Sámi background, Lise does not pass on Sámi language and culture to her children and remains silent about what happened to her and her family. This is a silence emblematic for many Sámi family histories, and a silence as important for the gaps in Sámi history as Swedish assimilation politics.[30]

In a way Lise's part in Axelsson's epic poem functions as a counter-narrative to Swedish postwar history—a corrective that not only includes Sámi history but also questions the version of Swedish welfare state history, which is taken for granted, a central element of the Swedish national narrative, something Swedish readers are familiar with and are now invited to question. At school Lise learned "about the Swedish welfare state/ and its famous solidarity// While mum/ and dad climbed the hills" (364). The criticism becomes even clearer when she describes Olof Palme, one of the heroes of the Swedish welfare system in the Swedish master narrative, as the builder and guardian of "Vattenfall's world", thereby referring to the state-owned energy company that since 1909 had generated hydroelectric power in Sweden. This is a rather dubious role, as this Vattenfall world, that evidently can be read as a synecdoche for the Swedish welfare state, does threaten the world of the Sámi.

While the pedagogical narrative of the benevolent Swedish welfare state as being a solidary state is debilitated, Lise's narrative presents the Sámi as the true keepers of the welfare state's values like equality and solidarity, by incorporating multiple examples of Sámi solidarity: a solidarity that includes outsiders as well, as is illustrated when the 350 members of the Sámi community Porjus welcome 200 refugees in 2015 and open a language café where Lise and her friends teach Swedish.

In the third and final part, Lise's children Sandra and Per operate alternately as the lyrical subject. Lise's children represent disparate attitudes towards Sámi identity and the struggle for Sámi rights. While Sandra is proud of her Sámi identity, invests in the revival of Sámi cultural traditions and language, and fights for Sámi rights in the Girjas case, her brother Per lacks agency. By concentrating on the differences between the family members, the variety within the Sámi community is reflected: Lise's taciturnity about the colonial practice and its consequences, Sandra's fighting spirit and Per's indolence.

The three parts in a way illustrate the development in indigenous national history as described by Alfred, moving from oppression, silence, and shame to pride and resilience.[31] While Ber-Joná and Ristin are powerless and simply have to conform to the will of the authorities, Lise represents an in-between position. Subjected to Swedification policy in school, she has assimilated but is still very much aware of and suffering from the multiple traumatic events in her early life. Her "protest", however, remains a silent one. Her daughter Sandra represents the third phase in

which Sámi identity, language, and cultural traditions are revitalized and have the power to make the Sámi voice get heard. This involves activism against the state to ensure that Sámi indigenous rights are not merely gestural politics.

Sigbjørn Skåden's *Våke over dem som sover* – A Double Narrative

Sigbjørn Skåden, in an interview with the Swedish national television broadcaster SVT, characterized *Våke over dem som sover* as a novel about power and the way power and power relations change. To illustrate the process of indigenous national consciousness, he too adopted a transgenerational perspective and made use of the family trope. Yet, unlike Axelsson's text, Skåden's criticism is not solely aimed at the treatment of the Sámi by the majority population and the nation-state, but also at the Sámi community. He describes how exclusionary practices that characterize the Norwegian and Swedish nation-states are internalized by the Sámi community.

Våke over dem som sover focuses on a Sámi family from Skånland, leading a sedentary life and combining farming and fishing. The novel shows that members of the family are marginalized not only by the nation-state but by their own people as well. As they are not a stereotypical reindeer herding family, they are not regarded as proper Sámi by reindeer herding Sámi. As such, the novel criticizes Sámi identity politics as well as the marginalizing practices of the Norwegian government.

The novel's opening section describes a loving, well-functioning family, in which the great-grandmother guards the moral principles and teaches her children to be responsible and solidary individuals while simultaneously making them more resilient against the injustice they face. The main plotline takes place nearly a century later, and follows her great-grandson, Amund Andersen. Amund, a 29-year-old Sámi film artist, travels by car from the Norwegian west coast, via Sweden and Finland, to Kautokeino where he will lead a film workshop and make a film for his first solo exhibition six months later. The journey by car could be read as an allusion to the seasonal migration of the reindeer-herding Sámi. This plotline closes with a description of the film as shown at the Sámi culture center in Karasjok and Amund's subsequent drive to his parents in Skånland. In between, the narrative retrospectively describes experiences of Amund's grandfather, his mother and himself as a child, shifting temporally between 1946, 1968, and the early 1990s. The temporal shifts help to illustrate parallels and changes in the relation between the Sámi and the Norwegians and in the relations between the Sámi themselves.

As in Axelsson's epic, the temporal shifts and the transgenerational perspective enable the display of multiple perspectives on issues like discrimination of the Sámi by the majority population, and the fluctuating ideas within the family/community about whether to assimilate to the majority population's cultural and linguistic norms or to pass on Sámi culture and language to the next generation. But the complexities of Sámi identity politics and especially the culture of silence within the Sámi community are as important in Skåden's narrative as the asymmetric power relations between Norwegians and Sámi. This change of focus is illustrated by differences in representation of the discriminatory and exclusionary practices.

Discrimination by Norwegians and the implications of the state's policy for reindeer-herding Sámi only is rendered mainly indirectly. Asymmetric power relations within the Sámi community, however, where people from centers like Kautokeino look down on Sámi from peripheral areas like Skånland, are displayed directly in the novel.

The most poignant descriptions of exclusionary and discriminatory practices within the Sámi community take place during Amund's days at school in the early 1990s. The positioning of these episodes in the novel's closing chapter is distressing as this doesn't signal a "happy end" to those practices. In the first episode, Amund witnesses his cousin Vidar being attacked physically by one of the other pupils, and called a Lapp, a derogatory term. Though all pupils are of Sámi descent, something Vidar reminds them of, the other pupils do not wish to identify as Sámi. The episode reflects the feelings of shame about Sámi identity. The second episode takes place shortly afterwards at a Sámi school in Kautokeino. Again, Vidar and Amund are being discriminated against, but now they are called Norwegians by one of the Sámi boys, who obviously doesn't see them as real Sámi.

Those practices of exclusion, and mental as well as physical abuse within the Sámi community, are part of ongoing practices of exclusion and abuse, as illustrated by the film project Amund carries out as an adult. With his film, meant as a response to a case of sexual abuse in Kautokeino in the early twenty-first century, Amund intends to break down the Sámi people's self-image, the illusion of innocence. By holding up a mirror to the Sámi community in Kautokeino, he wishes to make clear that the Sámi people are by no means only innocent victims of the colonizing Fennoscandian nation-states. His film installation thus presents a counter-narrative to the *Sámi master narrative* in which the Sámi are described as victims of the decolonial practices.

Suffering and victimhood became primary constituents in many indigenous narratives, the Sámi included, as is illustrated by many contemporary Sámi activists and artists. Skåden's narrative can be seen as a critical commentary on the focus on victimhood by presenting a story that portrays Sámi—including his protagonist Amund—as perpetrators. The film, in which Amund himself operates as the protagonist, describes in detail his seduction of Íssa, a 14-year-old schoolgirl. He records their meetings and conversations and shocks the audience by showing them this proof of sexual abuse. Yet, what he has done mirrors behavior within the Kautokeino community. The narrative thus not only displays Amund's own guilt, but openly questions the community's innocence, and subsequent silencing. That Amund's film is introduced by the director of the Sámi art center as a work "no one here has seen"[32] can therefore be read as an example of situational irony: everyone has seen it, or something very similar, but no one has taken responsibility.

As an example of how literature can function as an expression of civil society, *Våke over dem som sover* is interesting not only because it draws attention to marginalizing and often silenced practices within the Norwegian and Sámi community but also because of the form in which Skåden presents his "message". I argue the novel can be seen as a performance addressing the function of art in expressing inconvenient truths as well. (In a way the production of the film in which Amund

addresses tabooed issues is not unlike the images Anders Sunna sprays in *WE ARE STILL HERE*, though there is one important difference, in that Amund scrutinizes Sámi identity politics.) In this performance the reader is given a central role. By rendering the planning, making, and showing of the subversive film fragmentarily, the author makes the reader witness the turn of events at close perspective, and induces the reader actively to fill in what is not made explicit. In the process of filling in the gaps, intertextual references play an important role.

Skåden's novel explicitly refers to François Ozon's erotic thriller *Swimming Pool* (2003) and to Marry Áilonieida Somby's *Bajándávgi* (2004). Intertextually, the novel is thus connected to a European as well as an indigenous Sámi literary context. Although the Sámi writer, activist, and artist Somby won wide acclaim as a writer of children's literature in Sámi, it is interestingly not one of her books for children, but *Bajándávgi*, that Skåden refers to. This novel contains explicit erotic scenes between a female Sámi adult and a much younger Apache boy, which are indirectly paralleled in Skåden's text. François Ozon's film is connected directly to the novel, as Amund is secretly filming himself watching Ozon's film together with Íssa in his room, as part of his own film. Thus, footage from *Swimming Pool* is interwoven with his film, making explicit what is only implied in Skåden's narrative.

The narrative choice to let the readers witness the film project at close perspective, combined with the intertextual references, invites the reader to engage actively. This is illustrated in the final part of the sixth chapter where the film that is shown at the exhibition at the Sámi culture center in Karasjok is described. The film partly repeats the scenes between the protagonist and Íssa described earlier, though adding information that has not been rendered. But before reaching the climax, everything becomes black. Familiar with the content of similar narratives, both global and local, in *Bajándávgi*, *Swimming Pool*, and the court case handling sexual abuse in Kautokeino a few years earlier, both the audience at the exhibition in the novel and the reader will know what happens after having seen or read that "the man is leaning over the child".[33] (p. 175).

Skåden presents in *Våke over dem som sover* a double counter-narrative. Not only does he present a corrective to the Norwegian master narrative by showing that the modern Norwegian welfare state is not a state where all citizens are seen as equals, he also questions the Sámi master narrative. Unlike that narrative in which victimhood, asymmetric power relations between the Fennoscandian nation-states and the indigenous Sámi, and symmetric relations and solidarity between the Sámi form central elements, the novel presents a critical view of Sámi identity politics and displays that values like solidarity, equality, and safety are by no means inherent in the Sámi community.

Reception

Although *Ædnan* and *Våke over dem som sover* are fictional works, they were generally read as truthful renderings of Sámi indigenous history. This closeness to reality helped to create "affective conditions for public receptivity"[34] to the stories. In his review of Skåden's novel, Knut Hoem wrote that it was "the sense of closeness to

reality that made *Våke over dem som sover* […] feel dangerous".[35] And Ingunn Solli admitted the protagonist's behavior "made me goggle, more than once".[36] Remarks like these reflect that Skåden's subversive novel did touch the readers. The same is true for Axelsson's text, though here it was first and foremost the wrongdoings by the Swedes and Norwegians and their colonial history that moved and upset the reviewers.[37] Carina Elisabeth Beddari characterized *Ædnan* as a modification of history, indicating that Axelsson succeeded in countering the hegemonic narrative of Swedish history. Beddari's review is interesting from another perspective too, as she observed the difference between the mild tone in Axelsson's epic and Máret Ánne Sara's activist *Pile o'Sápmi*. Yet, that *Ædnan* is not an activist pamphlet, did not make *Ædnan* a less powerful articulation according to Beddari: "*Ædnan* is a poem which can mobilize action, a poem which challenges our belief that the Nordic welfare state are exempted from discrimination and racism".[38]

Despite the overt realism in both texts, the authors responded differently to comments made about the closeness to reality. Axelsson repeatedly made clear in interviews that *Ædnan* first and foremost should be seen as the result of her imagination. She also stressed that she was not speaking for the Sámi community as a whole.[39] Skåden consciously played with the blurred distinction between fiction and reality, not least because of the more obvious similarities between Skåden's and his protagonist's biography. This, combined with the sensitivity of the tabooed issues Skåden addressed, provoked stronger reactions, especially amongst Sámi readers – although Skåden admitted he received a less strong reaction than he had expected.[40] Sámi reviewers and interviewers were particularly curious about how much reality there was in his novel. Another element Sámi readers responded to was Skåden's choice to write in Norwegian, especially as he had written his literary debut in Northern Sámi. This indicates that the language issue is a delicate one.

Axelsson's epic and Skåden's novel were widely read, and both have won critical acclaim. Skåden was nominated for the P2 listeners prize, one of the largest literary prizes in Norway in which a professional jury nominates and a listener's jury chooses the winner. *Våke over dem som sover* won the regional Havmannprisen. Axelsson was even more successful, winning both the August Priset, the largest Swedish literary prize, as well as *Svenska Dagbladet*'s literature prize and the regional literature prize Norrlands litteraturpris. In 2020 *Ædnan* was adapted for theater by *Riksteatern* in Stockholm, and in 2023 Axelsson's epic poem was translated into English. The translation and the adaptation not only broadened the audience Axelsson reached but led to renewed attention as well. As reviews in *The Guardian* and *The Washington Post* of *Ædnan* illustrate, the media not only commented on what Axelsson had written about but more broadly wrote about Nordic colonial history and the position of the indigenous Sámi. Thus, her epic has without doubt contributed to spreading knowledge about the Sámi beyond Sápmi and even beyond the Nordic countries.

Closing Remarks

The reception in regional, national, and international media of the works created by Sámi artists and writers illustrate that these cultural expressions form an important

constituent of Sámi civil society and can possibly mobilize action. Something both Paulus Utsi and Máret Ánne Sara did underline as well. Artists and writers have been very successful in generating broader knowledge of and interest in Sámi life and (cultural) history, and Sámi experiences with the Fennoscandian nation-states' colonial practices in Sápmi, both nationally and transnationally. Reviews and interviews of the works also show that they succeed in making the public receptive to their perspectives and stories, something which I believe is essential to getting Sámi experiences inscribed on the (national) discursive agenda.

In their works they combine indigenous national discourse with an (inter)nationally orientated political-juridical discourse, while sharing personal experiences. They draw parallels between current and nineteenth- and twentieth-century examples of marginalizing practices to demonstrate that, despite reformation of Sámi policy and the recognition of the Sámi as indigenous people, power asymmetries still exist in the twenty-first century.

The parallels to a global indigenous postcolonial discourse which they call to mind help to debunk the myth of Nordic exceptionalism when it comes to colonialism. The works of art and literature analyzed in this chapter openly articulate the lack of humanism, solidarity, equal treatment, and respect which the majority population, state policies and authorities have displayed in their relation to the Sámi, something which leads to a debunking of the myth of the Nordic welfare state too.

As the reviews of the literary texts analyzed in this chapter illustrate, the way they have articulated these issues has been discussed in both regional and national media, in newspapers, and on television and radio. Though some, like Victor Malm in his review of *Ædnan*, have argued that most readers are familiar with Swedish colonial history and Axelsson could easily have skipped her "history lectures",[41] most other reviewers commented that her "grand and intimate" epic is an important contribution as it is "alarming how little we know about our indigenous people in Sweden".[42]

Yet, there are differences between the artistic and literary articulations as well. The image of the Sámi community presented in *Ædnan* and *Våke over dem som sover* seems to be more complex than in the works by Sofia Jannok, Anders Sunna and Máret Ánne Sara. The complexity is reflected on multiple levels. The literary narratives do not portray Sámi and Fennoscandian society as diametrically opposed. Despite a breach between ideals and practice, they show both societies in theory share values like solidarity, gender equality, and humanism. The relatedness between Sámi and Fennoscandian cultural traditions is also underscored by the fact that both Axelsson and Skåden fuse a Sámi indigenous cultural and narrative tradition with Western narrative traditions. These techniques, combined with the clearly personal involvement, contribute to the receptivity of the stories they tell, something which is demonstrated by the remarks of reviewers who have been touched by the narratives.

The image is further complicated and deepened by the multiple transgenerational, and at times contesting narrative voices of their family narratives. The family metaphorically reflects various positions and internal tensions within the Sámi community. Both literary texts display a transformation from silence and shame to

pride and resistance and resilience. Yet, the texts also show different approaches. Skåden's narrative illustrates that practices of marginalization, silencing, and hierarchical power relations are not only part of the Norwegian welfare society, but of the Sámi society as well. His novel hereby holds up a mirror not only to the majority population, but to the Sámi community as well. This may be read as a sign that it is not only the myth of the Fennoscandian welfare state that might need some debunking.

The works presented by Sámi artists and writers reflect both cultural pride and resilience and have found their way to renowned (inter)national platforms, as well as to a global (digital) public space. As Thomas Hylland Eriksen has argued, the Alta Conflict did strengthen transnational contacts with Indigenous peoples in the Arctic.[43] That transnational contacts are still at the core of Sámi civil society activities is illustrated not only by Pauliina Feodoroff, a Skolt Sámi artist from Finland who exhibited her work together with the Norwegian Sámi artist Máret Ánne Sara and the Swedish Sámi artist Anders Sunna in the Nordic Pavilion at the Art Biennale in Venice, where they addressed the ongoing encroachments by the Fennoscandian nation-states that they had experienced from a close perspective. As well, the explicit references of Sámi artists to (globally) shared Indigenous experiences serve as a confirmation of the importance of those alliances and emphasize the significance of a global context for small and diversified civil societies, like the Sámi, to assert their rights and influence politics, both on a national and transnational level.

Notes

1 See also Andersen, Evjen, and Ryymin, eds, "Grunnlaget for en ny samepolitikk."
2 www.kongehuset.no/tale.html?tid=171065&sek=26947&scope=0.
3 Considering that the Sámi people live in Norway, Sweden, Finland (and Russia), but not in other Nordic countries, I consider the adjective "Fennoscandian" more precise than the use of "Nordic".
4 Norway and Finland installed Truth and Reconciliation committees in respectively 2018 and 2021. The Norwegian Committee's report was presented 1 June 2023. Sweden installed a Truth committee in 2021. Though it is important to keep in mind that the assignments are not identical all committees intend to map out and examine state (assimilation) policy and its consequences.
5 Fullerton, "With Sámi Pavilion."
6 www.nhri.no/en/2023/about-the-wind-farms-on-fosen-and-the-supreme-court-judgment/.
7 See also Andersen, Evjen, and Ryymin, eds, "Grunnlaget for en ny samepolitikk."
8 See also Andersen, Evjen, and Ryymin, eds, "Grunnlaget for en ny samepolitikk."
9 See Minde, "The Challenge of Indigenism," 84.
10 Hylland-Eriksen, "Threats to Diversity," 10.
11 Cohen and Arato, *Civil Society*, 23.
12 The estimated number of Sámi in Norway is ca. 50,000, whereas Sweden counts ca. 20,000 Sámi, Finland 8,000, and Russia 2,000.
13 See also Berg and Lundgren, "We Were Here." On a common public sphere as part of civil society, see Sand's contribution to this volume.

14 Bhabha, *Nation and Narration*, 299.
15 Alfred, *Heeding the Voices*, 178.
16 Marakatt-Labba's *Historja* (2003–7) an epic 24 m-long textile artwork she narrated was shown at Documenta 14 in Kassel (2017) and in 2024 her work was presented at the National Museum in Oslo.
17 Oksanen, "The Rise of Indigenous."
18 See also Máret Ánne Sara's website www.pileosapmi.com/pile-o-sapmi-oslo-program/ (accessed 3 August 2023).
19 Olsen, "Den lange harde kalde kampen."
20 Rigney, "Remembrance", 248.
21 See also Reed, "Territorium."
22 As I do not read any of the Sámi languages, the analysis will be limited to an examination of literary texts written in one of the Scandinavian languages. Yet, as my interest lies in examining the way texts written by authors identifying as Sámi are used to generate knowledge and understanding amongst a double audience (Sámi and non-Sámi), this selection falls naturally.
23 Sara, www.collectorsagenda.com/en/in-the-studio/m%C3%A1ret-%C3%A1nne-sara (accessed 27 June 2024).
24 Gaski, "Song, Poetry and Images," 43.
25 Myhre, "Skam og seksualitet."
26 "Sigbjørn Skåden om tabuer." *Árdna – samisk kulturmagasin/ NRK*, 12 November 2014. https://tv.nrk.no/serie/ardna-tv/2014/SAPR67004414/avspiller. In other interviews, with Norwegian interviewers, Skåden expressed similar thoughts. For example, an interview with Helge Matland in 2023, and earlier, in 2014, Skåden told Tove Myhre in an interview for *Nordlys* (29 April 2014) that writing in Norwegian increases visibility.
27 Lantto and Mörkenstam, "Sami Rights," 27.
28 See also Reed, "Territorium."
29 See also Gaski, "Song, Poetry and Images."
30 See also Labba, *Herrarna*.
31 Alfred, *Heeding the Voices*.
32 Skåden, *Våke over dem*, 166.
33 Skåden, *Våke over dem*, 175.
34 Rigney, "Remembrance," 248.
35 Hoem, "Du må ikke sove".
36 Solli, "Overbevisende om makt og avmakt".
37 Tunbäck-Hanson, "En bok som både upprör och berör"; Jedvik, "Vidunderlig lyrik."
38 Beddari, "Urettens omkostninger."
39 Åström, "*Ædnan*."
40 *Ardna*, "Sigbjørn Skåden."
41 Malm, "Ett lyriskt epos."
42 Lahti Davidsson, "Ett litterärt storverk."
43 Hylland Eriksen, "Threats to Diversity," 10.

Bibliography

Alfred, Gerald R. *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Andersen, Astri, Bjørg Evjen, and Teemu Ryymin, eds. "Grunnlaget for en ny samepolitikk 1945–1963." In *Samenes historie fra 1751–2010*, 305–57. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk, 2021.

Árdna – samisk kulturmagasin. "Sigbjørn Skåden om tabuer." 12 November 2014. https://tv.nrk.no/serie/ardna-tv/2014/SAPR67004414/avspiller (accessed 27 June 2024).

Åström, Eva. "*Ædnan* är hennes känslolandskap." *Kuriren*, 26 July 2018.

Axelsson, Linnea. *Ædnan*. Stockholm: Bonniers, 2018.

Beddari, Carina Elisabeth. "Urettens omkostninger." *Morgenbladet*, 6 April 2018.

Berg, Linda, and Anna Sofia Lundgren. "We Were Here, and We Still Are: Negotiations of Political Space Through Unsanctioned Art." In *Pluralistic Struggles in Gender, Sexuality and Coloniality: Challenging Swedish Exceptionalism*, edited by E. Alm et al., 49–80. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.

Bhabha, Homi. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Cohen, Jean L., and Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994.

Fullerton, Elizabeth. "With Sámi Pavilion, Three Indigenous Artists Hope to Highlight the Ongoing Struggles of their People at the Venice Biennale." *ARTNews*, 18 April 2022. www.artnews.com/art-news/artists/sami-pavilion-2022-venice-biennale-1234625607/ (accessed 27 June 2024).

Gaski, Harald. "Indigenous Interdisciplinary Internationalism: The Modern Sámi Experience with Emphasis on Literature." In *Circumpolar Ethnicity and Identity*, edited by Takashi Irimoto and Takado Yamado, 371–87. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 2004.

———. "Song, Poetry and Images in Writing: Sami Literature." *Nordlit* 27 (2011): 33–54.

Hoem, Knut. "Du må ikke sove." *NRK*, 2 June 2014. www.nrk.no/kultur/vaker-over-den-som-sover-1.11744629 (accessed 27 June 2024).

Hylland-Eriksen, Thomas. "Threats to Diversity in the Shadow of Anthropocene Overheating: A Biosemiotic Perspective." *Kritisk etnografi* 6(1) (2023): 9–22.

Jannok, Sofia, and Anders Sunna. *WE ARE STILL HERE*, 2016. www.youtube.com/watch?v=EVH0jvnaIqU| (accessed 27 June 2024).

Jedvik, Hanna. "Vidunderlig lyrik om samernas historia i Ædnan." *Sveriges Radio*, 13 March 2018.

Jolly, Alice. 2024 "*Ædnan* by Linnea Axelsson Review – An Arctic Epic from Sweden." *The Guardian*, 18 January 2024. www.theguardian.com/books/2024/jan/18/dnan-by-linnea-axelsson-review-an-arctic-epic-from-sweden (accessed 27 June 2024).

Kong Harald. "H.M. Kongens tale ved åpningen av det tredje Sameting 7. oktober 1997." Det norske kongehus. www.kongehuset.no/tale.html?tid=171065&sek=26947&scope=0 (accessed 27 June 2024).

Labba, Elin Anna. *Herrarna satte oss hit: om tvångsförflyttningarna i Sverige*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 2020.

Lahti Davidsson, Elisabeth. "Ett litterärt storverk om samiska hjältar." *Dagens Bok*, 1 October 2018.

Lantto, Patrik, and Leif Mörkenstam. "Sami Rights and Sami Challenges: The Modernization Process and the Swedish Sami Movement, 1886–2006." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 33(1) (March 2008): 26–51.

Malm, Victor. "Ett lyriskt epos är inte ett underhållningsprogram på SVT." *Expressen*, 13 March 2018.

Matland, Helge. "Dette har gitt han større leserkrets." *ITromsø*, 20 August 2014. www.itromso.no/kultur/i/EwO3eG/dette-har-gitt-han-storre-lesekrets (accessed 27 June 2024).

Minde, Henry. "The Challenge of Indigenism: The Struggle for Sami Land Rights and Self-Government in Norway 1960–1990." In *Indigenous Peoples: Resource Management and Global Rights*, edited by Svein Jentoft, Henry Minde, and Ragnar Nilsen, 75–106. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers, 2003.

Myhre, Tove. “Skam og seksualitet.” *Nordlys*, 29 April 2014. www.nordlys.no/kultur/skam-og-seksualitet/s/1-79-7324832

Norwegian National Human Rights Institution, 8 March 2023. www.nhri.no/en/2023/about-the-wind-farms-on-fosen-and-the-supreme-court-judgment/ (accessed 27 June 2024).

Oksanen, Aslak-Antti. “The Rise of Indigenous (Pluri-)Nationalism: The Case of the Sámi People.” *Sociology* 54(6) (2020): 1141–58.

Olsen, Arne Skaug. “Den lange harde kalde kampen.” *Kunstkritikk*, 17 February 2017. https://kunstkritikk.no/den-lange-harde-kalde-kampen/ (accessed 27 June 2024).

Reed, Beatrice M. G. “Territorium, tvangsflytting og tap: Konsekvenser av unionsoppløsningen i Linnea Axelssons *Ædnan* (2018) og Elin Anna Labba’s *Herrarna satte oss hit: om tvångsförflyttningarna i Sverige* (2020).” In *Naturen som gave: Tvisyn på naturen i nordisk litteratur*, edited by K. L. Iversen, M. T. Mjaaland, and E. Oxfeldt. 158–75. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2023.

Rigney, Ann. “Remembrance as Remaking: Memories of the Nation Revisited.” *Nations and Nationalism* 24(2) (2018): 240–57.

Sara, Máret Ánne. *Pile o’Sapmi Supreme*, 2017. www.collectorsagenda.com/en/in-the-studio/m%C3%A1ret-%C3%A1nne-sara (accessed 27 June 2024).

Sarnecki, Simon. “Sigbjørn Skåden krossar fördommarna om samisk litteratur.” *SVT*, 4 April 2019. www.svt.se/kultur/norsksamiska-sigbj-rn-skaden-krossar-fordomar-om-samisk-litteratur

Skåden, Sigbjørn. *Våke over dem som sover*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2014.

Solli, Solgunn. “Overbevisende om makt og avmakt.” *Altaposten*, 28 May 2014.

Tharoor, Kanishk. “A Remarkable Epic About an Indigenous people near the Arctic Circle.” *The Washington Post*, 18 January 2024.

Tunbäck-Hanson, Monika. “En bok som både upprör och berör.” *Göteborgsposten*, 26 November 2018.

Tveten, Ole Henrik, and Preben Brækstad. ”Støre innrømmer pågående menneskerettighetsbrudd på Fosen.” *Dagsavisen*, 3 March 2023. www.dagsavisen.no/nyheter/innenriks/2023/03/03/store-innrommer-pagaende-menneskerettighetsbrudd-pa-fosen/ (accessed 27 June 2024).

Vogel, Saskia. “An Interview with Linnea Axelsson.” *Words Without Borders*, 29 March 2019. https://wordswithoutborders.org/read/article/2019-03/an-interview-with-linnea-axelsson-saskia-vogel/ (accessed 27 June 2024).

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Part III

Civil Society and Transnational Encounters

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

10 A Networked Scandinavia

Scandinavian Associations and Transnational Cooperation

Ruth Hemstad

Introduction

The practice of transnational cooperation across the Nordic region is deeply rooted and historically developed within the civil society with associations playing a key role. Although civil society is usually understood as the "crucial sphere of social activity between the private lives of individuals and the public power of nation-states",[1] the transnational cooperation within the region challenges the perception of civil society as bound to national territories.[2] Starting almost two hundred years ago, a fine network of associational collaboration has emerged and constitutes a comprehensive transnational interconnectedness. This pattern of Nordic cooperation practice has, however, not evolved as an inevitable process, but at times as a contested one, causing national resistance and reactions. It is a history of visions on behalf of the region as well as of grand failures, of high-minded rhetoric and serious shortcomings—but not least of pragmatic and practical solutions.

The high density of transnational ties at civil society level in the Nordic region is well known,[3] although we still lack a systematic overview of these links and the number of transnational Nordic associations, organizations and institutions, both today and in a historical perspective. Although there obviously is a *Nordic dimension* to civil society in the region—historically as well as today—there is still reason to ask whether it is, or has ever been, something like a *common* Nordic civil society, understood as a transnational space and sphere of institutionalized border-crossing social activity, aiming to pursue common goals, including the influencing of state authorities in one or more of the countries in the region. To give an informed answer, we need to know more about the range of these kinds of structural transnational relations and the different kinds of associational cooperation that have evolved. Does this, as it has regularly been argued with an exceptionalist approach, represent a unique case, a tradition of regional cooperation "longer and more intense than in any other region of the world",[4] a "special Nordic subsystem",[5] a Nordic dimension, facilitating "a unique transnational citizenship"?[6] These and similar claims may hold true, but they deserve a thorough comparison with other macro-regions—the Benelux Union and the Commonwealth have been suggested as relevant entities,[7] and the Baltic region could also be a relevant case in point. Although there were several transnational associations connected to European

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-13
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

pan-national movements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century,[8] they did not usually lead to broader regional cooperation, and a systematic comparison is well beyond the scope of this chapter. What I will try to do, however, is to reflect on the emergence and growth of what may at least be termed a *Nordic subsystem of civil society* through focusing on the vital role of associations, and to map, categorize and suggest a taxonomy of important features of the historical formation of regional civil cooperation. Of particular interest, are transnational, inter-Nordic associations, understood as associations with a transnational goal, membership and activities, and representing something slightly different than solely national associations cooperating on a regional or international Nordic level. In practice, however, all associations and organizations had to adhere to national legislation and had to be based in one specific country.

The historical legacy of civil society cooperation represents, it may be argued, the very foundation of postwar official Nordic cooperation,[9] making it imaginable for the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers, as they do in the Nordic 2030 vision, to promote Norden (in a few years' time) as "the most sustainable and integrated region in the world".[10]

Existing surveys and scholarship, including my own, and published contemporary sources, such as Nordic journals,[11] are utilized and discussed in the following, in addition to the Swedish overview from 1951 of associational life in Sweden, *Svenskt Föreningslexicon* (Swedish Encyclopedia of Associations, a Norwegian or Danish counterpart is unfortunately not available), in trying to get a better grip on the early development of associational cooperation in the region.[12] The focus will be on the long nineteenth century, but later developments will occasionally be included. The introduction in *Svenskt Föreningslexicon* by the editor, Bengt Åhlén, starts by describing the situation in Sweden at a time when voluntary associations were more important in everyday life in all the Nordic countries than today: "It is hardly an exaggeration to claim that every adult Swede—man or woman—has his economic and social life regulated by an association".[13] Of many thousands of entries covering all sorts of associations based in Sweden, only a handful are inter-Nordic associations. Taken together, however, they illustrate the Nordic dimension of associational life, although this overview is not complete and does not include inter-Nordic associations based in other Nordic countries, or the comprehensive associational cooperation not formalized in common institutions.

Writing the history of association formation is thus not solely "writing national history",[14] although research literature on civil society development in the Nordic region—as in general—often remains nation-state oriented, while to some degree including Nordic comparative perspectives. Association history is also an important part of the history of the Nordic region and of Nordic region-building, as will be shown below and as recent research literature on the formative phase of Nordic cooperation during the long nineteenth century has demonstrated.[15] Associations have been described as prime instruments of civil society and "engines of national integration".[16] It may, however, be argued, based on Nordic experiences, that associations could also serve as engines on a transnational level, as mechanisms of Scandinavian communication, cohesion and socio-cultural integration, vital to the

growth of what may be termed a *networked region*. Although integration, as an "immensely complicated political, economic, and cultural process",[17] has often been seen as a state-driven process from above, associating from below has also contributed substantially to Scandinavian transnational low-key integration both intentional and, in more "hidden", not-intended ways. Here I follow Misa and Schot's discussion on technology and integration on a European level, by focusing on transnational integration—and I will add the related concept of cooperation—as a "category of practice" that has been "experienced, projected, performed, exported, imported, appropriated, and reproduced in a range of contexts".[18]

The roots of the Nordic associational system, as a category of associational practice alongside national and local (and international) associations, may, as indicated, be traced back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, partly connected to pan-Scandinavian ideas and Scandinavian reconciliation after the Napoleonic Wars and the resulting new formation of the Nordic region.[19] Notably, Scandinavian civil society cooperation usually included all three countries, rarely only Sweden and Norway, united in a loose personal union since 1814.[20] Associational contacts and formations particularly expanded during the last part of the nineteenth century, partly inspired by a more practically oriented Scandinavianism after 1864, partly by the general professionalization and specialization within different segments of the societies, and in general stimulated by the growth of communication infrastructures making it easier to travel across the region. After a certain setback after 1905 and the national reaction caused by the dissolution of the Norwegian-Swedish union, the organizational contacts increased considerably during the interwar period. External pressure felt as a common threat against the region strengthened the perception of unity and has thus played an important role in motivating stronger practical cooperation.[21] This is particularly the case during the mid-nineteenth century, around 1900 and in the 1930s—and later also after the Second World War and, arguably, even today, reflecting geopolitical changes.

The transnational experience of collaboration has arguably facilitated the "construction of Norden" and shaped political and societal life in the region.[22] It may be claimed that Nordic cooperation, or "the Nordic model of transnational cooperation",[23] characterized mainly by a bottom-up, civil society-driven cooperation, is in fact a main part of the answer to the overarching question: "What was "Nordic" about Nordic civil societies?"[24] The region is not a nature-given entity but is instead shaped by common experiences and internal cooperation.[25] Why then Nordic cooperation? The ties across the region have been developed purposedly by men—and women—combining, with Tocqueville, their "efforts with those of his fellows and acting together", and "seeing in association the universal and, so to speak, unique means that men can use to attain the various ends that they propose".[26] In the Nordic collaborative context, the desired end was sometimes to strengthen the cooperation as such and thereby nourishing a sense of community, though more often, however, the aim has been to utilize the possibility of combining forces to obtain common particular societal, scientific, economic or political goals, although these motives certainly could and often did overlap. The tradition of cooperation has, furthermore, often had a certain normative dimension, frequently expressed

through a rhetoric of Nordicness connected to Scandinavian and later Nordic transnational and pan-national ideas. Scandinavianism and Nordism have thus at times inspired closer Nordic cooperation but also provoked national reactions and tensions by politicizing associational activities. In the region, the particular blend of pan-national ideologically driven and general pragmatically motivated collaboration stands out as a central historical trajectory arguably still influencing Nordic cooperation.[27]

A reflection on terminology must be added. A complicating factor in analysing this development is that the terms "Scandinavian" and "Nordic" are ambiguous. In common usage as in scholarly literature a "Scandinavian association" can in general mean all kinds of national organizations in the Scandinavian countries. It could, however, be used more narrowly, including only regional transnational, inter-Nordic, or networked organizations. An even more limited definition of "Scandinavian (or Nordic) association", reflecting contemporary terminology in the nineteenth century, is pan-national associations explicitly defining the promotion of Scandinavian cohesion and Nordic cooperation as the main goal. In this chapter, the term pertains to associations on a Nordic level and/or with Nordic contacts and purposes.

A Nordic Subsystem

An instructive and relevant study, although mapping the situation in the early 1970s, illustrates core features and functions of civil society cooperation in a region arguably less inclined to cooperate in recent years.[28] The study, *The Nordic Transnational Association Network: Structure and Correlates*, reveals and discusses the existence of a "Nordic subsystem" of transnational interaction, even if the historical trajectories leading to this system are not reflected upon. I will in the following section present some insights from this survey, before turning to the formative nineteenth century and the historical development of associational Nordic cooperation until the interwar years.

In their survey, Abraham Hallenstvedt, Raimo Lintonen and Aira and Jaakko Kalela define associations as "formally organized voluntary groups uniting people or other basic units for certain non-profit purposes", in general created for "permanent cooperation to further common goals based on interests, needs and values".[29] In line with traditional perceptions, they state that "it is through associations that interests and values, be they those of individuals or big business, are aggregated and transformed into goals and actions of societal relevance".[30] They furthermore describe a global transnational interaction system, arguing that the "particular interests and goals of associations, coupled with the relative autonomy of their activities, create base for solidarity with and direct relations across borders with other sub-systems—subnational, national and international".[31] Based on extensive national surveys of nation-wide associations in Norway and Finland,[32] including their international activities, for the year 1971, Hallenstvedt et al. have found what for them was an unexpectedly predominant Nordic dimension. The

survey conveyed a "strongly interrelated Nordic system of interactions among associations", leading the scholars to argue that it is "hard to think of any other group of nations where the interaction between associations would be of similar intensity".[33] Based on the survey, they therefore conclude that there is indeed a "special Nordic subsystem in the global transnational interaction system".[34]

Among the conditions facilitating this system, is the limited number of associations, the short distances and "the lack of serious linguistic problems", along with similar political and social systems in the region.[35] Pan-national aims, as we find during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, connected to the pan-Scandinavian and pan-Nordic movements, are not part of the picture and the scholarly explanation in the 1970s. It is worth mentioning that the survey was conducted the same year as the Nordic Council of Ministers was founded, as a compensation and response to the failure in trying to form a Nordic economic union, NORDEK.

The survey, based on a questionnaire answered by around 1,000 Norwegian and 1,400 Finnish associations, showed that in 1971 almost all associations—if they had some kind of external contacts at all, as around 50% of them had—had bilateral or multilateral "links to the Nordic countries".[36] The other Nordic countries were highest in priority for Norwegian and Finnish associations, and this pattern, the authors argue, was probably the case for the other Nordic countries as well.[37] A part of the explanation of the frequent interaction is the fact that half of the associations with multilateral contacts were members of an inter-Nordic international non-governmental organization (INGO).[38] As part of the survey, a separate list was made of "the relatively unknown inter-Nordic associations",[39] containing 436 associations with members from a minimum of three countries. The authors estimated the number to be higher, however, between 500−600 in total. Most of these inter-Nordic associations, more precisely 75%, aimed to "promote common interests".[40] Hallenstvedt et al., moreover, considered the pattern of cooperation within inter-Nordic associations to be "quite stable, unbureaucratic and democratic in nature".[41] We may add that this pattern is historically rooted and a cumulative process with certain distinct features, including both pragmatism and pan-nationalism, which will be further explored in the following.

Towards a Taxonomy of Nordic Civil Society

In mapping the historical development of inter-Nordic associations and cooperation, it may be fruitful to categorize the associational landscape into two main sub-groups based on their main goals and orientations. In this suggested taxonomy the main division is between pan-nationally motivated vs. pragmatically oriented associational cooperation:

1. Associations of Nordic cooperation: explicitly pan-national ideologically oriented, idealistic, cultural-political multilateral associations, defining their main purpose as stimulating closer cohesion and collaboration.
2. Associations cooperating on a pragmatic and not primarily ideological basis.

The first main group, *pan-Scandinavian*, and later all-Nordic associations, represents a distinct feature of the inter-Nordic associational landscape. Within this category, three different kinds may be distinguished, depending on purpose and geographical scope, although there were many interactions between these groups. The main group comprises culturally-politically oriented associations, aiming at changing society towards stronger Nordic cohesion, although primarily confined to cultural activities. These kinds of associations were founded in several rounds during the long nineteenth century. A minor group consists of multilateral Nordic foundations, also directed at encouraging Nordic cooperation. A third group comprises common Scandinavian associations among Scandinavian diaspora communities abroad, mainly formed during the last part of the nineteenth century.

The second main group, *pragmatically oriented associations*, is characterized by their transnational and regional reach, focusing on particular issues and interests, utilizing Nordic cooperation to promote and pursue their goals. This large category may be further divided into different groups, ranging from cultural, literary, leisure, and sporting societies, to scholarly and professional associations, and even to organizations connected to popular movements (not least labour-based organizations). These kinds of associations are known from the early nineteenth century onwards.

Both groups include what I understand as transnational associations: associations with Nordic membership—on an individual or associational basis, with defined Nordic purposes, and often a common goal and a joint program and activities facilitating regular interaction, such as meetings and joint publications. The division between these groups is, furthermore, not always clear-cut and with several overlaps, and the potential of politicization of all kinds of Nordic associations is manifest and has varied over time.

Within both categories, there were different kinds of associational cooperative structures. One major group consists of *Nordic-level organizations or INGOs*, often structured as umbrella organizations, mainly with national associations or branches as members, and often with a common secretariat and committees. The other important group comprises *nationally based networking associations*, characterized by pursuing direct or indirect relations with other Nordic associations. Direct relations imply contacts with counterparts in other Nordic countries. Indirect connections, I understand, with Hallenstvedt et al., as "activities at home pertaining to international [here: Nordic] relations, directed to the membership, the public, other associations and/or the government".[42] Pan-Scandinavian-oriented associations, as well as many Scandinavian associations abroad, were typically organized as interlinked networks. The diverse, comprehensive and multilayered Nordic associational landscape includes both multilateral and bilateral organizations, eventually semi-official associations with close ties to the different national political systems, and not least cooperation through regularly held meeting series.

Nordic Associations and Meetings

Inter-Nordic associations, or in general associational relations across or even beyond the region, were, as already suggested, neither new nor unknown during

the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, and there are obviously certain path-dependencies and an older legacy behind the seemingly unexpected numbers found in the 1971 survey.

In the next part of this chapter, I will try to sketch the development and present several examples of inter-Nordic or Nordic-oriented voluntary associations founded between the 1790s and until the interwar period, several of them short-lived precursors of later inter-Nordic organizations and collaboration, but some of them still functioning. The oldest ones still existing are probably the Scandinavian Association in Rome (*Circolo Scandinavo*), founded in 1860 for Scandinavian artists and scientists in Rome and from the beginning supported by the Scandinavian governments and from the 1970s by the Nordic Council of Ministers,[43] and the Letterstedt Foundation (*Letterstedtska föreningen*), a privately endowed society established in Stockholm in 1875 to promote Nordic cultural and scholarly collaboration, and eventually with national branches in all Nordic countries.[44] I will confine the presentation to *multilateral associations*, although *bilateral associations* are also relevant parts of the broader picture and will be mentioned briefly. More informal and personal kinds of inter-Nordic associational exchange, although of great importance,[45] are not included.

"Conference-institutionalized Cooperation"

In the Nordic collaborative context, regularly held meetings are an intrinsic part of the emergence, growth and activities of inter-Nordic associations, representing arenas of direct relations. In an earlier study, I have mapped meeting series, or what Grass has termed "conference-institutionalized" cooperation, held at a Nordic level, during the nineteenth and early twentieth century.[46] Nordic meeting series numbered almost 100 between 1839 and 1905. Some of these led to—or were the result of—inter-Scandinavian associations and it is not always easy to separate meetings and associations categorically. In the mid-nineteenth century, Janse and te Velde remind us, associations and meetings were closely connected and hardly distinguished by the organizers, only gradually becoming more clearly separated forms: "Meetings were like short-term associations, and associations consisted of a series of meetings".[47]

The most famous Scandinavian meeting tradition is the student meetings organized between 1843 and 1875 in different Scandinavian cities. Each meeting was organized by national ad hoc committees, representing the traveling students and the host university. The gatherings were often spectacular events, creating transnational spaces and arguably contributing to spatial socio-cultural integration by bringing hundreds and thousands of students together, travelling by steamboats, celebrating, drinking, singing, toasting and listening to agitating speeches. Not a few students, later representing the societal elites, learned to know other Scandinavians and the idea of region-building, at least on a low-political, cultural level, thereby laying the ground for further cooperation of varied kinds, sometimes on a life-long basis.[48]

Nordic meeting series became gradually more frequent, especially after the 1860s. One of the early important meetings, among national economists, starting

in 1863 on Swedish initiatives, later organized by the respective national associations, included many civil servants as well as politicians among the participants.[49] The same goes for the Nordic Jurist Meetings starting in 1872, which still regularly gather Nordic jurists and legal scholars as the oldest meeting tradition of this kind. To organize conferences and meetings, along with publishing proceedings and/or common journals have been central activities in most of the inter-Nordic associations. The meetings often included major social programmes where a rhetoric of Nordicness and normative statements on behalf of common Scandinavian ideas flourished.[50] These meeting series undoubtedly contributed to bringing central actors, large groups of students, teachers and numerous other groups together, shaping and nourishing transnational networks and Nordic platforms across the region.

"Scandinavian" Associations

Voluntary associations have been perceived as the "prime engines of civil society".[51] In the Nordic transnational context, the tradition of meeting series is, as mentioned, a vital part of this picture, but in the following, the focus will be on associational bodies organized on a Nordic level and/or with Nordic purposes. Inspired by the mid- and late-nineteenth-century spirit of association and the belief in the merit of organizing,[52] Scandinavians founded and joined associations and participated in common gatherings not only on local and national grounds, but also on a Scandinavian level. In general, these associations often included the adjectives "Scandinavian" or "Nordic" in their names. Scandinavians also founded national and Scandinavian associations abroad. This national—and pan-national—naming tradition reflects a general trend of using "Swedish", "Danish", "Norwegian", "British", etc. in the titles of societies from around 1800.[53]

Before going into more detail on the two main groups of Nordic associations, starting with the pan-nationally oriented ones, I will present some numbers. Preliminary findings indicate that between 40 and 50 different inter-Scandinavian or Nordic-oriented associations were founded within the region between 1796 and 1905 (see below), with an increasing tendency after the 1870s, reflecting the "general organisation of society into associational activity" from the latter decades of the nineteenth century.[54] After 1900, and especially from around 1913, the growth of inter-Nordic associations is marked, with approximately 80 associations founded between 1905 and 1939.[55] As a parallel development, mirroring—but also outnumbering—the emergence and growth within the region until 1905, Scandinavian associational life abroad thrived. Beyond the region, probably around 125 Scandinavian associations, mainly in European and North American cities, were founded during the mid- and late nineteenth century.[56] Most of these associations abroad, and also several within the region, disappeared, or were divided along national lines after 1905, due to the dissolution of the Norwegian-Swedish union and the national discord and strong reactions it caused in Sweden, directed

at almost all kinds of Nordic cooperation.[57] In spite of this temporal setback, the gradual expansion of meetings and associations means that ever broader sections of the population connected to many kinds of professions, different popular movements, and an array of organizations and institutions of different types, both within and beyond the region, had some sort of regular Nordic exchange during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Pan-national Associations from Scandinavianism to Nordism

The first known example of an association naming itself as "Scandinavian" within the region, is the Danish-dominated Scandinavian Literary Society (*Skandinavisk Literatur-Selskab*), founded in Copenhagen in 1796. The purpose of this society was to stimulate "literary exchange" between the Scandinavian states through a common journal and later a book series.[58] Explicitly pan-Scandinavian influenced, programmatic associations were, however, first founded in the 1840s and were usually nationally based. During the long nineteenth century, around 15 different and relatively short-lived associations, some of them including regional and local branches, were established, in Denmark and Sweden from 1843, and in Norway from 1864. These associations were forerunners of the Norden Associations of the early twentieth century, with associations in Iceland and Finland as well.

- 1796–1830s: Scandinavian Literary Society, Copenhagen (*Skandinavisk Literatur-Selskab*)
- 1843–56: Scandinavian Society, Copenhagen (*Skandinavisk Selskab*)
- 1843–52: Scandinavian Society, Uppsala (*Skandinaviska Sällskapet*)
- 1848–50s: Scandinavian Society, Gothenburg (*Skandinaviska Sällskapet*)
- 1864–72: Scandinavian Society, Christiania (*Skandinavisk Selskab*)
- 1865–72: Nordic National Assocation, Stockholm (*Nordiska Nationalföreningen*)
    - Regional branches in Lund and Gothenburg
- 1866–72: Nordic Society, Copenhagen (*Nordisk Samfund*)
- 1875–: Letterstedt Association/Foundation, Stockholm (*Letterstedtska föreningen för industri, vetenskap och konst*)
    - National branches in Norway, Denmark, Finland and Iceland
- 1899–1905: Nordic Association, Copenhagen (*Nordisk forening*)
- 1899–1905: Nordic Association, Kristiania (*Nordisk forening*)
- 1899–1905: Nordic Association, Stockholm (*Nordisk forening*)
    - Regional branches in Uppsala, Gothenburg, Norrköping and Lund
    - A Swedish youth association
        - Local branches of the Lund associations
- 1919: Norden Association, Norway (*Foreningen Norden*)
- 1919: Norden Association, Sweden (*Foreningen Norden*)
- 1919: Norden Association, Denmark (*Foreningen Norden*)
- 1922: Norden Association, Iceland (*Foreningen Norden*)
- 1924: Norden Association, Finland (*Foreningen Norden*)

Pan-national associations cooperated within the region, through direct and indirect relations, pursuing common activities, such as joint gatherings and common publications, and as such constituted a transnational network of associations across—and through contacts with Scandinavian associations abroad to some extent beyond—the region. They were mostly elite dominated and did not amount to a popular movement until the Norden Associations gained broader popular support in the 1950s. With the exception of the early Scandinavian Literary Society and the Letterstedt Foundation, keeping strictly out of political engagement, these associations were more or less explicitly connected to the pan-Scandinavian, and later Nordist movement, with its changing features during the long nineteenth century, and thus could provoke national reactions, varying during the century and with different intensity from country to country.[59]

The first example of these new associations simply using "Scandinavian society" as their registered name, was the Scandinavian Society in Copenhagen, founded in 1843, swiftly followed by similar associations in Uppsala (1843) and Gothenburg (1848). This represented something new, as the Swedish encyclopedia, *Svenskt Konversations Lexicon*, published in 1848, suggests by including an entry on "Scandinavian associations", defining them as new societies for the promotion of, in fact, a "Scandinavian nationality" through the dissemination of literature.[60] The terminology and ideological explanation of the term in the encyclopedia reveals the pan-Scandinavian influences and orientations at the time. The Scandinavian associations in Denmark and Sweden—Norway was more hesitant and only organized a book committee connected to the national student organization, the Norwegian Student Association (*Det norske Studentersamfund*)—were founded directly after the first Scandinavian student meeting in Uppsala in 1843.[61] In Denmark, the first attempt to form a Scandinavian Society (*Skandinavisk Samfund*) in July 1843 by leaders of the pan-Scandinavian movement, was prohibited by the absolutist authorities fearing Russian reactions. The Copenhagen cultural elite mobilized, however, and formed another Scandinavian Society (*Skandinavisk Selskab*), in September 1843. This time it got the necessary approval on the explicit precondition that it should not discuss politics.

The official aim of these associations was to strengthen Scandinavian sympathies and mutual cultural contact between the Scandinavian countries,[62] "to further a literary connection between the three Scandinavian peoples and thereby, as far as possible, to contribute to the development of Scandinavian culture", as the first clause of the statutes of the society in Uppsala stated.[63] To disseminate and distribute Scandinavian literature was thus a central task, primarily across the Scandinavian countries, but also to the newly formed associations founded by Scandinavian diaspora communities in Europe and North America.[64] The associations were a means to disseminate ideas of Scandinavian unity, if officially only by cultural and literary means, although activists agitated for a long-term political goal of Scandinavian unification. The Scandinavian associations of the 1840s formed an informal network and participated in common meetings, such as the Scandinavian student meetings, but in general had a limited degree of cooperation. They were dissolved during the 1850s—the Uppsala society was merged with the

new general student association in the city, and the association in Copenhagen was closed down in 1856.

New pan-Scandinavian associations were formed in all three Scandinavian countries during and after the Second Schleswig War in 1864 that resulted in the painful loss of the Duchy of Schleswig, without the expected help from Norwegian and Swedish military forces. The Scandinavian Society founded in Christiania in May 1864, was also the first Norwegian association of this kind, as many Norwegians perceived Scandinavianism as a competing more than a complementary national project and feared Swedish political ambitions of closer amalgamation. New associations were formed in Sweden in 1865 and in Copenhagen in 1866 (see list). These associations were clearly more political in orientation, although also pursuing what was called "practical Scandinavianism". They had a closer cooperation than their predecessors, not least through their common journal *Nordisk Tidskrift för politik, ekonomi och litteratur* (Nordic Political, Economic and Literary Journal), published 1866–70. Alongside focusing on Scandinavian literature and culture, the message of political unification in the journal was explicit.[65] The associations organized a common "political meeting" in Stockholm in 1869 and promoted all kinds of Scandinavian cooperation. They were dissolved in 1871, reflecting limited interest in political Scandinavianism after the German unification.[66]

Around 1900, as a response to perceived threats from Germany and Russia against the southern and eastern borders of the region, as well as rising tensions within the Swedish-Norwegian union, a renewed interest arose in Nordic cooperation and what was termed "neo-Scandinavianism". This led to the formation of new pan-Scandinavian associations, this time termed Nordic Association, again as nation-based networked associations, in Denmark and Norway, and with several branches, including a youth association, in Sweden. They had explicitly cultural-literary purposes and functioned as networked associations, collaborating on a joint journal, *Norden* (1899–1906). This period, 1899–1905, I have termed an Indian summer for Nordic cooperation and pan-Scandinavian ideas, due to a wide range of literary and practical collaborating initiatives, in addition to the Nordic Associations, and a general trend of ideologization of all kinds of Nordic cooperation and cohesion.[67] There was also a loose international network, a "Connection between Nordic associations within and beyond the Nordic countries", initiated by the Nordic Associations and aimed at an exchange of information and potential mutual support.[68]

The dissolution of the Norwegian-Swedish union in 1905 had a marked effect on the flourishing Scandinavian civil society activities. A "Nordic winter" followed the promising Indian summer, with Swedish reactions leading to a pronounced anti-Scandinavianism and national reactions directed at most kinds of Nordic cooperation. Most of the existing pan-Scandinavian associations, both at home and abroad, were dissolved after 1905.[69]

The First World War experience, however, revitalized Nordic cooperation. Shortly after the war, the Norden Associations were established in the three Scandinavian countries in 1919, in Iceland 1922 and in Finland 1924, as explicitly non-political organizations, but with pan-Nordic ambitions, promoting Nordic

cooperation in general. The practice established during the nineteenth century, with nation-based associations, was followed once again. The associations constituted a Nordic collaborative network with common annual meetings of national delegates and a joint journal and other publications, mainly during the first years. In 1965 a joint, although weak, umbrella organization was formed, the Norden Association's Federation (*Foreningene Nordens Forbund*). The Norden Associations have had close contacts with the political establishment in their respective countries from the beginning. They became central hubs within the Nordic subsystem of civil society during the interwar and postwar years, promoting voluntary and official Nordic cooperation of most kinds.[70]

The Norden Associations are still today the most profiled all-Nordic associations with an explicit Nordic-ideological goal, with around 600 branches across the Nordic region and neighbouring countries, although the membership rate has declined for many years after being at its height in the 1950s.[71] The vision of the Norden Association's Federation, in part concurrent with the official Nordic vision, is "to make the Nordic region stronger for all of the Nordic citizens by working for a more integrated region", even adding after a slash: "a Nordic confederation", and to strengthen the Nordic region globally by the same means.[72] These associations function as semi-official organizations supported by their respective state administrations and seek to influence both political authorities and the population in general. There are, argues former general secretary of the Swedish association, Arne F. Andersson, "not any similar kind of organizations anywhere else."[73] This claim may be true, as the other exceptionalist statements mentioned above, although it deserves a systematic comparative examination.

A related kind of associations, still active in the region, is Nordic bilateral cultural and friendship societies and foundations with the aim of promoting "Nordic solidarity and sense of community" by strengthening cultural links between two or more Nordic countries.[74] A survey by Nanna S. Hermansson from 2007 lists more than 30 such bilateral funds and societies, most of them established and directly or indirectly supported by national governments.[75] Hermansson states that the oldest of these bilateral friendship societies is the Danish-Icelandic Society from 1916, but there were several similar associations formed during the nineteenth century.[76] Similar foundations on a Nordic, multilateral level, are, as indicated, the Letterstedt Foundation, based in Stockholm and with national branches and publishing their own journal since 1878,[77] as well as the Clara Lachman Foundation and others.[78]

A specific group of pan-Scandinavian associations in the long nineteenth century, is, as mentioned, associations founded by and for Scandinavian diaspora communities abroad, which I have tried to map in an earlier study.[79] They also usually named themself "Scandinavian (or Nordic) association" in a specific city, as the Nordic Society in London, known from the 1780s, the Scandinavian Association in Hamburg, founded in 1842, and followed by approximately 125 Scandinavian associations during the century, particularly in European cities—Rome is already mentioned—but also in several cities in North America, Latin America, Australia, South Africa and Asia. Within Europe and North America, there were loose associational networks, as well as contacts with Scandinavian associations

in the homelands, and the inspiration from the pan-Scandinavian movement is at times pronounced. Most of these emigrant and expatriate associations, at least in Europe, were dissolved after the dissolution of the Norwegian-Swedish union in 1905, leading Swedish nationally oriented publicists and others to argue that the Scandinavian associations abroad were the last remnants of the detested ideas of Scandinavianism.[80] One main associational network, with a Danish-dominated umbrella organization based in Zurich in 1901, is the Central Support Fund for Scandinavians Abroad (*Central-Understøttelseskasse for Skandinaver i Udlandet*, C.U.K.), supporting travelling journeymen in Europe, and with around 30 local branches, mainly in German-speaking countries. The association has continued their activities and is still functioning, now based in Copenhagen.[81]

The pan-Scandinavian associations of the nineteenth century, and Scandinavianism as such, promoted and stimulated Scandinavian cooperation in general, and even if the high-political goals of Scandinavian political unification failed, the failures worked, one may say, in a productive way, facilitating low-political outreach and results that are not to be underestimated.[82] Scandinavianism, and later Nordism, as pan-national ideas thus contributed substantially to Nordic region-building, not least through associational means.[83] This claim may be substantiated through including other kinds of inter-Nordic associational cooperation advancing during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Pragmatic Nordic Associational Cooperation

Several inter-Nordic associations were founded during the long nineteenth century for pragmatic reasons and to pursue specific interests through joint efforts, mirroring the general development of national associational life. Most of these inter-Nordic or Nordic-oriented associations define Nordic cooperation and cross-national relations among their main tasks, but they otherwise reflect an array of different purposes, usually motivated by pragmatic rather than ideological reasons. Based on available sources, a list including many of these associations founded between 1839 and 1905 illustrates the number and scope. Of 30 associations—in addition to the pan-national associations formed within and beyond the region—almost 15 were founded during the 1890s. In general, most of them were professional associations or connected to the labour movement.

- 1839: Scandinavian Association of Natural Scientists (*Skandinaviska Naturforskaresällskapet*)
- 1847: Society for Nordic Art, Copenhagen (*Selskabet for nordisk Kunst*)
- 1847: Scandinavian Society, Stockholm (*Skandinaviska Sällskapet*)
- 1851: Nordic Bookstore Association (*Den nordiske bokhandlerforening*)
- 1861: Nordic Beekeepers Association (*Nordiska biföreningen*)
- 1864: Association for the Preaching of the Gospel to Scandinavian Seamen in Foreign Ports (*Foreningen til Evangeliets Forkyndelse for Skandinaviske Sjømænd i fremmede Havner*), from 1892: Scandinavian Seamen's mission (*Skandinavisk sjømannsmisjon)*

- 1866: Scandinavian Dentists' Association (*Skandinaviska tandläkareföreningen*)
- 1869/74: Nordic Railwaymen's Association (*Nordiska järnvägsmannasällska pet*)
- 1876: Nordic Glovemakers' Association (*Nordiske Handskemagerforbund*)
- 1878: Nordic Penitentiary Association (*Nordisk penitentiärförening*)
- 1882: Nordic Animal Protection Society (*Nordiska samfundet till bekämpande av det vetenskapliga djurplågeriet/Nordisk dyrebeskyttelsesunion*)
- 1889: Nordic Shipowners' Association (*Nordisk skipsrederforening*)
- 1890: Nordic Gym Teachers' Society (*Skandinaviska gymnastiklärersällskapet*)
- 1891: Nordic Teachers' Total Abstinence Association (*Nordiska lärarnes helnykterhetsförening*)
- 1892: Scandinavian White Tanners' Association (*Det skandinaviske hvidgarverforbund*)
- 1893: Nordic Surgeons' Association (*Nordisk kirurgisk forening*)
- 1894: Scandinavian Saddlemaker and Upholsterers' Association (*Skandinavisk sadelmager- og tapetsererforbund*)
- 1894: Nordic Philatelist Federation (*Nordiska filatelistförbundet*)
- 1896: Scandinavian Stonemasons' Federation (*Skandinaviska stenhuggeriarbe tarförbundet*)
- 1896: Nordic University Committee (*Den nordiske universitetskomité*)
- 1898: Nordic Collaborative Brick Association (*Nordens samverkande tegelföreningar*)
- 1899: Nordic Chess Federation (*Nordisk sjakkforbund*)
- 1899: Nordic Locomotive Driver's Federation (*Nordisk lokomotivmandförbund*)
- 1899: Nordic Press Federation (*Nordisk presseforbund*), from 1918 Federation of Scandinavian Press Associations (*Sammenslutningen av skandinaviske presseforbund*)
- 1901: Association for Scandinavian Seamen's Home in Foreign Ports (*Foreningen for de skandinaviske sjømandshjem i fremmede havne*)
- 1901: Central Committee for Scandinavian Sport Federations (*Centralkommittén för skandinaviska idrottsförbunden*), from 1918 (Nordic Committee for National Sport Federations (*Nordiske rigsidræts-forbunds fælleskomité*)
- 1901: Scandinavian Committee for Mutuality/Nordic General and Factory Workers' Federation (*Skandinaviska ömsesidighetskommittén*, 1953: *Nordiska grov- och fabriksarbetarefederationen*)
- 1903: Nordic Photographers' Federation (*Nordiska fotograf-förbundet*)
- 1904: Nordic Association for Economic Cooperation (*Nordisk Forening for Økonomisk Samarbejde*)

The first Nordic-level pragmatically motivated association, the Scandinavian Association of Natural Scientists, was also the first in the range of Nordic meeting series, illustrating the close connection between these kinds of Nordic civil society collaboration. The initiative was inspired by German and Swiss associations and their meetings, and natural scientists from the Scandinavian countries participated at the German meetings in Berlin in 1828 and in Hamburg in 1830. In a German

context, the meetings in the Society of German Natural Scientists and Physicians (*Gesellschaft Deutsche Naturforscher und Ärzte*) starting in 1822, were the first common gatherings of the German-speaking middle class other than the trade fairs, and they had a pan-German character.[84] Instead of the trouble of travelling southwards, Scandinavian scholars, initiated by the Norwegian natural scientist Christian Egeberg, decided to organize a congress in Scandinavia for natural scientists from the region. The famous Swedish scholar Jacob Berzelius first opposed the idea as a less fruitful expression of what he tellingly called the "Scandinavian associational spirit", fearing that the Scandinavian scholarly community would be too small.[85]

Due to its transnational character, the organizers of the first meeting in Gothenburg, gathering 93 participants from the Scandinavian countries, had to ask the authorities for a formal permit. The event, perceived as something new of its kind in the region, led early pan-Scandinavian activists, some of them participating at the meeting, to proclaim the trade city of Gothenburg to be the place where the "firstborn living son of the Nordic scientific union" saw the light of day.[86] Although pan-Scandinavian rhetoric definitely occurred as part of the social-cultural program, the reasons for the meetings and the association, from the beginning and continuing throughout the century until 1936, was to exchange and promote scholarly results and research. Meetings were held in Swedish, Danish, Norwegian and eventually Finnish cities. The common association had its own statutes and consisted of national committees. This way of organizing Nordic cooperation was followed by a range of other groups, and the natural scientists' organization may be seen as an inspirational impulse for many other groups. At the turn of the century, the many different sections at the comprehensive natural scientists' meetings led to the formation of new and more specialized associations, such as the Nordic Surgeons' Association, formed in 1893. In general, there was considerable interest in the press for these and other kinds of Nordic meetings, which were often covered carefully, not least regarding the speeches and toasts during the social events.

Another early transnational association, oriented towards Old Norse history, although clearly Danish-dominated, was the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries (*Nordisk Oldskriftselskab*), founded in 1825 in Copenhagen and later expanded with a Norwegian branch.[87] Among other early examples is the Society for Nordic Art, also Danish-dominated, founded after a meeting at the Scandinavian Society in Copenhagen in 1847. After the Second Schleswig War in 1864 and the German unification in 1870, which reduced the relevance of political Scandinavianism, there is a rise in transnational associations and meetings. This reflects both the more practical strategies employed by pan-Scandinavian activists, but also the general rise of all kinds of associations on different levels.

Some Nordic associations were based in the Nordic countries but were primarily directed at groups outside the region, such as the Association for the Preaching of the Gospel to Scandinavian Seamen in Foreign Ports, later the Scandinavian Seamans' Mission, founded in 1864. Scandinavian organizational cooperation as part of different kinds of international engagement was, furthermore, increasing during the last part of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, such as Scandinavian participants or sections in international organizations as well

as Scandinavian party political organizations among settler colonies in North America.[88] Associational Scandinavian life and experiences abroad, where the distance from national conflicts and demarcations at home contributed to fostering a Scandinavian identity, certainly had repercussions back home. A later example of a Scandinavian institution abroad was the folk high school in Geneva in the 1930s, founded as a collaborative Nordic social democratic project.[89]

An important part of the rising Nordic civil society cooperation was connected to the emerging labour movement, with contacts across—and beyond—the region dating back to the 1840s and rapidly expanding since the 1880s and throughout the interwar period. The "Scandinavian association" founded in Stockholm in 1847, was, in spite of its name, not a pan-Scandinavian association like the ones in Uppsala and Gothenburg, but rather a radical or communist association.[90] The transnational contacts between the early radical labour movement within the region and traveling journeymen associating on a Scandinavian level abroad, is so far clearly understudied. Within the region, there were several associational contacts and initiatives predating the first Scandinavian labour congress, held in Gothenburg in 1886 (see list).[91] Labour and trade unions were formed on a Scandinavian level before many national ones, and the term "labour Scandinavianism" was used already from the mid-1880s.[92] In 1905 it signaled a more solid cooperation than the "bourgeoise Scandinavianism" that has failed spectacularly, it was argued.[93]

In general, the dissolution of the Norwegian-Swedish union in 1905 led to a "Nordic winter", with most Nordic meeting series put on hold or cancelled and many Nordic associations dissolved, but within the labour movement and related organizations, there were still activities during this period. A major new association, formed after 1905, was the Nordic Inter-Parliamentary Union of 1907.[94] Other kinds of associations formed in the first years after 1905 include labour organizations such as the Scandinavian Transport Worker Federation (1907) and the Postmen's Union (1911), medical associations like the Nordic Dermatological Association (1910) and the Association for Internal Medicine (1913), and sport associations, such as the Nordic Rowing Association (1910) and Cycling Association (1913) and a Nordic Committee for National Sport Federations (1914). During and after the First World War, reminding the region of the importance of standing together, several Nordic organizations were established: among Nordic students (1915), the Scandinavian Museum Association (1915), a Nordic woman's movement association (1916), the Nordic Association of Odontology (1917) and ones related to temperance associations, church-related activities, sport and medicine.

During 1918, when the meeting of the three Scandinavian kings and their foreign ministers in Malmö highly encouraged Nordic cooperation, seven Nordic organizations were formed: The Nordic Federation of Public Administration,[95] the Nordic Peace Association, the Nordic Association of Agricultural Science, the Nordic Association of Freight Forwarders, the Scandinavian Co-operativ Wholesale Society the Scandinavian Woodworkers' Secretariat and the Nordic Music Union. The next year, in 1919, eleven new Nordic-level organizations were founded, the Nordic Writers' Council, Nordic Gymnastics Federation, the Nordic

Prohibition Committee, the Nordic Union of Railwaymen, The Interscandinavian Union of Engineers, Nordic Society of Medical Radiology, the Nordic Orthopaedic Federation, the Nordic Housewives Association, the Scandinavian Bureau of the Communist International (from 1924 the Federation of the Scandinavian and Finnish Communist Parties), a Nordic Society of Tuberculosis Physicians and a joint organization of Scandinavian editors.

The formation of the Norden Associations in 1919 thus reflected a broader tendency towards Nordic cooperation. This development continued during the 1920s, with around 25 new Nordic organizations. During the first years of the 1930s, 160 Nordic gatherings, meetings and organizations were listed in the journal of the Lettersted Foundation.[96] In the mid-1930s, the concept of labour Scandinavianism resurfaced, utilized by the social democratic governments reassuring their close cooperation in a world of rising international tensions, and also with the Norwegian Labour Party rejoining Nordic and international social democratic cooperation.[97] The main collaborative organ, the Scandinavian Cooperation Committee of the Labour Movement from 1913, was renewed and further formalized through the Nordic Cooperation Committee of the Labour Movement, SAMAK (*Samarbejdskomitteen for den Nordiske arbejderbevægelse*), uniting the Danish, Finnish, Icelandic and Swedish Social Democratic movements in 1932.[98]

While formalized Nordic cooperation mainly took place within a civil society context in the nineteenth century, the interwar era included stronger political interaction and a growing amount of intergovernmental and interparliamentary cooperation, for domestic and international purposes, in addition to and interacting with the civil society engagement. The importance of Nordic cooperation was manifested in 1936, through the celebration of a Nordic Day in October, a successful joint effort by the Norden Associations and the Social Democratic governments now in power.[99] On this day, a Norwegian newspaper stated, "it is difficult to name any branch of the activities of the peoples which have not organized their Nordic cooperation".[100]

In conjunction with the celebration, a survey of Nordic associational cooperation was pursued by the Norden Association in Sweden. The Swedish newspaper *Aftonbladet* published a short account of what was termed a "systematic and thorough survey" of Nordic exchanges within associational life, under the rather inaccurate title of "Index of Nordic Associations". A questionnaire was circulated to 716 associations in Sweden. Of the 533 associations which reported back, as many as 327—around 60%—confirmed that they had experiences with Nordic cooperation of one kind or another. Among business-oriented organizations, there were around 50% with Nordic contacts, while almost all associations with scientific or cultural goals reported Nordic activities, spanning from the publication of Nordic journals, the organization of joint conferences or frequent meetings, to more occasional contacts.[101] Although there is a potential bias in reporting back on this kind of questionnaire by associations primarily supportive of Nordic cooperation, the result of the survey aligns well, as we have seen, with statements from the press. It also illustrates, together with the associational development presented in this chapter, that the inter-Nordic international organizations, presented as relatively

"unknown" in the 1971 survey, had a solid, historical base and represented a comprehensive Nordic cooperation practice that later official organs could build on.

Conclusion

Motivating and legitimating Nordic cooperation conceptually in different ways, including associational cooperation, has been done as long as the cooperation has taken place. The most recent turn in this development seems to be the phrase of "Nordic added value", utilized to underline the usefulness of official Nordic cooperation today and as a guiding principle in funding relevant activities.[102] When introduced in 1995 by the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers, it was defined as activities that "could otherwise be undertaken at the national level, but where concretely positive effects are generated through common Nordic solutions"; moreover that these activities "manifest and develop a sense of Nordic community"; and, furthermore, "increase Nordic competence and competitiveness".[103] While being an instrumental, policy-strategical device, "Nordic added value", paradoxically, also seems to legitimate reduced support to and funding of cultural cooperation, which, as shown in this chapter, constitute a historical foundation of Nordic region-building as such.

Neither the cultural-political pan-Scandinavian associations formed within, and beyond, the region from the 1840s, nor the broader pattern of region-building civil activities and the "Scandinavian associational spirit" that they were part of, have been thoroughly studied. Based on preliminary findings, one may nevertheless argue that the long nineteenth century was a foundational period for the growth of Nordic cooperation and civil society integration from below, inspired, and at times hampered by pan-national ideas and in general were part of pragmatic interests-based responses to societal and economic developments. During this period, almost 100 Nordic-level or Nordic-oriented associations were founded within the region, along with at least 100 different meeting series since 1839. In addition, more than 100 Scandinavian associations were formed abroad. This associational landscape may be divided into two main, although partly overlapping categories: pan-national idealistic associations of Nordic cooperation and transnational associations pursuing particular goals and pragmatically using the Nordic region as a relevant platform.

Together, this comprehensive activity, seen as a cumulative process, arguably constitutes if not a common Nordic civil society, at least a Nordic subsystem of civil society within certain fields, and in general a networked Scandinavia. This often-unacknowledged specific Nordic experience of civil society and transnational exchange constituted during the mid-twentieth century a region more or less spiderwebbed with inter-Nordic networks, associations and institutions, although the main framework for civil society development was—and probably still is—the nation-state. The national perspective often employed in civil society research may conceal the importance of border-crossing activities, so manifest in the region. This development has had significant historical rises and ruptures, setbacks and renewals, partly due to its interconnections with national and pan-national ideas

and movements, partly as a response to international tensions and tendencies. This kind of low-political, socio-cultural cooperation, or even hidden integration, may also be seen as positive outcomes of "productive failures",[104] as pragmatic, more sustainable, low-profile solutions compensating for failed high-political projects, of which there have been an abundance in the history of Nordic cooperation.[105]

Notes

1 Novak, "The American Law of Association," 163.
2 Götz, Haggrén and Hilson, "Nordic Cooperation."
3 Strang, "Introduction."
4 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 138.
5 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*.
6 Stenius and Haggren, "Det nordiska samarbetets."
7 Strang, "Introduction."
8 Hemstad and Stadius, "Introduction," 11.
9 See also Ørskov, "The Scandinavist Origins," Stadius "Nordism" and Stadius' contribution to this volume.
10 "Our Vision 2030", www.norden.org/en/declaration/our-vision-2030 (accessed 3 July 2024).
11 *Norden* (1920–29).
12 Åhlén, ed., *Svenskt Föreningslexikon*, vol. 1.
13 Åhlén, "Föreningslivets historia," 18.
14 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 127.
15 Among them, Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, Hemstad, "Organised into existence," Götz and Haggrén, *Regional Cooperation*, Strang, "Introduction."
16 Clark, *British Clubs*, 429.
17 Misa and Schot, "Inventing Europe," 2–3.
18 Misa and Schot, "Inventing Europe," 7.
19 Hemstad, "From Peace on the Scandinavian Peninsula."
20 See also Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*.
21 Götz, Haggren and Hilson, "Nordic Cooperation," 58; Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, Hemstad, "Organise into existence."
22 Strang, "Introduction." Østergaard, "The Geopolitics."
23 Strang, "Introduction," 3.
24 See Mary Hilson's epilogue to this volume.
25 Strang, "Introduction."
26 Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*.
27 See also Hemstad and Stadius, *Nordic Experiences*.
28 Strang, "Introduction."
29 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 126.
30 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 124.
31 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 128.
32 Not including enterprises, foundations, cooperative organizations, or organizations controlled by government. Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 125.
33 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 135, 132.
34 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 138.
35 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 138.

36 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 136.
37 For a more recent report on Finland and Nordic cooperation, see Häggman, *Det nordiska Finland*.
38 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 136.
39 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 125.
40 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 136−38.
41 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 148.
42 Hallenstvedt et al., eds, *The Nordic Transnational*, 129.
43 The Nordic Council of Ministers decided to cut their funding in 2024, but some funding was granted in the revised budget. The future funding is, at the time of writing, fundamentally uncertain. circoloscandinavo.it (accessed 25 March 2024).
44 www.letterstedtska.org (accessed 28 June 2024).
45 See Stadius' contribution to this volume,
46 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, Grass, "The Strongest Bridge."
47 te Velde and Janse, *Organizing Democracy*.
48 See Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*.
49 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, 605–31, *Nationalekonomiska möten i Norden under 100 år*.
50 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*. See also Stadius' contribution to this volume.
51 Clark, *British Clubs*, 487.
52 te Welde and Janse, *Organizing Democracy*.
53 Clark, *British Clubs*, Jansson, *Adertonhundratalets*.
54 David Kirby, "What was 'Nordic'," 22.
55 Preliminary list based on, among others, Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*; *Svenskt föreningslexicon* 1, *Norden* (1920−29); *Nordisk Tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri* (1935).
56 Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
57 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*; Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
58 See also Julius Clausen, *Skandinavismen historisk fremstillet*, 18.
59 See Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*.
60 *Svenskt Konversations Lexicon*, 547−48.
61 *Beretning om studentertoget til Upsala*.
62 *Beretning om Studentertoget til Upsala*, 91–104.
63 Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
64 Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
65 *Nordisk tidskrift för politik, ekonomi och litteratur* 1−5 (1866−70).
66 On political Scandinavianism in the 1840s to 1860s, Rasmus Glenthøj and Morten Nordhagen Ottosen have published extensively the recent years, see f.ex. Ottosen, "Windows of opportunity," Glenthøj, "Highwater" and Glenthøj and Ottosen, *Scandinavia and Bismarck*.
67 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*.
68 "Forbindelse mellem nordiske foreninger," *Norden* 3 (Dec. 1901): 29−30.
69 Hemstad, *Fra Indian summer*, Hemstad "Organised into existence."
70 Stadius, «Nordism», Micheletti, "Föreningen Norden."
71 Hermansson, *Nordiska bilaterale*, 20; Stadius, "Hundra år av nordism."
72 www.norden.no/om-foreningen/prinsipprogram (accessed 15 March 2024).
73 Hermansson, *Nordiska bilaterala*, 21. Andersson held this position from 1945 to 1979.
74 Hermansson, *Nordiska bilaterale*.
75 Hermanson, *Nordiska bilaterala*, 21.

76 Some of these are mentioned in *Svenskt Föreningslexicon*.
77 *Nordisk Tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri*.
78 Founded in 1920.
79 Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
80 Hemstad, "Organised into existence."
81 Hemstad, "Organised into existence," www.naverne-cuk.dk (accessed 25 March 2024).
82 On low-political vs. high-political in pan-national movements see Maxwell, "Pan-nationalism"; Hemstad and Stadius, "Introduction," 5.
83 Hemstad and Stadius, *Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms*.
84 Eriksson, *"I andans kraft,"* 40.
85 Eriksson, *"I andans kraft,"* 160.
86 *Brage og Idun*, 3(1) (1840): 22.
87 See Gunnarsdóttir's contribution to this volume.
88 Rasmussen, *Civil War Settlers*.
89 Hellenes, "Pilgrims and Missionaries." See also Engh's contribution to this volume.
90 On this association, see Jansson, *Adertonhundratalets associationer*.
91 Grass, "The Strongest Bridge," Kirby, "What was 'Nordic'," 29.
92 On labour Scandinavianism and Nordic labour cooperation, see Krake and Hemstad, "Labour Scandinavianism."
93 Krake and Hemstad, "Labour Scandinavianism."
94 Ørskov, "The Scandinavist Origin."
95 See Stadius' contribution to this volume.
96 "Nordiska möten och sammanslutningar m.m.." *Nordisk Tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri* 11 (1935), 92–96, 173–76, 237–40, 319–20, 388–92, 465–72, 542–44, 629–32.
97 Hemstad, "Promoting *Norden*," 39−40.
98 Norway became a member in the late 1930s. Krake and Hemstad, "Labour Scandinavianism."
99 Hemstad, "Promoting *Norden*."
100 "Et mål for samarbeidet," *Norges Handels- og Sjøfartstidende*, 27 October 1936.
101 *Aftenbladet* 26 October 1936: "Register över nordiska föreningar" (Index of Nordic associations).
102 Limatainen, *Nordic added value*. See also Ørskov et. al, *Nordic added value*.
103 Limatainen, *Nordic added value*.
104 I would like to thank Andreas Mørkved Hellenes for making me aware of the concepts of productive and destructive failures related to his project on "A history of non-sustainable integration. High-speed trains, Europeanisation and the failure of the Nordic triangle, 1985−2005 (2023−25).
105 Strang, "Introduction."

Bibliography

Aftonbladet, 1936.

Åhlén, Bengt. "Föreningslivets historia." In Bengt Åhlén, ed. *Svenskt Föreningslexikon*, 7−18. Uppsala: Ludvig Larsson Boktryckeri, 1951.

———, ed. *Svenskt Föreningslexikon*. Vol. 1. Uppsala: Ludvig Larsson Boktryckeri, 1951.

Beretning om Studentertoget til Upsala i Juni Maaned 1843, afgiven af den danske Bestyrelse. København: Wahlske Boghandels Forlag, 1844.

Clark, Peter. *British Clubs and Societies, 1580−1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Clausen, Julius. *Skandinavismen: historisk fremstillet*. Copenhagen: Nordiske Forl., 1900.

Eriksson, Nils. *"I andans kraft, på sannings stråt…De skandinaviska naturforskarmötena 1839–1936."* Gothenburg Studies in the History of Science and Ideas 12. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, 1991.

Glenthøj, Rasmus. "Highwater for Political Scandinavianism, 1863−1865." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by R. Hemstad and P. Stadius, 57−75. London: Routledge, 2023.

Glenthøj, Rasmus, and Morten Nordhagen Ottosen. *Scandinavia and Bismarck: The Zenith of Scandinavianism*. London: Palgrave, 2024.

Grass, Martin. " 'The Strongest Bridge Between the Nordic Peoples': Scandinavian Archives and Collections." In *The World in the Basement: International Material in Archives and Collections*, edited by M. Grass, G. Litzell, and K. Misgeld, 11−16. Stockholm: Labour Movement Archives and Library, 2002.

Græger, Nina, Ruth Hemstad, Peter Nedergaard and Peter Stadius, eds. *Handbook of Nordic Cooperation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (forthcoming 2025).

Götz, Norbert, and Heidi Haggrén, eds. *Regional Cooperation and International Organizations: The Nordic Model in Transnational Alignment*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Götz, Norbert, Heidi Haggrén, and Mary Hilson. "Nordic Cooperation in the Voluntary Sector." In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang, 49−68. London: Routledge, 2016.

Häggman, Larserik. *Det nordiska Finland*. Helsinki: Pohjola-Norden, 2013.

Hallenstvedt, Abraham, Aira Kalela, Jaakko Kalela, and Raimo Lintonen, eds. *The Nordic Transnational Association Network: Structure and Correlates*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1975.

Hellenes, Andreas Mørkved. "Pilgrims and Missionaries of Social Peace: Geneva and Pontigny as Sites of Scandinavian Internationalism in Late Interwar Europe." *Nordic Journal of Education History*, 7(2) (2020): 5−29.

Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian summer til nordisk vinter: Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008.

———. "Organised into Existence: Scandinavianism and Pan-Scandinavian Associations Within and Beyond the Region." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by R. Hemstad and P. Stadius, 158−179. London: Routledge, 2023.

———. "Promoting *Norden* and Nordic Cooperation in the 1930s: Social Democratic Visions and Transmedial Manifestations." In *Nordic Media Histories of Propaganda and Persuasion*, edited by F. Norén, E. Stjernholm, and C. C. Thomson, 31−54. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2023.

———. "From Peace on the Scandinavian Peninsula to Nordic Peace: Geopolitical Rhetoric and Pan-Scandinavian Reconciliation." In *Nordic Peace in Question: A Region of and for Peace*, edited by Christopher S. Browning, Marko Lehti, and Johan Strang, 38−54. London: Routledge, cop. 2025.

———. "Pragmatic Scandinavianism: Cultural, Scholarly and Practical Cooperation." In *Handbook of Nordic Cooperation*, edited by Nina Græger, Ruth Hemstad, Peter Nedergaard, and Peter Stadius. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (forthcoming 2025).

Hemstad, Ruth, and Peter Stadius, eds. *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*. London: Routledge, 2023.

———. "Introduction." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by R. Hemstad and P. Stadius, 1−18. London: Routledge, 2023.

Hermansson, Nanna Stefania. *Nordiska bilaterala kulturfonder och föreningar: Tillkomst och verksamhet*. Copenhagen: Nordiska Kulturfonden, 2007.
Jansson, Torkjel. *Adertonhundratalets associationer. Forskning och problem kring ett sprangfullt tomrum eller sammanslutningsprinciper och foreningsformer mellan tva samhallsformationer, c:a 1800–1870*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1985.
Kirby, David. "What Was 'Nordic' About the Labour Movement in Northern Regions?" In *Lokalt och internationellt: Dimensioner i den nordiska arbetarrörelsen och arbetarkulturen*, edited by Pauli Kettunen, 13−32. Tammerfors: Sällskapet för forskning i arbetarhistoria i Finland, 2022.
Krake, Kristina, and Ruth Hemstad. "Labour Scandinavianism and Cooperation of Nordic Labour Organisations." In *Handbook of Nordic Cooperation*, edited by Nina Græger, Ruth Hemstad, Peter Nedergaard, and Peter Stadius. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (forthcoming 2025).
Limatainen, Tuire. *Nordic Added Value in Nordic Research Cooperation. Concept and Practice*. Oslo: NordForsk, 2023.
Maxwell, Alexander, "Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 28(1) (2022): 1–19. doi: 10.1080/13537113.2021.2004767.
Micheletti, Michele. "Föreningen Norden och nordiskt samarbete – i går, i dag och i morgon." In *Europa i Norden: Europeisering av nordisk samarbeid*, edited by Johan P. Olsen and Bjørn Otto Sverdrup, 318–343. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug, 1998.
Misa, Thomas J., and Johan Schot. "Inventing Europe: Technology and the Hidden Integration of Europe." *History and Technology* 21(1) (March 2005):1−19.
Nationalekonomiska möten i Norden under 100 år. Stockholm: Haglund & Ericson Boktr. AB, 1963.
Norden, 1920−29.
Nordisk tidskrift för politik, ekonomi och litteratur, vols. 1−5 (1866−70).
Nordisk Tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri, 11 (1935).
Norges Handels- og Sjøfartstidende (1936).
Novak, William J. "The American Law of Association: The Legal-Political Construction of Civil Society." *Studies in American Political Development* 15 (Fall 2001), 163–188.
Ørskov, Frederik Forrai. "The Scandinavist Origins of 'Nordic Peace': Fredrik Bajer and the Peaceful Afterlife of a Nineteenth-Century Pan-Ideology." In *Nordic Peace in Question: A Region of and for Peace*, edited by Christopher S. Browning, Marko Lehti, and Johan Strang, 55−77. London: Routledge, 2024.
−−−. et. al. *Nordic Added Value in Inter-Ministerial Nordic Co-operation: Past and Present Perspectives*. Oslo, Copenhagen: NordForsk and Nordic Council of Ministers, 2024.
Østergård, Uffe. "The Geopolitics of Nordic Identity: From Composite States to Nation-States." In *The Cultural Construction of Norden*, edited by Øystein Sørensen and Bo Stråth, 25–71. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1997.
Ottosen, Morten Nordhagen. "Windows of opportunity and the political anatomy of Scandinavianism, 1848−1858." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by R. Hemstad and P. Stadius, 37−56. London: Routledge, 2023.
Rasmussen, Anders Bo. *Civil War Settlers: Scandinavians, Citizenship, and American Empire, 1848−1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.
Stadius, Peter. "Hundra år av nordism." In *Meningen med föreningen. Föreningarna Norden 100 år*, edited by Henrik Wilén, 9−27. [Copenhagen]: Föreningarna Nordens Förbund, 2019.

———. “Nordism as a remake of the Nordic-Scandinavian pan-nationalism.” In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by R. Hemstad and P. Stadius, 180−197. London: Routledge, 2023.

———. “Nordic Cooperation in the Interwar Period and the Norden Associations.” In *Handbook of Nordic Cooperation*, edited by Nina Græger, Ruth Hemstad, Peter Nedergaard, and Peter Stadius. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (forthcoming 2025).

Stenius, Henrik, and Heidi Haggrén. “Det nordiska samarbetets vardagspraktiker: Vad vet vi om dessa förutom att de har varit/är viktiga?” In *Finland i Norden: Finland 50 år i Nordiska rådet*, edited by Larserik Häggman, 79–90. Helsinki: Pohjola-Norden, 2005.

Strang, Johan. “Introduction: The Nordic Model of Transnational Cooperation.” In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang, 1–26. London: Routledge, 2016.

Svenskt konversationslexikon. Vol. 3. Stockholm: Per Gustaf Berg, 1848.

te Velde Henk and Maartje Janse, eds. *Organizing Democracy: Reflections on the Rise of Political Organizations in the Nineteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. London: Saunders and Otley, 1835.

www.norden.org.

www.norden.no/om-foreningen/prinsipprogram.

11 State Civil Servants and Voluntary Nordic Cooperation

The Nordic Federation of Public Administration 1919–52

Peter Stadius

Introduction

The immediate period after the First World War saw the upsurge of a new Nordic cooperation trend which had its roots in the thawing period of reconciliation during the war. After what has been referred to as the Nordic, or Scandinavian, winter in the aftermath of the union breakup between Sweden and Norway, the external threats posed by the war proved a centripetal factor that brought back the idea and incentive of Nordic cooperation.[1] The contacts between Norway and Sweden slowly became normalized, and the three kings meeting in Malmö in December 1914 paved the way for a cooperative mindset. Concretely, in 1917 a tripartite agreement for the exchange of goods to meet the challenges of food and raw material shortages was established between the three Scandinavian kingdoms. After the war, these experiences triggered a further interest in capitalizing on the possibilities that Nordic cooperation might facilitate. Business interests, general popular sense of kinship, and other traditions from nineteenth-century Scandinavianism now reappeared as a regional cooperation idea between sovereign states. Leaving behind the most far-reaching dreams of a common Scandinavian kingdom or a Nordic union, this new Nordic cooperation retook the idea of working for closer contacts as a tool for strengthening the region in what has been referred to as a "pluralistic security community".[2]

In practice, this new trend initially manifested itself in the establishment of all-Nordic civil society organizations. The main example is perhaps the Norden Associations (*Föreningarna Norden*) established in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway in 1919, with Iceland joining in 1921 and Finland in 1924. But there was a myriad of other joint initiatives that continued the established culture of seeking transnational Nordic forms of cooperation, ranging from academic disciplines to various professional groups, and political party organizations.[3]

This chapter focuses on the Nordic Federation of Public Administration (*Nordiska Administrativa Förbundet*/*Nordisk Administrativt Forbund*, NAF),[4] which is a somewhat special case for studying civil society, since it involves state civil servants, and almost exclusively civil servants of higher rank. The period in focus is from the founding of the Federation in 1918 up to the consolidation

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-14
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

of an official inter-governmental Nordic cooperation body which was achieved when the Nordic Council was established in 1952. NAF as a case will primarily be studied as part of the transnationalization processes of Norden as a concept during the inter-war period. One striking feature of NAF, as well as of some other Nordic associations founded during the twentieth century, is the high legitimacy which Nordic cooperation enjoyed at the supreme political level. Compared to the often-short-lived societies that endorsed Scandinavianism from a civil society perspective in the previous century, organizations like NAF represented a pronounced need articulated by the establishment. The imperative to promote Nordic cooperation had no dimension that could be understood to challenge the existing political order and the respective nation states. However, there were also differences between the various Nordic organizations that emerged during the inter-war period, both in ideological and practical terms. This chapter seeks to position NAF in that spectrum as an organization that had practical goals connected to the promotion of civil servants' professional labour market interests and that ideologically stood for continuity regarding the role of state bureaucracy as a pillar of stability.

There is an obvious paradox in state civil servants organizing themselves as a pan-Nordic association, at least when applying the classical perspective of civil society as a field of action explicitly outside official state institutions. It has often been pointed out that Nordic societies have a special state and civil society relationship that differs from the British, French, and German.[5] What has been described as a corporatist state,[6] or associative democracy,[7] essentially refers to the close and interactive relationship and processes, particularly between the emerging labour movement and the state, proving the Scandinavian/Nordic cases as distinct from a model that focuses on the strict opposing roles of both partners. This has been described by Bo Rothstein and Lars Trägårdh, here in the Swedish case but giving it a general Scandinavian validity, as the boundary between the concepts of state and civil society being "so blurred and permeable that until very recently the Swedish word 'society' was used to describe both 'state' and 'civil society'".[8] This embeddedness is one way of understanding the dual identity of NAF, since it gave the members practical use, agency, and room for maneuvering through a civil society organization.

This documented close tie and permeability of the state and civil society relationship are not a perfect fit for the NAF case. State civil servants as part of associational life has in this case a labour-market logic, and as such the promotion of working-life interests is part of the agenda. But still, in general terms the direct connection of NAF members to the state makes it a somewhat different case. Since they identify with the state, their work is a mix of upholding existing structures and promoting moderate reforms. It is unlikely that any of the members strongly identified themselves as being part of a civil society initiative, but rather they saw themselves representing their respective countries in a Nordic cooperation setting, which had a strong and legitimate cooperative ethos and agenda. If we look through this lens of the history of Nordic cooperation, a certain logic appears.

All those individuals and groups which found it important to work for the advancement of Nordic cooperation in any forms, were during the inter-war period and until 1952 bound to organize themselves primarily as civil society organizations, since the official government-driven cooperation would not yet be institutionalized in a comprehensive all-Nordic way, even if there had been inter-governmental cooperation before and during this period. Yrjö Loimaanranta, chairman of the Finnish branch of NAF, would always refer to the activities of NAF as a "side hobby of an idealistic nature".[9] This by no means implied that he was giving it a diminutive status, but rather that it was an extra effort still worth the sacrifice, as it was seen as vital for the development of the respective Nordic states as modern and efficient societies. Loimaanranta's comment is an example of what Henrik Stenius and Heidi Haggrén have referred to as a Nordic dual regime, where individuals are part of a culture where one acts within both official state institutions and civil society organizations.[10]

When studying Nordic cooperation and its operative fields, a distinction between official state institution cooperation and civil society cooperation is one standard and general division.[11] In strict terms, NAF represents the civil society category. Another is the distinction between formal and informal cooperation. While the former alludes to formalized procedures such as meetings, conferences, committees, minutes, and other documents produced, the latter refers to the informal ways of interaction. This latter includes personal contacts and informal conversations—in short, a more private but no less important part of everyday Nordic cooperation networking.[12] Here, the application of this perspective is used as a tool to make sense of the various layers of activity within NAF. One central point here is that the association framework, with its established practices, enabled this informal networking, which had a considerable impact on the development of Nordic cooperation, leading up to considerable political achievements later. The archive material of NAF exposes the informal dimension of cooperation, as it contains many personal notes that bear witness to close personal relations. We can follow the practice of informal cooperation through cordial letters and postcards exchanged by central actors and recreate the processes of how trust was created, and mutual goals were pursued. Within this scheme of Nordic cooperation, NAF represents the civil society sector, while the members of NAF were professionally active in the public sector. Voluntary organizations of this type could be a vehicle for lobbying political reforms, for Nordic identity building as a voluntary pan-nationalist ideological practice, and as such an intermediate practice between the national and the broader international communities. In this broader international community Nordic cooperation was instrumental and seen as a clear added value to each nation's possibilities to make themselves heard.[13] The voluntary organization of Nordic transnational cooperation for the highest state civil servants is not exactly a classic example of grassroots citizen activity. However, if we consider, as argued in this volume, that the nexus between civil society and the state, and transnational cooperation, is a special feature in the Nordic countries, and that this special relationship and close entanglement has been vital in forming Nordic societies, the case of NAF is relevant.

A Federation for Nordic Civil Servants

The Nordic Federation for Public Administration (NAF) was founded in 1918, to serve as an independent forum for civil servants with the specific aim of dealing with issues of public administration. The initiative to form NAF came from the national civil servant organizations. *Statsförvaltningens tjänstemannaförening* (the Civil Service Association of the State Administration, Sweden), *Centralforeningen af Ministeriernes Embedsmænd og Assistenter* (the Central Association of Ministries' Officials and Assistants, Denmark), and *Departementsforeningen* (the Departmental Association, Norway) took the formal role in the process of constituting NAF as an organization. These organizations not only acted as midwives but obviously overlapped in many other ways as well. Many persons were active on both levels, and there is little doubt that the members of NAF represented the core of state administration. As with the Norden associations, NAF from the beginning was also divided into separate national organizations, initially only in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. The Icelandic and Finnish branches were established shortly afterwards, in 1920 and 1922 respectively. The federation was an offspring of the Nordic Jurist Meetings (*Nordiske Juristmøter)*, established in 1872. Well into the twentieth century, the jurist meetings had grown in size, and some active groups found a need to strengthen the attention paid to public administration within that organization. Soon, however, it became clear to these active participants in the jurist meetings that they needed their own organization.[14]

Curiously, the administrators did not just establish another parallel regular meeting practice like the lawyers' example, but they went all out to found different national organizations. This was both a practical and ideological solution. It was more practical to have five separate national organizations for gaining financial support from the respective governments, as well as for mobilizing members as national organizations. Ideologically, there was a demand for respecting each nation's sovereign status. The core institutions for the operation of NAF were the general meetings, usually held every third year with a principle of a rotating host arrangement, smaller preparatory committee meetings between the general meetings, and the journal *Nordisk Administrativt Tidskrift* (*NAT*). No permanent secretariat was ever established, although the Danish branch in the beginning had suggested that this should be done.

NAF thus followed the model of many other Nordic umbrella cooperation organizations, such as the labour movement's cooperative body SAMAK (1932) and the Norden Associations (1919). However, when compared to the establishment of the Norden Associations, there is one interesting difference concerning the incorporation of Finland. The establishment of the Finnish branch of NAF in 1922 was the result of a comparatively uncomplicated process, while the establishment of the Finnish national Norden Association finally in 1924 was prolonged due to various concerns. In both cases the Swedish opinion and willingness to include Finland was decisive. In the case of the Norden Association, well-grounded concerns over the Finnish organization becoming an exclusive club for Swedish-speaking Finns prolonged the process before an all-national organization was established to match

the other four national associations.[15] In the case of public administrators, the situation was much clearer and there was little room for partisan interpretations since Finland had two official languages, with Finnish clearly in the majority. In addition, the potential membership group was also well defined. The minutes of the national meetings were held in Finnish, while it remained self-evident that participation in the Nordic meeting activities required skills in Swedish.

At the second general meeting's opening in Stockholm in August 1922, the chairman of the Swedish Section, County Governor Eric Trolle, extended a special greeting to the recently joined Icelandic and Finnish delegations:

> As this is the first time, we have seen our Finnish and Icelandic colleagues, I would like to extend a special greeting to them. It has been dear to us to see them complete the chain of the Scandinavian ring, and we hope that their participation in our work will be a valuable contribution to the realization of the aim which the League has set itself.[16]

The Swedish chairman spoke of a common goal, which should be understood to mean closer cooperation between the leading Nordic officials. However, it was a bit unclear what this meant in practice. How close and integrated should the cooperation be? In what practical ways could five separate organizations with separate funding cooperate? As the early Danish proposition to establish a permanent secretariat in Copenhagen was discarded,[17] the common project during the time between planning the general meetings became the joint publication of *NAT*. It first appeared in 1920 with four issues annually and became the central forum for fulfilling the aims of providing information and insight into each country's public administration with its peculiarities and challenges. Each year every national organization provided a brief overview of the most notable issues in public administration that year. The journal was a central piece in the practical promotion of mutual knowledge exchange, and as such had a function that exceeded any regular exchange of information that would have occurred between civil servants of the different countries.

The Danish, having taken the main initiative, would always host the journal, while a procedure for each national organization contributing financially was agreed. Aage Sachs, secretary of the Danish branch (1920–36), became a long-term editor of *NAT* and one of the most active figures within NAF. The journal included articles from members, often presentations given, or rather articles read out, at the general meetings. The debate on the pages of *NAT* during the first decades was rather formal since the comments to the preprinted presentations were also delivered in advance and published. Generally, the publication policy was marked by an orderly form that provided substantial information about administrative legislation and other matters. If there were any controversial issues which aroused heated debate, they would not be visible in the journal, nor do they appear in the minutes of at least the Swedish and the Finnish associations.

The Federation had multiple aims, the first of which was to gather civil servants for regular meetings and to offer information about the conditions of public

administration of each country to the others.[18] This is the equivalent of the 'here-but-not-further' approach that became the standard in twentieth-century Nordic cooperation. This meant that cooperation was strictly maintained at an international level, without any pronounced aims of pan-nationalist state integration. This *modus viviendi* and potential tension is visible in the careful wordings of various speeches held at the general meetings. In his final closing words of the second general meeting in Stockholm in 1922, Sweden's Eric Trolle reminded all the participants that:

> After all we are sons of one and the same ancient tribe, and if our ways later in natural ways have parted, they now run all the better in parallel terms. They do not cross each other, and the more the understanding concerning this enters the minds of the various nation's consciousness, the better the Nordic Federation of Public Administration will achieve its task.[19]

The words of Trolle, who served as Sweden's foreign minister during a short stint in 1905–06, just months after the breakup of the Swedish-Norwegian union, were chosen very carefully to stress that this was a new form of cooperation that respected each nation's sovereignty. The new post-First World War reality also brought new international forums, and the Nordics also needed to consider whether, and then how, to participate. Should there be a common Nordic voice?

The first world congress for *Commission permanente internationale des Congrès des Sciences administratives* was held in 1910 in Brussels where the organization also had its office. When activities were restarted after the war, the Nordic associations also showed some interest in active participation. The Swedes wanted to arrange the next congress in 1923 in Gothenburg and made a bid for it. After some practical difficulties concerning the arrangements, the congress was finally held again in Brussels. However, the Swedes in particular remained active, participating in the subsequent congresses in Paris in 1927 and in Madrid in 1930, with Danish and Norwegian representatives also participating.[20] The Commission was not a global organization at this stage by any means, and as a European institution it had a distinct Latin-European profile with France and the Benelux countries dominating. The British did not bother to participate, and the Germans were not allowed to join, as part of the hostile Franco-German atmosphere in the aftermath of the Great War. This latter caused visible irritation and antipathy among the Swedish members of NAF, who saw that "the conditions for such cooperation here in Norden are much better".[21] When considering a Nordic strategy for the congress participation, the Swedish chairman of NAF, Gabriel Thulin, urged for joining forces, in order to make their voices heard:

> If, however, these international administrative congresses are to have any significance for the Nordic countries, it is important—and this seems to be the opinion of the Swedish Government—that the Nordic countries all participate in the congresses and proceed along uniform lines, and that Germany, which has now been approached for this purpose, should also take part in the work,

> so that the Nordic-Germanic element may be able to assert itself alongside the Romanic and Anglo-Saxon.[22]

The Swedes had taken some action to forward the acceptance of German membership, and the Swedes also developed some cooperation with the Germans as the Berlin-based *Vereiningung für Staatswissenschaftliche Fortbildung* visited Stockholm in 1924.[23] The Nordic involvement in the Committee would come to an end during the early 1930s. At the Madrid congress, it was decided that the Commission was to be reorganized into an international institute or administrative affair, which happened at the same time when *L'Institut inernationale de Sciences adminstratives* was founded during the same year of 1930 in Brussels (where it still resides today). All member countries were asked to contribute to the running of the institute in exchange for national membership. The Swedish government supported the institute in the beginning until the end of 1931, but after that, the membership payments ceased as no government support was given. This meant that, by 1931, the Nordic national societies were no longer part of this somewhat partisan international organization. However, all five national governments continued to support the Nordic cooperation within NAF, which seems to have been the more sensible and functional option for all the Nordic partners.

When NAF was founded, it was exclusively aimed at the higher ranks of public administration. It was some decades before lower-ranking civil servants and university professors were admitted as members. This confirms NAF as one of the Nordic cooperation civil society organizations that in its essence was a top-down initiative with a visible paternalistic modus operandi, that would only slowly move towards actively seeking a broader recruitment base towards the end of the inter-war period.[24] The pressure to broaden the member base can be seen in the light of general democratization, but also specifically in the example set by the intensified social democratic labour organizations of Nordic cooperation, that had from the start already aimed at forming a mass movement.[25] This clear elitist dimension has often been seen in a problematic light as a defect from a perceived popular imperative of unofficial Nordic cooperation, a critique that was also directed at the Norden associations in the inter-war years. At the same time, it was often within the top layers of society where there was a capacity for both envisioning and executing transnational cooperative projects beyond the national framework.[26]

As NAF was an exclusive organization with a specific recruitment base, this trend is not visible in the same way as in the more civil society–oriented Nordic associations. The economics were kept separate for the five national organizations, but with stipulated contribution to the journal *NAT*. Most organizations would receive continuing annual support from their respective state authorities, but a steady concern for increasing the member base is an ever-recurring observation from the annual reports. Eventually the criteria were loosened and in 1931 the Danish and Icelandic branches approved a change in their statues to include "assistants at the ministries" as well.[27] This meant that lower-level civil servants could also become members. University professors and teachers were still not considered for membership and would be approved only in 1953. In Finland a similar reform was made

in 1934, and according to the minutes, university teachers were also allowed in the Finnish case, some 20 years earlier than the other countries.[28] This was mainly motivated by a need to find new members to vitalize the Finnish branch. The almost total absence of female members during the first decades was mainly conditioned by legal restrictions for women to access high public offices. Wives would accompany their husbands to the NAF conferences, but the members usually referred to themselves as "men of public administration" (Swe. *förvaltningens män*).

A Broader Societal Function

On the most practical level, the federation was a forum for sharing experiences and giving mutual moral support for the enhancement of the working conditions of public civil servants. This professional organization dimension is always present and serves as part of the benchmarking culture that was established early on. By sharing experiences, informing about the current situations and developments of work conditions, salary development, and other legal issues, the NAF became a forum for professional representation.

However, this benchmarking function was not only to defend the interests of public administrators but also to contribute to a broader societal development through the Nordic cooperation practices and structures. In the first statutes it was also mentioned that NAF should, "[. . .] also, as far as possible, work for uniformity and reforms within the three countries' administrations".[29] This was clearly a more ambitious and strategic part of the main aims of NAF. Even if this formulation in favour of aligned reform policies was erased from the statutes during the first general meeting upon an explicit Norwegian demand, it was reintroduced in 1931 and kept as such up until today.[30] The formulation is quite explicit, but at the same time vague. "As far as possible", could of course mean very different things for the various national organizations, but in general terms, it holds the germ of what was to become the official Nordic cooperation after the Second World War, when both politicians and civil servants worked closely together to establish a functioning official inter-parliamentarian Nordic cooperation. In this sense, the pronounced goal for NAF was of quite considerable importance, and far-reaching in its practical approach to the advancement of Nordic cooperation.

In the Finnish case of NAF, this benchmarking function is clearly visible from the beginning. In 1921 a special committee working on how to reform state administration was formed. As one of its first tasks, a number of its members undertook a tour of the three Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, to study how ministries and agencies had been reformed there, and in particular the balance of power between agencies and ministries. In addition to the main officials of the Finnish branch of NAF, Yrjö Loimaranta, Hjalmar Oker-Blom, and Hugo Blankett, other participants in the April–May 1921 trip included Kyösti Kallio, Member of Parliament and future president of the Republic, Professor Aimo Kaarlo Cajander (Prime Minister in 1922), Deputy Chief Justice Anton Kotonen, and Aukusti Aho, a counsellor at the Ministry of Justice. The committee submitted

its report to the government in two parts in autumn 1922 and spring 1923. As a result of this work, two articles were also published in NAT, first Blankett's article "Efforts and Measures in Finland to Simplify the Administration" in 1922, and the following year, the Nordic colleagues were able to read Loimaranta's article "The Reorganization of the Central Administration in Finland: Some Excerpts from the Reports of the Committee on Civil Service in Finland". The theme was common to all the Nordic countries and there was certainly a large readership for this type of information. In the article, Loimaranta emphasized the significance of the upcoming reforms and therefore:

> […] the Committee felt that it should request the Government that the Committee's chairman and its member Oker-Blom be given the opportunity, before the Committee draws up a final proposal, to gain more detailed knowledge of the situation in the Scandinavian countries and of the current organization of the agencies in those countries.[31]

Finland faced major challenges: the young republic was based on an existing state administration, but a completely new foreign administration was to be established, and the outlook for the world economy was hopeful but not without its share of worries. The number of civil servants increased by as much as 25% between 1919 and 1921, putting a strain on government finances and calling for solutions to find savings and rationalization targets. This was the first of many pronouncements from the Finnish section on the inadequate employment conditions of civil servants, and the NAF clearly became a forum for inspiration, modelling, and moral support in pursuing the labour rights of civil servants in Finland. Once again, we see how the Nordic countries become a fundamental reference point, something to aspire to. There is no doubt that leading Finnish civil servants saw enormous practical benefits in this activity. It also suggests a deep sense of Nordic belonging among the Finnish civil servants.

When assessing the rhetoric and practices of NAF as a promotor of a common Nordic identity, certain features stand out. The Nordic cooperation dimension of NAF had the clear aim to help solidify each Nordic country as well-organized and prosperous Western liberal bourgeoisie societies with a specific Nordic twist. The latter was mainly the cultivation of a narrative of Nordic exceptionalism in the name of a perceived Nordic, or Scandinavian, "tradition of justice" (Swe. *rättsuppfattning*). This tradition was cultivated in the ideal and narrative of an uncorrupted and dutiful civil servant, and it at least implicitly suggested a distinction from other countries and traditions outside the Nordic region. It is notable that the Nordic countries, with their joint organization of NAF, had seemingly the only pan-regional organization internationally, even if there were visible partisan groups within the only existing international administrative organization during the inter-war years. When writing about the Nordic participation in the International Commission for Administration in the 1920s, Gabriel Thulin voiced the opinion that Nordic cooperation had a much better prospect of succeeding, and besides the proximity in language understanding, he pointed to "a similar tradition of justice".[32]

He recalled the fact that concrete results in harmonizing legislation had already been achieved before the First World War through the lawyers' cooperation.

This shared value became an even stronger part of the common narrative as the international security situation got worse. During the Second World War, it became a central element in defining what was at stake for the Nordic nations. In 1940 a Swedish publication *Nordisk gemenskap* [Nordic Unity], the president of the Court of Appeal, Birger Ekeberg, referred to this common heritage and how it had been managed in modern times by active association and meeting practices. He lists 35 different laws that had been created over the past 40 years as a result of Nordic cooperation. These he saw as concrete results of cooperation, and he was clear about the importance of this:

> Nowadays it is clearer than ever that we Nordic citizens have common legal ideals to defend. By jointly nurturing and developing these ideals, by making the laws a clearer expression of people's views, we not only strengthen the sense of togetherness but also protect our common culture.[33]

This idea, articulated from the perspective of Nordic legal cooperation, certainly touched on what many of the active members of the NAF also felt and saw as the basis and leitmotif for their own form of Nordic cooperation. However, for the civil servants, the idea of the steadfast civil servant as one of the pillars of society became an even more used trope. This somewhat idealized image of the civil servant—"the best in the Nordic civil service spirit"—was continuously repeated at NAF activities during and after the war. When the 1949 general meeting was arranged in Oslo, the chairman of the Swedish branch, County Governor Bo Hammarskjöld, invoked this spirit in his welcoming speech:

> The picture from our eastern neighbour, Finland, which since childhood has appeared to us as the ideal of a civil servant, the picture the poet Runeberg painted of the governor Wibelius, who against violence and occupation and dictation put the whole ancient force of law and justice—this picture has in modern form been shown to us especially by our Norwegian colleagues.[34]

The uncorrupted civil servant was presented through both a historical and a contemporary figure. The image of Governor Johan Wibelius, who in Runeberg's poem *Landshövdingen* (*The Governor*, 1860) is depicted as the heroic civil servant who defies Russian military authority during the war of 1808–09, was enhanced by a dose of poetic fiction. At least all Finnish and Swedish participants were in those years still able to declaim most of the poems in Johan Ludvig Runeberg's epic *Tales of Ensign Stål* (Swe. *Fänrik ståls sägner*) by heart. The allusion to the Norwegian colleagues had a more direct address. Carl Platou, chair of the Norwegian section of NAF 1931–46, had served a prison sentence during the German occupation, and was now seen as a steadfast example of this Nordic civil service spirit. In his speech, Hammarskjöld saw how Platou, "rather took on heavy and long years of imprisonment than deviate from the path of justice and civil service".[35]

Here Hammarskjöld found the core of a specifically Nordic conception of law and order, which bound the Nordic civil servants together and, "which has kept us all going during the various difficulties of the past years and which will give us the strength to fulfil our high task, whatever we encounter".[36] In his opening speech at this ninth general meeting in Oslo in 1949, the Norwegian chairman Einar Boyesen looked back on the 30 years that NAF had now completed. As a kind of balance sheet, he referred to the fact that from the very beginning, the association had dealt with and debated current issues without prejudice. He also emphasized the practical aspects and how the activities had been "determined by real needs and by the will to create uniform practice where the conditions naturally lent themselves to it".[37] This had not in his mind involved forced uniformity, but rather a good will based on shared values.

Formal and Informal Meetings for the Nordic Cause

The venues and activities of NAF were mainly the general meetings held every third year, and various smaller working committee meetings in the interim. The latter were connected to the preparation of the general meetings and the practical work connected to the federation's journal *NAT*. The meetings required travelling, which was both an incentive and vital part of the creation of a common group identity and gave active members an opportunity to travel outside their own country. The Nordic framework was for many the first step towards gaining experience and competence in international cooperation. For most members this became the main arena for international engagement, and as such contributed to the reinforcement of a Nordic sense of common identity and natural point of reference. Even if travelling also included many practical challenges and obstacles, internal Nordic travelling still seems to have offered an accessible alternative. Even if travelling between Nordic countries still required passports before 1952, and economic challenges at times presented a practical problem for participation (especially from Iceland and Finland), the general meetings became major events with roughly 200–450 participants each time they were arranged. The establishment of a Nordic passport–free zone in 1952 is often seen as the successful headstart for the Nordic Council, but the meetings of NAF, and other similar Nordic gatherings, most probably also contributed to an atmosphere that saw the Nordic passport union take form gradually from the first protocol in 1952 to the final convention signed in 1957 (Iceland and the Faroe Islands would remain partially outside these arrangements until 1965 and 1966 respectively).

During the period under study, the hosting of the general meetings would circulate between Kristiania/Oslo (1920, 1933, 1949), Stockholm (1922, 1935), Copenhagen (1925, 1938, 1946), and Helsinki (1929, 1952). The first general meeting in Iceland was arranged in 1958, but Icelandic participation had been permanent from the beginning. The Icelandic organization listed 134 members in its first year, and later the membership count would be between 200–250.[38] However, mostly because of the expensive travel costs, the Icelandic participation in the general meeting would remain modest. Also, the other latecomer Finland experienced

a steady growth in members, with the membership number rising from 74 to 290 between 1934 and 1939. The fact that the Finnish organization had opened membership rights to certain categories of lower civil servants, and even university professors and lecturers in law and political science, certainly had a considerable effect. As well, the fact that the general atmosphere in Finland towards Nordic cooperation became much more positive on the highest governmental level after 1935, probably also played a role in this development.

The general meetings were the main events where the most pressing and relevant questions concerning public administration were presented and discussed. Some themes were of a more specific organizational dimension, especially with the first year's questions about rationalization and cutting spending within the state administration on the agenda. At the second meeting in Stockholm in 1922, the two main presentations had tellingly similar content. Knut Dahlberg spoke from a Swedish perspective about "Rationalizations and savings in the state administraton", while Hugo Blankett's speech had the title "Reorganization and rationalization of Finland's adminstration".

When the general meeting was arranged in Helsinki in 1929, one of the two main themes of the meeting was the principle of openness in public administration. The main speaker on this theme, Carl Axel Reuterskiöld, quickly turned to a Nordic comparison. Reuterskiöld noted that "with us [in Sweden], publicity has been in our blood ever since the middle of the eighteenth century, when we got our first freedom of the press act".[39] He then pondered on the actual restrictions that still existed and why they were justified, referring in particular to Denmark as an example. His comparisons were confirmed by the Danish Permanent Secretary, Frederik V. Petersen, who recognized that the Swedish principle of public access "to a Danish ear, sounds almost like a fairy tale [. . .] the conditions existing in Sweden are so infinitely distant from the conditions in our own country".[40] This is a small glimpse of the dynamics of comparison and exchange of knowledge, experiences, and different national solutions. Without going into detail on these topics and how they were both similar and different between the various Nordic countries, it gives an insight into the actual issues of great importance that were aired very thoroughly at these general meetings, and which then were also documented in the Federation's own journal.

The Helsinki meeting got wide publicity in the Finnish press, as was customary with all the NAF's general meetings. The front page of *Hufvudstadsbladet* on 7 August 1929 carried the headline "Legislative Work in the Nordic Countries should be more Practically Oriented". The headline was in quotation marks and was a direct statement by the secretary of the Danish section and editor-in-chief of NAT, Aage Sachs, who had given the paper an exclusive interview. The Danes had travelled from Stockholm on the ship Ilmarinen and arrived the day before the meeting began. The same afternoon they had travelled by car to Porvoo, "for a visit to Runeberg's home and to the skald's grave", in order to "pay tribute to the memory of the poet king".[41] First-page headlines with pictures of the delegations arriving at train stations and harbours reflect the status these meetings had all the way up to the 1950s.

The following day the front page of the same newspaper featured an interview with the chairman of the Swedish branch, Gabriel Thulin, who, according to the reporter, met him "happy and smiling in his room at [hotel] Kämp". Thulin emphasized his pleasure at once again being in Helsinki, a familiar city to him, and he also pointed out that from the Swedish point of view there were many reasons to be particularly pleased. NAF was celebrating its tenth anniversary as a vigorous and successful federation and it was gratifying to be in Finland, since the Finnish branch had been established on Swedish initiative. Thulin referred to the importance of general meetings in creating friendships and lasting networks, and he also took the opportunity to support his Finnish colleagues in diplomatic terms: "The sense of togetherness thus created has allowed us in Sweden, for example, to feel a spontaneous sympathy for the Finnish officials' endeavours to improve their position".[42]

When studying the venues of NAF and how they have been recorded and reported in the journal *NAT*, one is exposed to a myriad of social events, ranging from grand dinners at the general meetings to receptions and excursions as part of the quite extensive programme, as was customary in Nordic meetings of this kind at the time. The venues would be held in parliament buildings or other prominent locations. The gala dinners could take place at Hotel d'Angleterre in Copenhagen, the Grand Hotel in Stockholm, and other first-class restaurants. Opera visits were often included in the social programme, and inaugural sessions would be attended by monarchs, presidents, and ministers. The framing was exclusive and pompous, reflecting the position of NAF and its members, and represented the bourgeoisie and elitist version of Nordic meeting practices during this era.

At the third meeting in Copenhagen in 1925, the final dinner, described as a "stylish party" at the town hall, gathered over 1000 persons, since all higher civil servants of the Copenhagen city administration attended the banquet.[43] The grandiose setting and the somewhat pompous forms included formalized speeches of gratitude by the guests, and reading out telegram responses from the respective Nordic head of states. The forms for the larger festivities and the social programme with excursions, lunches, and special programmes for the spouses was kept more or less intact from the beginning to the late 1950s.

This high-society social culture was viewed by lower-situated circles involved in Nordic cooperation within civil society activities in a negative light. "Banquet Nordism" was the label used to express a discontent with what was felt to be a too elitist approach dominating Nordic cooperation. This became visible from the 1930s onwards and was especially cultivated among labour movement representatives in Nordic associations like NAF and Norden urging for a democratization and transformation of civil society Nordic cooperation to something genuinely more grassroots and folkish. Another meaning given to "banquet Nordism" was that of irrelevance and lack of efficient and goal-oriented strategies and actions.[44] This ever-recurring debate on the need to make Nordic cooperation relevant and more efficient is well documented up to today.

What was labelled as "banquet Nordism" in a pejorative sense, was the practice and social forum for the informal part of NAF's activities. In the case of NAF,

it was based on a model of high-society social culture and in that sense, it had an air of exclusivity around it. The forms and its cultural refences suggest that NAF was guided by an upper-class bourgeoisie culture concerning civil society activities, and there is little doubt that the members of NAF saw themselves firstly as representatives of the state, and only in a second order as voluntary actives within a civil society association. For them the Nordic cooperation was part of their professional ethos and sense of civic duty, which included various degrees of interest in getting to know their Nordic peers, and using the knowledge provided by the organizational structures and practices of NAF both to promote work-market related interests and to update their professional competence. For the most active members this also included the establishment of personal friendship bonds over the national borders. This social side of Nordic administrative cooperation falls within the category of informal cooperation in unofficial Nordic cooperation. This was the forum for forming social bonds and friendships that in some cases would last for decades, based on a shared identity. The fact that most of the participants at the general meetings would be accompanied by spouses is significant here. As part of the conference culture of the time, the social programme at these events provided a forum for mixing work with informal socializing. NAF is just one of many cases of this friendship mobilization and practice that in a substantial way provided a social glue for Nordic cooperation both in its civic and official forms.

The usually one-week conference venue would include excursions to other parts of the hosting country, giving the guests an opportunity to see places they might not previously have visited, and to meet local dignitaries. In Copenhagen in 1925, the official programme was concluded with an excursion to Frederiksborg Castle and Marienlyst seaside town in northern Zealand. In addition to that, an extra and longer excursion was arranged for those interested in the following days. Around 80 participants attended the excursion to Southern Jutland and the historical Danish-German border region. The recently regained areas after 1920 were of course of special interest to the Nordic guests, and during a visit in Aabenraa the Danish minister H. P. Hanssen gave a speech on “Struggle of the Danish Southern Jutlanders to return to their old lands.”[45] In Helsinki in 1929, trips to nearby Porvoo were included in the official programme, as well as an excursion to Hämeenlinna where the visitors, after a steamboat journey on Lake Vanaja, were hosted for lunch by the province’s governor Albert von Hellens. After the meeting, 70 participants participated in a journey to the lake district of Finland, visiting Imatra, Olavinlinna Castle, and Punkaharju, all emblematic national landscapes.

These trips certainly had an impact on strengthening the bonds and feeling of belonging to a Nordic community among NAF’s members. Spending longer free time together was not just a consequence of an era when travelling was not as common as today, and conference and meeting trips would extend to cover many days. It was also an important and strategic part of building up motivation and personal incentives for engaging in Nordic cooperation, besides the obvious goal

of providing the members an opportunity to see places in their fellow Nordic countries that they would otherwise not perhaps have the opportunity to do. This was in line with the over-all mission of NAF to increase the mutual knowledge and understanding about the conditions in other Nordic countries. From a civil society perspective, this voluntary-based socializing practice enhanced a civic engagement for Nordic societal development and mutual understanding. Many active members became life-long family friends with each other across the Nordic countries. Christmas cards, birthday greetings, and condolences would be sent in private postcards and letters.[46] In a way, the pattern from nineteenth-century Nordic student meetings would be reproduced in terms of long-lasting personal friendships.

Conclusion

The Nordic Federation of Public Administration provides a somewhat special case in the over-all picture of civil society and state interaction in the Nordic region. NAF represented during this period a largely state-embedded association (in five different states), the main mission of which was to enhance the national public administration conditions through Nordic cooperation. The other mission, to serve as a benchmarking forum for all Nordic nations to catch up with each other, included a mutual understanding of certain hierarchies. These were not, however, ever voiced by any parts in a negative light, but there was a mutual understanding of common interests. This was legitimized and facilitated by an understanding of sharing values about a special Nordic tradition of justice and a civil servant ideal. The inspiration to engage in NAF's activities was fostered by a social community spirit that provided an incentive and social context for engaging in Nordic cooperation. In this latter sense, NAF was just one of many organizations working for Nordic cooperation with Nordist ideals.

In a comparative light, NAF represented a tradition-bound, but still reform-oriented forum, that alongside other major Nordic cooperation initiatives of the period did not directly take part in the avant-garde approach of making Nordic cooperation a grassroots popular movement. This was in a sense not even possible since the organization was mainly founded with an imperative to work for policy learning and harmonization between the state administrations of the Nordic countries. As a forum for exchanging information and ideas, sharing experiences, and edifying lasting personal friendships, NAF served as a transnational association contributing to societal stability by cultivating a strong sense of a specific Nordic sense of justice and the ideal figure of an uncorrupted Nordic civil servant. In this sense it was a civil society organization promoting what they saw as a responsible and edifying development of the civil servant profession and the state at large. When assessing the impact of NAF in both civil society and public life, NAF could be described as impactful, but relatively unknown. It was one of the many important forums for establishing contacts, practices, and knowledge about the advancement of Nordic cooperation in a period leading up to the establishment of the institutionalized official Nordic cooperation.

Notes

1 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer*, 11. See also Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
2 Deutch, *Political Community*; Lindgren, *Norway-Sweden: Union, Disunion*. See Andersson, *Nordiskt samarbete*, 28.
3 See also Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
4 The acronym NAF is not to be confused with *Nordisk Anndelsförbund*, the cooperative movement's Nordic organization. Both organizations have established the same acronym.
5 Trägårdh and Rothstein, "The State and Civil Society," 229–30. See also Byrkjeflot's and Sand's contributions to this volume.
6 Hecksher, *Staten och organisationerna*.
7 Johansson, *Folkrörelserna*.
8 Trägårdh and Rothstein, "The State and Civil Society," 231.
9 SKA, NAF Suomen osasto, folder F7:1, "Vuosikertomus 1931–1932."
10 Haggrén and Stenius, "Det nordiska samarbetets vardagspraktiker," 80.
11 Strang, *Nordic Cooperation*, 8–9.
12 Haggrén and Stenius, "Det nordiska samarbetets vardagspraktiker," 82.
13 Haggrén and Götz, "Introduction: Transnational Nordic Alignment," 8.
14 Sachs, "Det Nordiske Administrativt," 104–5.
15 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa förbundets*, 19–21.
16 *Det nordiska administrativa*, 113.
17 Torgersen, "Det Nordiske Adminstrativt," 72.
18 *Stadgar för nordiska*, 276.
19 *Det nordiska administrativa*, 116.
20 Thulin and Nordin, "Nordisk Administrativa Förbundet," 14.
21 Thulin and Nordin, "Nordisk Administrativa Förbundet," 14.
22 Thulin and Nordin, "Nordisk Administrativa Förbundet," 14.
23 RA/ NAF, folder A.5.
24 Hansen, *Vennskap og kjennskap*, 87; Stadius, "Nordism as a Remake," 189.
25 Hemstad, "Promoting *Norden*," 36–37.
26 Rerup, "Nationalisme og skandinavisme."
27 Torgersen, "Det nordiske Adminstrativt," 74.
28 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 31.
29 Torgersen, "Det nordiske Adminstrativt," 71.
30 Torgersen, "Det nordiske Adminstrativt," 73.
31 Loimaranta, *Den centrala förvaltningens*, 90.
32 Thulin and Nordin, *Nordisk Administrativa Förbundet*, 14.
33 Ekeberg, "Det nordiska samarbetet på lagstiftningens," 90.
34 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 47–48.
35 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 48.
36 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 48.
37 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 48.
38 Torgersen, "Det nordiske Adminstrativt," 78.
39 Reuterskiöld, "Offentlighetsprincipen i förvaltningen," 163.
40 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 34.
41 *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 7.8.1929.
42 *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 8.8.1929.
43 *Det nordiske administrative*, 143.
44 Stadius, *Nordiska Administrativa Förbundets*, 27.

45 *Det nordiske administrativa*, 143.
46 RA/ NAF, folder E1.2.

Sources

Archives

National Archive of Finland (SKA, Kansallisarkisto)
Swedish National Archives (RA, Riksarkivet)

Bibliography

Andersson, Jan A. *Nordiskt samarbete: Aktörer, idéer och organisering 1919–1953*. Lund Political Studies 85. Lund: Universitetet, 1994.

"Det nordiska administrativa förbundet andra allmänna möte i Stockholm: Den 28.–30. August." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 3–4 (1922): 113–17.

"Det nordiske administrative forbunds tredje almindelige medelmsmøde i København." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 3–4 (1925): 141–43.

Deutch, K. W. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Ekeberg, Gunnar. "Det nordiska samarbetet på lagstiftningens område." In *Nordisk gemenskap*, edited by Karl Petander, 84–99. Stockholm: Kooperativa förbundet, 1940.

Working Græger, Nina, Ruth Hemstad, Peter Nedergaard and Peter Stadius, eds. *Handbook of Nordic Cooperation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (forthcoming, 2025).

Haggrén, Heidi, and Henrik Stenius. "Det nordiska samarbetets vardagspraktiker: vad vet vi om dessa förutom att de har varit/är viktiga?" In *Finland i Norden: Finland 50 år i det Nordiska rådet*, edited by Larserik Häggman, 79–90. Helsinki: Pohjola-Norden, 2005.

Haggrén, Heidi, and Norbert Götz. "Introduction: Transnational Nordic Alignment in Stormy Waters." In *Regional Cooperation and International Organizations: A Nordic Model in Transnational Alignment*, edited by Norbert Götz and Heidi Haggrén, 1–22. London: Routledge, 2009.

Hansen, Svein Olav. *Vennskap og kjennskap i 100 år: Foreningen Norden 1919–2019*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2020.

Heckscher, Gunnar. *Staten och organisationerna*. Stockholm: Kooperativa förbundet, 1946.

Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter. Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008.

———. "Promoting *Norden* and Nordic Cooperation in the 1930s: Social Democratic Visions and Transmedial Manifestations." In *Nordic Media Histories of Propaganda and Persuasion*, edited by Fredrik Norén, Emil Stjernholm, and C. Claire Thompson, 31–54. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022.

Johansson, Hilding. *Folkrörelserna och det demokratiska statsskicket i Sverige*. Lund: Gleerup, 1952.

Lindgren, R. *Norway-Sweden: Union, Disunion and Scandinavian Integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Loimaranta, Yrjö. "Den centrala förvaltningens nyorganisation i Finland." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 2 (1923): 89–104.

Rerup, Lorenz. "Nationalisme og skandinavisme indtil første verdenskrigs udbrud." *Den Jyske Historiker* 69–70 (1994): 79–87.

Reuterskiöld, Carl-Axel. "Offentlighetsprincipen i förvaltningen." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 2 (1929): 89–104.

Sachs, Aage. "Det Nordiske Administrativt Forbund igjennem 12 aar 1918–1943." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidskrift* 1–2 (1943): 103–61.

"Stadgar för nordiska adminstrativa förbundet." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 3–4 (1922): 276–277.

Stadius, Peter. *Nordiska Administrativa förbundets finska avdelning 100 år, del I*. Helsingfors: NAF finska avdelning, 2022.

———. "Nordism as a Remake of the Nordic-Scandinavian Pan-Nationalism." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-Nationalism: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius, 180–97. New York: Routledge, 2023.

Strang, Johan, ed. *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.

Thulin, Gabriel, and John Nordin. "Nordisk Administrativa Förbundet, dess insats för det internationella och särskilt för det nordiska samarbetet på förvaltningen område." *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift* 1 (1929): 8–22.

Torgersen, Rolf Normann. "Det nordiske Adminstrativt forbund 70 år – 1918–1988." *Nordisk Adminstrativt Tidsskrift* 1 (1989): 68–112.

Trägårdh, Lars, and Rothstein, Bo. "The State and Civil Society in an Historical Perspective: The Swedish Case." In *The State and Civil Society in Northern Europe: The Swedish Model Reconsidered*, edited by Lars Trägårdh, 229–53. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007.

12 From War Effort to Development Aid

The Scandinavian Red Cross Societies and Korea

Sunniva Engh

Introduction and Research Questions

Nordic and Scandinavian international engagement is often studied from a state-focused angle, and this is particularly true of studies of the countries' development cooperation efforts. This makes sense, as state development agencies such as Norad, Sida, and Danida have been at the centre of Scandinavian development cooperation efforts. At the same time, in Nordic international engagement, several associations and organizations have acted in a range of capacities over time; as knowledge providers, as trendsetters, as practitioners, as lobbyists and support groups, and as means to access larger international networks. Although the earliest Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian development cooperation initiatives were all carried out with considerable involvement of civil society actors, the striking impact of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in development work since the 1980s has meant that research on NGOs' role in aid has primarily focused on the past four decades.

This chapter presents an alternative to the often-dominant state-centred history of NGOs in aid by looking beyond the state as an actor, and tracing early Scandinavian international cooperation carried out by civil society actors, on behalf of the states.[1] Specifically, the chapter studies the Scandinavian Red Cross societies' efforts in Korea, in the period 1950–71. The chapter investigates the societies' involvement in the provision of hospitals to Korea, as part of the UN-led war effort in Korea 1950–53, and in the establishment of the Scandinavian teaching hospital the National Medical Centre (NMC) in Seoul, a development collaboration between the three Scandinavian governments, South Korea, and the UN. The NMC received Scandinavian support from 1958 to 1971. In late 1968, the NMC was transferred to the Korean government, which has run the hospital independently since 1972.[2]

The main research question revolves around the roles of civil society organizations in the Scandinavian countries' international engagement in the immediate post-war period. As the Cold War hardened with the Korean War, and as Denmark and Norway placed themselves squarely on the Western side of the conflict, why did they choose to do so through the representation of civil society organizations, rather than through state-run initiatives? In the case of neutral

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-15
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

Sweden, representation through a civil society organization may seem more immediately logical. Alliances and allegiances aside, however, when the Korean War had ended and a joint Scandinavian development initiative in Korea became a reality, what was its relation to the Scandinavian Red Cross societies, particularly vis-à-vis the newly established aid organizations? What may these cases reveal about the roles of civil society organizations in early Scandinavian international engagement? What factors drove civil society organizations' central role in early post-war Scandinavian foreign policy, both regarding military engagement and civilian development cooperation?

This chapter argues that civil society organizations held key roles in the initial Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish contributions to the UN effort in the Korean War due to a combination of factors. Firstly, they were all highly motivated to contribute and took crucial first initiatives, and secondly, they had close ties to the military forces and could thus easily interact and achieve interoperability with these, whilst at the same time present an alternative to supplying troops to the Korean War, as a humanitarian and civilian channel for participating in international operations. Moreover, as the three Scandinavian-run hospitals in Korea wound down after the end of the war, and the joint aid initiative the NMC emerged, an overlap of personnel indicates a continued role for civil society organizations or at least networks originating within civil society engagement. The NMC received Scandinavian support in the years 1958–71, thus during the same period as the Scandinavian countries all had established, or were establishing, aid administrations. Nevertheless, from the Scandinavian side, the project was run by an ad hoc organization, simply called The Scandinavian Teaching Hospital in Korea, comprising the NMC's Scandinavian Board and a secretariat, thus indicating that the initiative emerged before the formal state-run development administrations were in regular operation. Thus, as the new policy area of development cooperation emerged, the institutional vacuum led to ad hoc solutions with greater roles for civil society actors.

The chapter's overarching aim is to contribute insights on three levels: firstly, on state–civil society relationships in general, secondly, on civil societies' roles in joint Scandinavian cooperative ventures, and, most importantly, on civil societies' roles in Scandinavian international and transnational engagement. First, this chapter provides an overview of existing research on the Scandinavian Red Cross societies and their involvement in Korea, both through the war effort and the NMC. Secondly, I will discuss the roles of civil society in the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish hospitals in Korea as part of the military engagement, and in the later civilian joint Scandinavian development cooperation. Thirdly, I will describe the role of Red Cross personnel in launching the NMC initiative, before concluding with a discussion of the place of civil society in early post-war Scandinavian international engagement.

The Scandinavian Red Cross Societies and Korea: The State of Research

The Scandinavian countries were among six nations that supported the UN effort in Korea with medical units. Each dispatched a hospital, operated by the countries' Red

Cross societies, under the United Nations' Command in Korea. The Scandinavian efforts have been the subject of a slowly growing literature, where authors have primarily investigated the individual countries' efforts. However, studies investigating the overall impact of all three countries' efforts have also recently emerged.

The literature largely takes the Korean War's relation to the greater Cold War conflict as the central point of departure, and the Scandinavian countries' alliance policies, with Norway and Denmark as NATO members and Sweden as neutral, as key motivating factors behind their participation in Korea.[3] Thus, the expanding communist threat is seen as a motivating factor, as it has been in research on other early Scandinavian aid efforts to Asian countries.[4] Indeed, as Jacob Stridsman points out, the existence of several studies using the Korean War as a case for understanding Sweden's greater foreign policy considerations and Sweden's policy of neutrality more specifically, seem to indicate that for Swedish researchers, a key concern has been to understand the Swedish neutrality policy within the great power conflict.[5] It is all the more striking that these studies, including Stridsman's, should do so, with a main focus on Swedish attitudes towards and understandings of the Korean War, with only minimal attention to and analysis of Sweden's actual contribution to the UN effort in Korea.

In addition to underlining the Cold War as a framework for understanding the Scandinavian Korean War efforts, some contributions have particularly examined what may be termed the humanitarian components of this support, such as historian Kristine Midtgaard's article on Denmark's effort, "National Security and the Choice of International Humanitarian Aid: Denmark and the Korean War, 1950–1953".[6] Midtgaard shows how the Danish contribution to the UN effort in Korea was a civilian, rather than a military effort, in several ways: the staff was civilian rather than military, and they engaged in a number of civilian projects in Korea, contrary to their UN assignment which was the treatment of UN soldiers.[7] The relative space for humanitarian and military objectives is also key in historian Sigfrid Su-Gun Östberg's work on the Swedish contribution to Korea, the Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan.[8] According to Östberg, the Swedish Red Cross staff "had to balance the humanitarian objectives of the Red Cross with the military interests of the UN and the U.S. military" and gradually worked towards a greater focus on help for the civilian population.[9] The Swedish Red Cross Field Hospital's opportunities to treat civilians is also underlined by Ji-Wook Park, who found that as the frontline moved north, the number of civilians treated increased.[10]

Tensions between military and humanitarian involvement and concerns also plays a key role in research on Norway's contribution to the UN effort in Korea, the Norwegian Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (NORMASH). Lockertsen, Fause, and Hallett find that, while the NORMASH's role was to support the military effort, the hospital staff viewed their work as a form of humanitarian aid, also extending medical help to the civilian population.[11] Research on NORMASH has also explored the possible impact of the medical efforts in Korea on Norwegian health work, post-Korea. According to Lockertsen and Fause, the wartime experience of the nurses who worked in NORMASH was a "catalyst for identifiable changes in Norwegian

nursing and education of nurses," impacting practice and training as well as giving opportunities to engage in humanitarian work in the Korean health sector.[12]

The impact of Scandinavian medical efforts in the Korean War on Korean medical work and the country's post-war medical system is investigated by Sekwon Jeong, You-ki Min, and Sangduk Lee, who contrast the Scandinavian medical aid during the Korean War with American medical efforts, arguing that the Scandinavian countries were "highly influential in the process of shaping modern Korean medical system".[13] Indeed, contrasting the Scandinavian efforts with the American ones, Jeong, Min, and Lee emphasize the Scandinavians as "civilian friendly", and seemingly argue that this line continued following the war, ensuring a different type of influence:

> The efforts of the three Scandinavian countries to provide humanitarian medical aid in addition to the military medical aid that would determine the outcome of the war, contributed to the development of modern medicine in Korea in a different way from that of the United States following the armistice.[14]

This influence is echoed by Lockertsen and Fause, who state that the Scandinavian impact is recognized by Korean nurses, citing a Korean publication arguing that Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian influence on Korean nursing has been "immense".[15] Thus, the mutual experiences and impacts of the Korean War on both Korean and Scandinavian health systems appear underexplored and deserving of further research.

The focus of this chapter, however, lies rather on the transnational interconnectedness of the relations between state and civil society in Scandinavian international engagement. Using the Red Cross societies in Korea as an example, I highlight the roles of civil society organizations in the Scandinavian countries' engagement in Korea in the immediate post-war period. Research has already established the influence of transnational and international networks and encounters upon Scandinavian civil societies from the mid-1800s onwards. Research on Scandinavian and Nordic political activism, such as indigenous activist groups, shows how these were active beyond and across national boundaries,[16] and such transnational connectedness was also a hallmark of religious organizations and movements, leading to continued international engagement.[17] Indeed, Olav Riste argues that in the case of Norway, the "long and strong traditions of sending missionaries to less fortunate countries" has been "one of the most important roots" of the country's post-war international efforts for "a better and more peaceful world".[18] The role of missions as a precursor to the later official development aid is particularly underlined in histories of Scandinavian development aid.[19]

Similarly, civil society organizations' roles in the early phase of Scandinavian development cooperation are also often a point in Scandinavian aid histories. Examining Denmark's Committee for Cooperation on International Relief (*Samarbejdsudvalg for Internationalt Hjælpearbejde*) (SIH) from its 1944 inception until its conclusion in 1953, Friis Bach et al. underline the central role of three organizations: the Danish Red Cross (*Røde Kors*), ActionAid Denmark

(*Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke*), and Save the Children (*Red Barnet*).[20] In Sweden's Central Committee for Swedish Technical Aid to the Less Developed Areas (*Centralkomittén för svenskt tekniskt bistånd till mindre utvecklade områden*), (CK), an umbrella organization which during the years 1952–61 ran Sweden's first aid initiatives and popularized the idea of development cooperation, civil society, business interests, and government representatives have all participated.[21] Norway's first aid administration, the ad hoc Foundation for help to the underdeveloped areas (*Fondet til hjelp for de underutviklede områder*), also called the India Foundation (*Indiafondet*), was similarly a semi-independent organization, comprising representatives of public administration and politics, civil society organizations, and businesses.[22] Thus, in all Scandinavian countries, civil society organizations held central positions in the early stages of development cooperation as aid became a new policy area following World War II.

At the same time, historical research on joint Nordic aid has focused on early joint initiatives taken through the Nordic Council, its Ministerial Committee on Aid and the related Nordic Advisory Council for Aid, active from 1961 onwards, as well as on the first joint Nordic aid project in Tanganyika, Kenya.[23] Thus, existing research on joint aid initiatives has largely begun its investigations from the time of the launch of joint Nordic aid, tracing precursors such as missionaries' international relief work, and has not delved into any relief or aid efforts jointly initiated by other civil society organizations across the Scandinavian or Nordic countries.

Most research on the Scandinavian initiatives in Korea during the Korean War mentions the establishment of a joint Scandinavian aid effort, the NMC in Seoul, following the war. The initiative itself, however, has so far not been the main subject of any in-depth research. Rather, the NMC is mentioned as a by-product of the individual Scandinavian war efforts, with the idea of a joint initiative appearing in 1951 and being agreed upon in 1956.[24] Friis Bach et al. stand out for describing the NMC in slightly greater detail, and view it as a continuation of post-war humanitarian aid, where private organizations played considerable roles.[25] Thus, the history of the three national Red Cross societies' individual efforts and the subsequent joint Scandinavian aid initiative the NMC, should be expected to provide insights on civil societies' roles vis-à-vis the Scandinavian states, in relation to Scandinavian cooperation, and finally, in relation to joint Scandinavian international initiatives.

Scandinavia and the Korean War: Three Field Hospitals

This section traces the role of civil society organizations in the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish provision of field hospitals in the UN-sanctioned and US-led effort to support South Korea in the Korean War. Looking at the Red Cross societies in the three Scandinavian countries' initiative, planning, and execution of support to the international operation in Korea, what may we learn about the place of civil society organizations in Scandinavian foreign policy and international engagement in the early 1950s?

When war broke out with North Korea's attack on South Korea on 25 June 1950, the UN's Security Council the same day condemned the attack through its

Resolution 82.[26] In the following days and weeks, the Council followed up with further resolutions recommending UN members' assistance to South Korea, and eventually authorized the United States to lead a joint military force to assist South Korea under the UN flag, consisting of member states' contributions.[27] Already two days after the Council had recommended that UN member states assist, the UN's Secretary General, Norwegian Trygve Lie, asked all the Scandinavian governments for contributions.

Considerable hesitation and outright resistance to be involved in the military action, however, seems to have existed in all three countries. The main reasons included the limited military resources and personnel available, and in the case of Denmark and Norway, the experiences of the German invasion in April 1940 encouraged the building up of their own defence rather than sending soldiers abroad. An additional factor was the Scandinavian countries' proximity to the Soviet Union, which created a wish to avoid any undue provocation of their superpower neighbour.[28] In the case of Sweden, participation in the UN operation in Korea would go against their policy of neutrality, and for Denmark and Norway as NATO members, a balance had to be struck between supporting the alliance and stirring up discontent among the domestic opposition to NATO membership, which in the case of Norway had been considerable. According to Midtgaard, Denmark's government several times took the initiative to find a common Scandinavian position on a contribution to the UN's effort in Korea, through June, July, and August of 1950.[29] No common position or contribution was reached, however, as by July, Norway had agreed to a request from Lie to contribute with tonnage from Norway's merchant fleet, and Sweden had settled on a contribution of a field hospital. In 1951, when the UN requested troops from all the Scandinavian countries, Denmark again took the initiative for a Scandinavian coordination, raising the issue at a meeting of the Nordic Ministers of Foreign Affairs.[30] Eventually, however, all three Scandinavian countries would settle for what they regarded as humanitarian contributions to the war effort in the form of hospitals, and all initially with a clear civilian, rather than military profile, in the form of Red Cross contributions.

Denmark: the *Jutlandia* Hospital Ship

From late June 1950, Denmark's government received several requests from the UN to contribute to the efforts in Korea. According to Friis Bach et al., these entailed a dilemma. On the one hand, Denmark wanted to show support for the UN and the USA, and the NATO membership made support a natural step. On the other hand, there was political agreement that a contribution should not be military in nature, and thus the choice eventually fell on a form of contribution that could be classified as humanitarian.[31] In July 1950, Denmark's Foreign Minister Gustav Rasmussen established a "Korea Committee" consisting of representatives of Denmark's Red Cross Society and the Foreign Ministry. The committee proposed that Denmark's contribution to the UN in Korea could be a Red Cross ambulance, equipment, and personnel, and this suggestion was forwarded to the UN. The idea was presumably inspired by the 1939 initiative by Denmark's Red Cross to supply a 200-bed

field hospital to Finland, complete with doctors and nurses. Danish physician and leading member of Copenhagen's Red Cross Karl Lehmann was among those who took part in Finland, and in the late summer of 1950, Lehmann was given the task of negotiating Denmark's contribution to the Korean War. Meeting with US representatives in New York and Washington, Lehmann soon discovered that the proposed ambulance did not satisfy American ambitions for contributions. As a solution, Lehmann launched an idea that Denmark should instead supply a hospital ship. This turned out to be an acceptable idea both to the US and the UN, and in Denmark, Kai Hammerich, President of Denmark's Red Cross society secured the government's support for the plan. Within weeks, the Danish government formally proposed to contribute a fully equipped and staffed hospital ship, organized and operated by Denmark's Red Cross.[32] Soon, at the Nakskov shipyard, the passenger vessel *Jutlandia* was being rebuilt into a hospital ship with 356 beds, four operation theatres, laboratories, and wards.

Kai Hammerich, a naval officer by education, had considerable experience from civil society work, as head of the religious philanthropic organization DanChurchSocial (*Kirkens Korshær*) 1930–40, and as head of the secretariat of Denmark's Committee for Cooperation on International Relief (SIH). As Director of Denmark's Red Cross from 1945, and in addition its president from 1946, he set an ambitious course for the organization. While the Red Cross received limited funding from the Danish government, through his extensive personal networks Hammerich managed to attract large donations from the American Red Cross society. This was crucial for the organization's international work, which in the late 1940s involved efforts in Norway, Finland, Germany, Poland, Austria, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Greece.[33] In October 1950, Hammerich stepped down as Red Cross President, and instead became responsible for the Danish efforts in Korea, personally heading *Jutlandia*'s work in Korea.

Leaving Denmark in January 1951 and reaching Busan, Korea in March, *Jutlandia* conducted three journeys to and stays in Korea during 1951–53. The first mission spanned from January to September 1951, the second from November 1951 to July 1952, and the third from September 1952 to October 1953. During its initial two stays, the Danish hospital ship was stationed far from the front lines in the harbour of Busan, located in the southern part of South Korea, alongside two US hospital ships. For its third mission, *Jutlandia* served in the Bay of Incheon, closer to the front lines. On its three voyages between Denmark and Korea, *Jutlandia* operated as a transport ship, transporting wounded soldiers between Korea and Japan, and to the Netherlands and Denmark.

While the ship and all its medical staff was operated by the Danish Red Cross, in Korea *Jutlandia* was under the command of the Eighth United States Army in Korea (EUSAK) and their Hospital Corps, its main duty being to supply sanitary services to the UN forces. According to Midtgaard, however, the *Jutlandia*'s medical work significantly departed from its UN assignment from the outset, with the Danish doctors and nurses insisting on including civilians instead of exclusively focusing on soldiers.[34] Thus, from its first mission, the ship's medical staff

frequently went ashore to provide medical treatment outside the established military medical system of the UN and the EUSAK. Eventually, Hammerich achieved the UN's approval of the treatment of civilians, provided soldiers were prioritized. Over the three years the *Jutlandia* was active, it is estimated the ship treated a total of 5,000 soldiers and 6,000 civilians.[35]

The *Jutlandia*'s choice to treat civilians, and thus somewhat circumventing its UN mission, was welcomed in Denmark, as it underlined the civilian and humanitarian character of the Danish contribution in Korea. Indeed, it matched the Danish government's insistence upon not supplying troops or being seen to participate in military action. Thus, entrusting the Danish Red Cross with the *Jutlandia* missions was a decision based on the Danish government's consideration that it would be politically advantageous for the *Jutlandia* to be perceived as a Red Cross vessel rather than a state-operated hospital ship. Midtgaard shows that, to underline this, the supervision of the Red Cross's management was intentionally placed under the Foreign Ministry rather than the Ministry of Defense.[36] Indeed, the *Jutlandia* was flying not only the UN and Danish flags, but also the Red Cross flag, and she was painted white with a red ribbon to signify the Red Cross affiliation, rather than the white with a green ribbon which the US military hospital ships had. In addition, of course, Denmark's Red Cross society and its president, Kai Hammerich, were significantly experienced actors in humanitarian assistance, and well connected both at home and abroad. Historian Claus Kjersgaard Nielsen argues that today, *Jutlandia* is a "symbol of the humanitarian tradition in Danish foreign policy" and understood as part of Denmark's participation in international operations sanctioned by the UN.[37] Thus, *Jutlandia*'s character as a state-run, rather than a civil society initiative, seems to have become the most dominant narrative.

Norway: the Norwegian Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (NORMASH)

During the summer of 1950, the Norwegian government received several requests from the UN to support the UN effort in Korea. Discussions between the UN, the Norwegian UN delegation, and the Foreign Ministry eventually led to Norway supplying tonnage in the form of two ships that would be placed under American command, from late July onwards.[38] Norway's main contribution, however, became the Norwegian Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (NORMASH), which was in operation during the years 1951–54, with 90,000 patients treated. NORMASH grew out of the Norwegian Red Cross's initiative in the Korea matter, and over time became a state-run contribution to the UN operation.

On 1 August 1950, Norway's Red Cross society contacted the Norwegian Foreign Ministry to encourage help for Korea. Meeting with the Ministry, Red Cross president, Erling Steen, offered the Red Cross's assistance to any Norwegian effort in Korea. According to the Foreign Ministry, a Norwegian effort would likely be aimed at helping Korean civilians. Following this meeting, the Ministry instructed the Norwegian UN delegation to signal to the UN that Norway would be willing to extend humanitarian aid to Korea. In addition, the Ministry tasked the Red Cross with suggesting possible aid efforts.[39]

The Red Cross established a committee of leading members Michael With Endresen, and medical doctors Gunnar Johnson and Sten Florelius. The connections to the Norwegian Armed Forces Joint Medical Services were close, as Johnson had been the Medical Services' first leader at its establishment in 1941 and Florelius held this position from 1947.[40] Norway's Red Cross traditionally had close relations with Norway's armed forces, with historian Gaute Lund Rønnebu arguing it provided "semi-official support for the Norwegian Forces" from the 1890s onwards.[41] This was certainly the case during the fighting that followed the German attack on Norway on 9 April 1940, when the Red Cross provided crucial medical support to the wounded. As head of the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services following the war, Florelius argued that the Red Cross' work during the campaign showed that this civil-military cooperation ought to be strengthened further in the post-war years.[42] Florelius, Endresen, and Johnson suggested that Norway supply a refugee camp including a hospital for South Korean evacuees to Japan.[43] The Norwegian government hesitated, however. By October the Red Cross was impatient and pushed for a meeting with Prime Minister Gerhardsen. Gerhardsen could not be swayed to make a decision. However, the Red Cross proceeded to give an independent donation of medical equipment to Korea. Civil society commitment to Korea seemingly ran high, and on the UN Day 24 October 1950, the Red Cross, the UN Association, the Norwegian Health Association (*Nasjonalforeningen for folkehelsen*), the Norwegian Women's Public Health Association (*Norske Kvinners Sanitetsforening*), and Norwegian People's Aid (*Norsk Folkehjelp*) jointly organized a fundraising effort, raising NOK 83,000.[44]

In November 1950, Norway's government committed support to the rehabilitation of Korea under the auspices of the UN Korean Rehabilitation Agency (UNKRA), with parliament allocating 13 million NOK over the years 1951/51 and 1952/53 tied to the use of Norwegian goods and services.[45] In the meantime, frustrated by the Norwegian government's inertia, Norway's Red Cross opted to accommodate the International Federation of Red Cross Societies' request for "welfare teams" consisting of medical doctors, sanitary engineers, and welfare officers. Norway's Red Cross supplied one such team, which travelled to Korea in March 1951. The team consisted of Dr. Ragnar Wisløff Nilssen, Paul Lindemann, and Niels Ihlen Sopp. Both Nilssen and Sopp had extensive experience from China, where Nilssen had been a missionary doctor for nine years, and Sopp had worked in the customs services for 29 years.[46]

The welfare teams were under US military command, as part of the UN Civil Assistance Corps Korea (UNCACK). A welfare team from Denmark's Red Cross returned home, judging that being under military command made it "more than difficult to carry out Red Cross work according to Red Cross principles".[47] The Norwegian team appear not to have had similar issues, and were given different areas of responsibility. Lindemann worked in Taegu, Sopp on the island Koje-do, while Nilssen became based in Busan, responsible for health work in the region.[48] Following their six-month contracts with the UNCACK, Sopp and Lindemann continued their engagements in Korea, now as part of the UN Korean Reconstruction

Agency (UNKRA). Although Nilssen returned to Oslo, his stationing in Busan would be crucial for the initial idea of a joint Scandinavian project in Korea.

In late 1950, Norway learned from the UN that a donation of a field hospital to strengthen the joint armed forces' medical care would be much preferable to a refugee camp. Despite some hesitation as to whether such a contribution could be seen as supporting the war effort, the Foreign Ministry in January 1951 tasked the Red Cross committee of Johnson, Endresen, and Florelius with creating plans for a field hospital along the lines of the Swedish hospital in Korea, which opened in September 1950. According to NORMASH veteran Ulrik Pedersen, the Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish Red Cross coordinated the planning of their respective contributions to Korea on behalf of the Scandinavian governments from the summer of 1950.[49] Johnson, Endresen, and Florelius, however, based their proposal on the American Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH), based in tents to be able to service and follow the front. Submitting the proposal to the government, Florelius had handed in his resignation as head of the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services, and was due to become Secretary General of the Red Cross from March 1951. According to historian Kjetil Skogrand, Minister of Defence Jens Chr. Hauge did not approve of Florelius' close ties to both organizations, arguing that the field hospital should be seen as a Red Cross initiative, rather than anything concerning the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services.[50] At the same time, however, the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services' involvement in the process continued, as the preparatory meetings included both Florelius' predecessor Carl Semb and his replacement Torstein Dale.[51] Moreover, Florelius and Semb also knew each other from their establishment of the *Sanorg* during the war, a secret sanitary organization related to Norway's resistance movement *Milorg*, where Semb was part of the leadership. *Sanorg* counted the Red Cross Search and Rescue Corps among their resources, thus underlining the close civil-military relations.[52]

When the Norwegian government settled on the NORMASH plan in January 1951, allocating NOK 5 million for an initial six-month period, several main concerns were visible. Firstly, the contribution should be civilian and humanitarian, and not appear as part of the war effort, given a considerable domestic opposition regarding Norway's NATO membership. Secondly, and at the same time, it should still be a clear support to the US-led UN effort, and create American goodwill towards Norway. Thirdly, the existing Swedish and Danish medical aid to Korea had set highly visible examples and created positive public attention, which may have been inspirational and pointed towards possible Scandinavian coordination.

In April, officers from Norway's Armed Forces Joint Medical Services travelled to Japan to negotiate with the US Far East Command. In June, Carl Semb was despatched as representative of the Norwegian government and Norway's Red Cross to the US, Japan, and Korea, to coordinate with the UN and the Eighth United States Army in Korea (EUSAK) and facilitate the establishment of NORMASH.[53] A 60-bed mobile hospital was purchased from the USA, and this was delivered in June 1951. By the end of May, the first Norwegian contingent of 83 doctors and nurses was in place, and the official opening of NORMASH took place on 19 July 1951.[54] Similarly to the other Scandinavian hospitals in Korea, NORMASH was part of the

EUSAK, and was supplied with an additional 52 American staff as well as Korean staff in supporting functions. As NORMASH's primary task was to perform emergency surgery on soldiers, it thus remained close to the frontlines, first at Uijongbu before moving to Tongduchon.[55] Patients would receive critical treatment, and be referred on to hospitals further away from the front for recuperation. According to historian Torunn Laugen Haaland, this proximity to the front and tight-knit integration with the US forces created American goodwill for Norway.[56]

From the second contingent onwards, the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services took over the running of the NORMASH, and the Red Cross lost its formal role in the hospital. Skogrand argues that the change was due to a mounting pressure on Norway to take part militarily, and NORMASH staff, which were increased to 106, were now given military status.[57] The American participation was discontinued.

When NORMASH closed on 15 November 1954, seven contingents and a total of 623 Norwegian staff had served at the hospital. Approximately 90,000 patients had received treatment, and 9,600 operations had been carried out.[58] Civilian patients were not prioritized as long as fighting took place, but their numbers did increase in NORMASH's last year.[59]

NORMASH was established due to the Red Cross's continued pressure on the Norwegian government, and the continued requests for support from the UN. For the Norwegian government, funding the Red Cross–operated NORMASH initially provided an opportunity to support the UN effort without providing clear military support. Similarly, reorganizing NORMASH as a military hospital in late 1951 solved the increasing pressure on Norway to contribute militarily. NORMASH nevertheless operated in an organizational grey zone, as a combination of private initiative and public funding which resulted in international engagement operationalized through a civil society organization. It is striking that in the planning of NORMASH, four former and contemporaneous heads of the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services were involved, even before the hospital had been established. In addition, as accounts written by NORMASH veterans show, the personnel were a mix of civilian and military, and several had experience from recent military action, either fighting on Finland's side in the 1939–1940 Winter War, from the German attack on and campaign in Norway in 1940, from the Norwegian resistance, and from the Norwegian Independent Brigade Group (British Army of the Rhine), which participated in the allied occupation of Germany from 1947 onwards.[60] Thus, while the NORMASH initiative appears as the result of a civilian enthusiasm and engagement, in practice, the hospital had close ties to the Armed Forces Joint Medical Services, and a mixed military and civilian staff, even in the first, Red Cross-organized contingent.

Sweden: the Swedish Red Cross Hospital

Sweden's Red Cross society also supplied a hospital—the Swedish Red Cross Hospital (SRCH), which was active 1951–57. Having received similar calls for assistance to the UN mission to Korea as Denmark and Norway, Sweden was the first Scandinavian country to settle on a contribution of a Red Cross field hospital.

The initial Swedish reactions to the UN request seem to have been clear on the point that Sweden wanted to retain her policy of neutrality, and thus replied that the deployment of troops was impossible due to Swedish law.[61] Sweden, however, suggested extending humanitarian help in the form of a field hospital. According to Östberg, the choice was due to Sweden's wish to avoid a military contribution, and thus a humanitarian effort would pass as evident support for the UN whilst not jeopardizing Sweden's neutrality. A hospital, furthermore, became viewed as the most effective solution. Östberg argues that the Swedish hospital was "very much a product of the tension between Swedish neutrality, the Soviet threat, and the Swedish commitment to the UN".[62] This view is echoed by Stridsman, who argues that the Swedish government's views and statements on the UN operation in Korea, and their decision to supply a field hospital, was a clear position in favour of South Korea and the US-led coalition.[63]

These interpretations, however, focus on the motivations behind Sweden's wish to support the UN without being involved militarily, but at the same time overlook motivations behind how the humanitarian contribution was operationalized. The Swedish government commissioned the Swedish Red Cross to organize and run the hospital, and throughout its period of operation, the hospital was a Swedish contribution to an international operation, run by a civil society organization. As Bro points out, the Swedish Red Cross Hospital was also a result of an additional two motivations. Firstly, the Swedish Red Cross society itself wanted to contribute with medical help to Kora, and secondly, the US Army needed their medical support as part of the war effort.[64] Thus, Bro highlights the voluntary sector's own motivation to extend help to Korea, as well as the need for medical collaboration. The Red Cross organization's motivation is underlined by the fact that on 12 July 1950, two days before Trygve Lie's second appeal to UN member countries for aid for the UN effort, the South Korean Red Cross itself issued an appeal for immediate assistance. Requesting the international Red Cross system of organizations to help, this appeal thus reached the Swedish Red Cross via a telegram from the International Red Cross Committee.[65] Swift deliberations between Sweden's Ministry of Defence and the Red Cross followed, and a week later, Sweden's Foreign Minister Östen Undén proposed to Trygve Lie that Sweden supply a field hospital.[66] At negotiations in the US over the summer of 1950, Sweden was represented by the head of the Defence Medical Board, Fritz Braun, and agreement was reached on a 200-bed field hospital with Swedish personnel, and the purchase of equipment in the US, to avoid shortages in Sweden.

Given the Swedish government's clear wish to avoid military contribution and jeopardizing its neutrality, it is to be assumed that the government very much welcomed the Red Cross's interest in participating. Thus, as in the case of Denmark, a balance was struck between supplying help without compromising their own position in international affairs, while keeping state responsibility for the humanitarian effort at a minimum. The Swedish state financed the effort, while it was operationalized by a civil society organization.

Once the agreement had been reached, things moved quickly. In early August, Sweden's Deputy Director of Health Carl Erik Groth was appointed head of the

hospital, and recruitment of medical staff was carried out through ads in newspapers and radio. The hospital would include around 170 Swedish staff members, comprising doctors, dentists, nurses, assistant nurses, and dieticians, in addition to 30 American military personnel and 200 locally employed Korean staff.[67] The initial plan for a 200-bed mobile field hospital was abandoned, both to meet increasing demand for hospital beds and to allow for purchase of US equipment. Thus, Sweden received equipment for a hospital twice the intended size and became based in Busan as a transit hospital for the US Eight Army Hospital Corps.[68] By late September, all personnel had arrived in Busan, and would be stationed in Korea for six-month periods. The hospital admitted patients ahead of its official opening on 5 October, and patient numbers rose swiftly, reaching 350 within the first month.

According to Iko, after only two months of operation, the SRCH staff requested the US Army command to move the hospital closer to the front to help a greater number of patients, but were turned down. Patient turnover was high, and as a result the Swedish medical staff felt underemployed. Some travelled to the frontlines to study how the medical work was carried out there, and from spring 1951, plans emerged for how the SRCH could help the civilian Korean population, for example through a teaching hospital.

Eventually, the SRCH established a work pattern similar to that of the *Jutlandia*: the Swedish personnel engaged in helping civilians, gradually circumventing the official task of exclusively catering to the allied forces. At all times, around twenty civilian patients would be admitted to and treated by the SRCH, and from late 1951 onwards Swedish staff regularly provided medical care in civilian Korean hospitals, providing referral for local patients and advising Korean staff.[69] The SRCH also established an unofficial polyclinic, serving civilian Koreans, and eventually, the hospital's pediatrician established a mobile children's polyclinic, providing medical services to orphanages. In late 1952, the EUSAK allowed the SRCH to earmark 125 beds for civilian use, and from 1953 an additional 40 beds were designated for pediatric treatment.[70]

After the fighting in Korea ceased in late 1953, the SRCH remained part of the military organization under American command. However, the hospital's civilian profile was further strengthened. Partly due to the cessation of fighting, this was nevertheless largely a result of the continued Swedish prioritization of civilian care. This prioritization seems to have been approved implicitly by the Swedish Foreign Ministry, provided it did not risk any goodwill with the Americans.[71] The SRCH remained in operation until April 1957, at which point a total of 1,124 Swedish men and women had served at the hospital, which had treated a total of 255,000 patients.[72]

Throughout the SRCH's years of operation, Swedish authorities remained anxious that the hospital and its staff were not portrayed as participating in the military conflict in Korea, instead emphasizing the humanitarian effort under the auspices of the UN.[73] Thus, similarly to the Danish government, the Swedish government looked to pragmatic political concerns when settling for a humanitarian effort, operationalized by a civil society organization. Humanitarian motivations were, on the other hand, clearly visible in the Swedish Red Cross staff's continued push to prioritize the Korean civilian population. As head of the SRCH Carl Erik Groth

argued, the poverty and need in Korea "had created a strong wish to do anything to help and relieve".[74] Fulfilling a Swedish political wish to support the UN without compromising their neutrality, the SRCH also fulfilled the Swedish Red Cross society's wish to help. At the same time, these motivations were balanced with the interests and needs of the US-led coalition force. For many SRCH staff, the commitment to international work became a lasting one, with several participating in the later UN mission in Congo.[75]

The Joint Scandinavian Initiative: The National Medical Centre

As shown above, the national Red Cross societies held key roles in all three Scandinavian countries' efforts in Korea. As the war came to an end, the *Jutlandia* left Korea in August 1953, the NORMASH left in October 1954, while the SRCH remained in operation until April 1957.

When the SRCH came to an end, Sweden decided that a medical team would stay on in Korea until the joint Scandinavian project the National Medical Centre (NMC) was established, in October 1958.[76] The prospect of a Scandinavian collaboration seems to have motivated the continued Swedish funding of the SRCH and the medical team, as this would secure continuity. Östberg has found that there were no obvious connections between the projects.[77] However, some clear continuities exist in terms of key actors taking crucial first initiatives.

In 1951, already before NORMASH had opened, discussions came about as to whether Denmark, Norway, and Sweden should establish a combined effort in Korea following the end of the war. The emergence of this idea shows the continued, decisive influence of Red Cross representatives, which would have bearings on the joint Scandinavian project.

According to Ragnar Wisløff Nilssen, who at this point worked for the UNCACK, the first discussion took place on board the *Jutlandia*. Kai Hammerich informed Nilssen that Denmark's government had decided to provide medical aid to Korea after the war had ended, and the two discussed further aid with UNKRA representative Sir Arthur Rucker. Meeting Norwegian representatives later the same day, Nilssen realized that the Norwegian government had also allocated funding for aid to civilians, and in further discussions between Nilssen and Rucker, the idea to reach out to Swedish representatives transpired. On 27 June 1951, eleven representatives of Norway, Denmark, Sweden, UNKRA, and UNCACK met at the UNKRA headquarters, and a committee was established to prepare plans for a joint Scandinavian effort in Korea.[78]

A whirlwind series of meetings preparing the initiative followed, including daily meetings from 26–30 June and 2–5 July.[79] Here, according to Nilssen, Carl Semb played a decisive role: "General Semb was the man with the plan", and with his "rich experience, his excellent administrative abilities and his enthusiasm" became the driving force behind the initiative.[80] Based on the discussions, Semb quickly sketched plans for a joint project, submitting these to Rucker and UNKRA.[81] By 5 July, Rucker reported that UNKRA's Agent General J. Donald Kingsley was "cordially approving the whole project in principle".[82] The following day, 6 July

1951, Semb submitted a report to Norway's Foreign Ministry to describe the plan, giving it "his strongest recommendations".[83] The main reasons were listed as the strong need for aid in Korea, the potential contribution to international collaboration, the UNKRA involvement was seen as positive, and the potential to gain valuable experience for Scandinavian medical personnel. Semb's report set out two alternatives; a short-term aid effort which would provide training of Korean health personnel and placements for Scandinavian doctors in Korean hospitals, and a long-term effort involving the establishment of a permanent, 1000-bed teaching hospital which would train Korean medical students and personnel. Given the need for increased hospital infrastructure in Korea, the teaching hospital was envisaged as a 1000-bed hospital, and the support would last for ten years. The project would be a form of "help to self-help," in that it would gradually increase Korean medical and administrative capacity, and thus the hospital would eventually be transferred from the donors to the Korean government.[84]

The prolonged war in Korea delayed these plans. However, when fighting ended in 1953, UNKRA formally requested Scandinavian aid. A Scandinavian committee was established with subcommittees in each country, and delegations visited Korea in 1953 and 1955. The result was the joint Scandinavian teaching hospital called the National Medical Centre (NMC), which merged the short and long-term aid ideas sketched in Semb's report. On 13 May 1956, an Agreement for the NMC was signed between UNKRA, the government of South Korea, and the governments of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.[85] The NMC would be based at Seoul City Hospital, provide medical care, and train "Korean doctors, advanced medical students, nurses and technicians".[86] Part of Korea's public health system, the centre would also be part of UNKRA's rehabilitation programme. South Korea were responsible for buildings and grounds, Korean personnel, and expenses for care of patients. The Scandinavian governments would provide a "Medical Mission" consisting of 80 medical personnel and their salaries, transport, and administrative support. Each Scandinavian country would contribute up to USD 2,000,000 until the end of 1957, and thereafter USD 1,500,000 annually, for a five-year period. UNKRA's contribution amounted to USD 2,400,000.[87] Thus, the NMC was a collaboration between five parties: the governments of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and South Korea, and the UNKRA, while its designation as a Scandinavian teaching hospital came from the Scandinavian initiative as well as the Scandinavian provision of medical personnel which held leading roles in the NMC.

During the NMC negotiations, it became clear that ownership and lines of command in the project presented challenges, and thus, the NMC was given an intricate organizational set-up. The Scandinavian countries were determined to keep control over the hospital, while the Korean government wanted control over Korean funds.[88] This resulted in a joint administration with divided responsibilities. A Scandinavian Board included Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish government representatives, and these appointed the Chief of the Scandinavian Medical Mission. There was also the Korean Director of NMC, who answered to the Korean Minister of Health and Social Affairs. An NMC Governing Board comprised six members: three Korean and three Scandinavian, plus the

Scandinavian Mission's Chief. Each NMC Department would be headed by a Scandinavian.[89] In 1964, an addendum ensured continued cooperation through September 1968, highlighting the gradual project transfer, as "the responsibilities of the Scandinavian staff are transferred to Korean medical, technical and administrative personnel", and the Korean government would gradually assume all operating costs.[90]

In preparation for the Korean takeover, the 1964 addendum also concerned the charging of fees, stating that "the present practice of admission and the scale of fees must be revised" due to the changing conditions of funding.[91] While the NMC seemingly had offered services free of charge, this would have to change with the Korean takeover of the hospital and the end of Scandinavian aid. According to John Eikås at NMC's Tuberculosis Department, in practice "You often had to alter the rules a little and take in patients for humanitarian reasons, those you could not bring yourself to send home".[92]

The 350-bed, 17-department hospital was eventually transferred to Korea on 30 September 1968. Since its 1958 inauguration, NMC activities had comprised postgraduate medical teaching, a school of nursing, and a Tuberculosis Control station. The 1964 agreement underlined the importance of training, stipulating that the Scandinavian governments would endeavour "to provide training opportunities in Scandinavia for Korean personnel" trained at the NMC.[93] Over the years, a total of 367 Scandinavian staff worked at NMC.[94]

As shown above, the NMC was an aid project by the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish governments in collaboration with UNKRA and Korea. Nevertheless, the decisive first initiative as well as the planning of the NMC was done by Red Cross representatives in semi-official roles relating to the *Jutlandia*, NORMASH, and the SRCH, particularly Hammerich, Nilssen, and Semb. On the Norwegian side, key actors remained central throughout the NMC's existence. In the mid-1960s, the Norwegian administration of the NMC was integrated into the aid administration Norwegian Development Aid (*Norsk Utviklingshjelp*), which had been established in 1962, and a Medical Board was appointed, consisting of several old Korea hands. This included doctors Carl Semb, Bernhard Paus, and Erling Hjort, and Director of Norway's national hospital (*Rikshospitalet*) Jonn Caspersen and Deputy Director of Health Jon Bjørnson.[95] Semb had been key in NORMASH throughout its history, whilst Paus and Hjort had served at both NORMASH and NMC.[96] Caspersen and Bjørnson had, with Semb, been involved in negotiations on the termination of NORMASH.[97] The Scandinavian Board and the board of Norwegian Development Aid had decided that the Norwegian administration of the NMC would be integrated into Norwegian Development Aid, thus gradually subsuming the project into the official aid administration—a process which was welcomed by the Scandinavian Board.[98] A similar gradual integration into the recently established state-run aid administration appears to have taken place in Sweden, where Berg, Lundberg, and Tydén have found that the NMC features in the reports of the Board for International Aid (*Nämnden för internationellt bistånd*) (NIB) and Sida from the 1960s onwards.[99] The Norwegian Medical Board

retained an advisory role, coordinating with the Scandinavian board and advising Norwegian Development Aid's decisions during NMC's final years of operation as a joint Scandinavian project.[100]

Conclusions: From War Effort to Development Aid

This chapter has examined the roles of the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish Red Cross societies in their countries' assistance to the UN effort in the Korean War, as well as in the Scandinavian aid initiative, the Scandinavian teaching hospital the National Medical Centre (NMC). The aim has been to highlight civil societies' roles vis-à-vis the Scandinavian states, in relation to Scandinavian cooperation, and finally, in relation to joint Scandinavian international initiatives.

This chapter contends that civil society organizations played pivotal roles in the early contributions of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden to the US-led joint UN force in Korea, as a result of several factors. Firstly, the Red Cross societies were highly motivated and took the initial crucial steps to promote Danish, Norwegian and Swedish assistance. Secondly, their close ties with the national military forces enabled seamless interaction and interoperability, while also providing a humanitarian and civilian alternative to deploying troops. Additionally, as the three Scandinavian-run hospitals in Korea wound down post-war, and the NMC was established through a joint aid initiative, the overlap of personnel suggests that civil society organizations or networks originating from civil society continued to play a significant role.

Also, the fact that during the 1950s, development cooperation was a new policy area for Scandinavian countries may have meant that civil society initiatives were particularly welcome from the Scandinavian governments' perspectives, and were given room to manoeuvre. In July 1951, when the initiative for a Scandinavian teaching hospital in Korea was taken with Hammerich, Nilssen, and, perhaps most of all, Semb, in central roles, none of the Scandinavian nations had established regular aid administrations. Indeed, Denmark's Committee for Cooperation on International Relief (SIH), where Hammerich had headed the secretariat, was the closest there was. When planning began in earnest in 1953, the SIH no longer existed, and by the time the NMC agreement was signed in 1956, Norway's India Foundation and Sweden's Central committee (CK) had only recently been established. Thus, in this institutional vacuum, the NMC was organized through an ad hoc organization, The Scandinavian Teaching Hospital in Korea, where personnel from the *Jutlandia*, NORMASH and SRCH played leading roles.

In Korea, Danish, Norwegian and Swedish personnel, irrespective of whether they were primarily Red Cross, national government or UNCACK representatives, appear to have gravitated towards each other, sharing news from home, updating each other on developments, and coordinating efforts. On board the *Jutlandia*, in the NORMASH camp and the SRCH hospital buildings, as well as in the UNKRA headquarters, networks were forged, and plans were made, which would set the

direction for a joint Scandinavian effort in the years 1956–71: the National Medical Centre.

The NMC has been understood as a successful development project, and the hospital remains central in Korea's health infrastructure today. However, no further joint Scandinavian aid projects were launched. During the NMC's time of operation, state-run development co-operation gradually became a policy area of priority for the Scandinavian countries' governments, thus necessitating a more permanently organized aid sector. Beginning with the 1962 launch of Norway's Norwegian Development Aid and Sweden's Board for International Aid, and culminating in the 1965 and 1968 establishments of Sida, Norad, and Danida, state aid administrations gradually replaced the ad hoc organizations of aid's early period. Thus, from the mid-1960s, The Scandinavian Teaching Hospital in Korea's different branches became integrated into the new aid administrations in each Scandinavian country. By the time of the final transfer of Scandinavian funding to the NMC in 1971, development aid had become a regular feature of the Scandinavian countries' foreign policy – a policy area whose importance and share of the national budgets would only increase over time. In a parallel process, development aid also became an arena for joint Nordic initiatives. Since 1961, the Nordic Council had established a Nordic Ministerial committee and an advisory council for development aid, also launching joint Nordic projects. As new aid administrations emerged nationally and regionally, and the NMC was being transferred to the government of Korea, there was presumably little need for or political will to establish further Scandinavian aid projects or to retain a joint Scandinavian aid administration marked by civil society commitment.

Through the case of Scandinavian Red Cross societies' engagement in Korea, from the war efforts of the *Jutlandia*, NORMASH, and the SRCH to the development aid collaboration over the NMC, we may recognize the global interconnectedness and multilevel presence of civil society representatives over time, observing how civil society has played key parts in the Scandinavian governments' early post-war international engagement. Thus, exploring the roles of civil society and its evolving functions, contexts, and influences, has potential to allow exploration of dynamics and developments both within and beyond Scandinavia, seeing beyond the state as an actor. Following the Red Cross societies' efforts in Korea, while state-run aid administrations took on leading roles, NGO involvement in Scandinavian aid has stayed strong, and the Red Cross societies have remained main partners.

Notes

1 This chapter has evolved from a paper presented at the 7th Nordic Challenges Conference, and I am grateful to two referees for comments on an early version, and to Erlend Seim Kjeken for research assistance.
2 Norway in South Korea, "National Medical Center."
3 See e.g. Saxer, "The Korea Question."
4 See e.g. Pharo, *Hjelp til selvhjelp*, Simensen, *Norsk utviklingshjelps historie*, and Berg, Tydén, and Lundberg, *En svindlande uppgift*.

5 See e.g. Stridsman, “Sverige och Koreakriget,” Silva, “Keep Them Strong,” Ekecrantz, “Hemlig utrikespolitik.”
6 Midtgaard, “National Security.”
7 Midtgaard, “National Security,” 149.
8 Su-Gun Östberg, “The Swedish Red Cross Hospital.” See also Su-Gun Östberg, “Svenska Röda Korset-sjukhuset i Pusan.”
9 Su-Gun Östberg, “The Swedish Red Cross Hospital,” 153.
10 Park, “The Medical Assistance.”
11 Lockertsen, Fause, and Hallett, “The Norwegian Mobile Army Surgical Hospital.”
12 Lockertsen and Fause, “The Nursing Legacy of the Korea Sisters,” 98–99.
13 Jeong, Min, and Lee, “Medical Support.”
14 Jeong, Min, and Lee, “Medical Support.”
15 Lockertsen and Fause, “The Nursing Legacy of the Korea Sisters,” 98–99.
16 Vik, “Indigenous Internationalism.”
17 See e.g. Simensen, “Norsk misjonsforskning,” and Berg, “Misjonshistorie og samfunnsforskning.”
18 Riste, *Norway’s Foreign Relations*, 256.
19 Berg, Lundberg, and Tydén, *En svindlande uppgift*, and Simensen, *Norsk utviklingshjelps historie*. See also Brimnes, Olsen, and Gulløv, eds, *Danmark og kolonierne*, Engh and Pharo, “Nordic Cooperation,” Engh, “The Conscience of the World?”
20 Friis Bach et al., *Idealer og realiteter*, 31–55.
21 Berg, Lundberg, and Tydén, *En svindlande uppgift*, 62–80.
22 See Helge Pharo, *Hjelp til selvhjelp*.
23 Engh, “The ‘Nordic model’ in international development aid,” Engh and Pharo, “Nordic Cooperation,” Røed, ‘Utdanning for utvikling,” Paaskesen, “Hvid elefant i fællesnordiske fodspor.”
24 Lockertsen and Fause, “The Nursing Legacy of the Korea Sisters,” 98, Su-Gun Östberg, “The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan,” *Korea Journal* 54(1) (2014), 152.
25 Friis Bach et al., *Idealer og realiteter*, 88.
26 See Security Council Resolution 82 (1950), www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-1950 (accessed 4 July 2024).
27 See Security Council Resolutions 83, 84, and 85 (1950), www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-1950 (accessed 4 July 2024).
28 See e.g. Su-Gun Östberg, ‘The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan,” 134, Midtgaard, *Småstat, magt og sikkerhed*, 115–41, and Pharo and Eriksen, *Kald krig og internasjonalisering*, 52–53.
29 Midtgaard, *Småstat, magt og sikkerhed*, 115–19.
30 Midtgaard, *Småstat, magt og sikkerhed*, 126–31.
31 Friis Bach et al., *Idealer og realiteter*, 84.
32 Midtgaard, *Småstat, magt og sikkerhed*, 117–21, and Hansen, *Præsidenterne*, 124–25.
33 Hansen, *Præsidenterne*, 124–25, Danmarks Røde Kors, 110–13.
34 Midtgaard, “National Security.”
35 Jeong, Min, and Lee, “Medical Support.”
36 Midtgaard, “National Security,” 168.
37 Nielsen, ‘Korea-krigen, 1950–1953.’
38 Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 15–16, see also 23–31.
39 Skogrand, “Norge og Koreaspørsmålet,” 150.
40 Melien, *Forsvarets sanitet*, 445.

41 Rønnebu, "Mellom Solferino og Berlin," 71.
42 Rønnebu, "Mellom Solferino og Berlin," 85.
43 Reitehaug and Ulvestad, *Norske militære feltsykehus*, 32.
44 Skogrand, "Norge og Koreaspørsmålet," 150.
45 Skogrand, "Norge og Koreaspørsmålet," 153.
46 Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 37–39.
47 Ahlmann-Ohlsen to Dunning, 02 June 1951, quoted in Skogrand, "Norge og Koreaspørsmålet," 156.
48 Nilssen, *Med Røde Kors i Korea*, 35–41.
49 Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 33.
50 Skogrand, "Norge og Koreaspørsmålet," 158–59.
51 Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 40
52 Rønnebu, "Mellom Solferino og Berlin," 223–228.
53 Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 40–41.
54 Kristiansen, *Norsk militær innsats*, 33.
55 Melien, *Forsvarets sanitet*, 269.
56 Haaland, "Norges militære utenlandsengasjement," 166.
57 Skogrand, *Norsk forsvarshistorie*, 232.
58 Melien, *Forsvarets sanitet*, 270.
59 Reitehaug and Ulvestad, *Norske militære feltsykehus*, 36.
60 Treider, "Fra vinterkrigen til Korea," 44–54 and Pedersen, *Norge i Korea*, 45.
61 Grunewald, "Svenska sjukhuset i Korea," 2737–39. https://lakartidningen.se/aktuellt/kultur-2/2010/11/svenska-sjukhuset-i-korea-humanitar-insats-i-kriget/ (accessed 5 July 2024).
62 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 135.
63 Stridsman, "Sverige och Koreakriget," 107.
64 Bro, "Återställandets konst," 34.
65 Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," 5.
66 Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," 5.
67 The following rendition of the SRCH's work in Korea is mainly based on Bro, "Återställandets konst," Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," and Su-Gun Östberg, "Svenska Röda Korset-sjukhuset i Pusan."
68 Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," 6.
69 Kim and Yang, "Seojeon Byungwon, Jutlandia, and NORMASH."
70 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 142–45, and Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," 8–10.
71 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 144.
72 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 138.
73 Iko, "Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård?," 16.
74 Groth's article "Från krigssjukhus till fredssjukhus," 8, quoted in Su-Gun Östberg, "Svenska Röda Korset-sjukhuset i Pusan," 18.
75 Bro, "Återställandets konst," 34.
76 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 152.
77 Östberg, "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan," 152.
78 Norway's national archives (*Riksarkivet*) (NO RA) state archives (*statsarkiv*) (S) 2913 Skandinaviske undervisningssykehus i Korea, 1/D/Da/L0026/0001: Referat fra møte i det Norske Medicinske Selskab 27. januar 1960. Lecture given by Dr. Ragnar Wisløff Nilssen.
79 NO RA S 2913/2/E/Eb/L001/1.2: Semb to Okkenhaug, 21 March 1968.

80 Nilssen, *Med Røde Kors i Korea*, 178.
81 NO RA S 2913/2/E/Eb/L001/1.2: Semb to Rucker, 4 July 1951.
82 NO RA S 2913/2/E/Eb/L001/1.2: Rucker to Semb, 5 July 1951.
83 NO RA S 2913/2/E/Eb/L001/1.2: Semb to the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6 July 1951.
84 NO RA S 2913/2/E/Eb/L001/1.2: Semb to the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6 July 1951.
85 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: Agreement for the establishment and operation of a national medical center in Korea 1956.
86 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: NMC Agreement 1956.
87 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: NMC Agreement 1956.
88 Friis Bach et al., *Idealer og realiteter*, 86.
89 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: NMC Agreement 1956.
90 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: The agreement for the establishment and operation of National Medical Center March 1964.
91 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: NMC agreement 1964.
92 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Da/L0026: Referat fra møte i det Norske Medicinske Selskab 27. januar 1960, Lecture by Dr. John Eikås, 2.
93 NO RA S 2913/1/D/Dd/L0075/0002: NMC agreement 1964.
94 Paus, "National Medical Center," 84.
95 NO RA S 6305 Norsk Utviklingshjelp/1/D/Da/L041: Letter of appointment, Fagstyret for Det skandinaviske undervisningssykehuset i Korea, 16 December 1964.
96 Bernhard Paus was involved in the planning of NORMASH, took part in the first NORMASH contingent, and was Head of Orthopedic Surgery at NMC 1958–60. Erling Hjort was head of NORMASH in 1952 and Head of General Surgery at NMC1962–63. *NORMASH. Korea i våre hjerter*, 88–96.
97 NO RA S 6305 Norsk Utviklingshjelp/1/D/Da/L041: Instruks for det norske fagstyre for Det skandinaviske undervisningssykehuset i Korea, 16 December 1964.
98 NO RA S 6305 Norsk Utviklingshjelp/1/D/Da/L041: Letter from the Scandinavian Board to Norsk Utviklingshjelp, 14 April 1965.
99 Berg, Tydén, and Lundberg, *En svindlande uppgift*, 661, note 73.
100 NO RA S 6305 Norsk Utviklingshjelp/1/D/Da/L041: Norsk Utviklingshjelp Board document 94/65, 7 December 1965.

Sources

Archives

Norway's National Archives (*Riksarkivet*) (NO RA) State archives (*statsarkiv*) (S)
2913 Skandinaviske undervisningssykehus i Korea
6305 Norsk Utviklingshjelp

Bibliography

Bakke, Finn, ed. *NORMASH: Korea i våre hjerter*. Valdres: Norwegian Korean War Veterans Association, 2010.

Berg, Annika, Urban Lundberg, and Mattias Tydén. *En svindlande uppgift: Sverige och biståndet 1945–1975*. Stockholm: Ordfront forlag, 2021.

Berg, Roald. “Misjonshistorie og samfunnsforskning.” *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 3–4 (2009): 322–36.

Bro, Tomas. “Återställandets konst: Svenska frivilliga läkares erfarenheter av militärmedicin i utländska krig 1864–1964.” PhD diss., Lund University, 2017.

Ekecrantz, Stefan. “Hemlig utrikespolitik. Kalla kriget, utrikesnämnden och regeringen 1946– 1959.” PhD diss., University of Stockholm, 2003.

Engh, Sunniva. “The Conscience of the World?: Swedish and Norwegian Provision of Development Aid.” *Itinerario* 33(2) (2009): 65–82.

Engh, Sunniva. “The ‘Nordic Model’ in International Development Aid. Explanation, Experience and Export.” In *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images*, edited by Haldor Byrkjeflot, Lars Mjøset, Mads Mordhorst and Klaus Petersen, 124–142. London: Routledge, 2021.

Engh, Sunniva, and Helge Pharo. “Nordic Cooperation in Providing Development Aid.” In *Regional Cooperation and International Organizations: The Nordic Model in Transnational Alignment*, edited by Norbert Götz and Heidi Hallgrén, 112–30. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009.

Forsvaret. *I tjeneste for Norge*. www.itjenestefornorge.no/operasjoner?query=korea (accessed 4 July 2024).

Friis Bach, Christian, et al. *Idealer og realiteter: dansk udviklingspolitiks historie 1945–2005*. København: Gyldendal, 2008.

Groth, Carl-Erik. “Från krigssjukhus till fredssjukhus.” *Joboseyo* 1(1) (1961): 8–10.

Grunewald, Karl. “Svenska sjukhuset i Korea – humanitär innsats i kriget.” *Läkartidningen* 44(107) 2010: 2737–39. https://lakartidningen.se/aktuellt/kultur-2/2010/11/svenska-sjukhuset-i-korea-humanitar-insats-i-kriget/ (accessed 5 July 2024).

Gulløv, Hans Christian, Olsen, Poul, and Brimnes, Niels, eds. *Danmark og kolonierne*. København: G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 2017.

Haaland, Torunn Laugen. “Norges militære utenlandsengasjement 1947–2017.” In *Historiker, strateg og brobygger: Festskrift til Rolf Tamnes 70 År*, edited by Helge Ø. Pharo, Kjell Inge Bjerga, Sunniva Engh, Gunnar D. Hatlehol, and Kristine Offerdal, 162–83. Oslo: Pax forlag, 2021.

Hansen, Preben Søegaard. *Præsidenterne: En fortælling om Røde Kors i Danmark 1864–2019*. Coopenhagen: ScandinavianBook, 2020. https://issuu.com/danskrodekors/docs/pr_esidenterne_bog_230x155_2021_digital_med_links (accessed 4 July 2024).

Iko, Per. “Sjukvårt i krig eller krigssjukvård? Det svenska fältsjukhuset i Korea 1950–1954.” fil. mag. dissertation, Försvarshögskolan, 1995.

Jeong, Sekwon, You-ki Min, and Sangduk Lee. “Medical Support Provided by the UN’s Scandinavian Allies during the Korean War.” *Korean Journal of Medical History* 32(3) (2023): 829–64.

Kim, David W., and Heung-Sook Yang. “Seojeon Byungwon, Jutlandia, and NORMASH: UN’s Scandinivian Allies at the Korean War and Beyond (1950s–1960s).” *East Asia* 39 (2022): 127–47. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12140-021-09369-8 (accessed 4 July 2024).

Kjosås, Knut Rødseth. “De taushetsbelagte menn. Den ukjente historien om norske soldater i Koreakrigen.” MA. diss., Høgskulen på Vestlandet 2017. https://hvlopen.brage.unit.no/hvlopen-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2481624/Masterthesis_Kjosås.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 4 July 2024).

Kristiansen, Rolf. *Norsk militær innsats for de Forente Nasjoner (1949–1970)*. Oslo: Forsvarets krigshistoriske avdeling, 1972.

Lockertsen, Jan-Thore. "We Ran a Hospital: The Norwegian Nurses Efforts during the Korean War and the Impact of their Experiences on Norwegian Nursing and Theatre Nursing." PhD diss., UiT Norges arktiske universitet, 2021.

Lockertsen, Jan-Thore, and Åshild Fause. "The Nursing Legacy of the Korea Sisters." *Nursing Open* 5(1) (Jan 2018): 94–100.

Lockertsen, Jan-Thore, Åshild Fause, and Christine E. Hallett. "The Norwegian Mobile Army Surgical Hospital in the Korean War (1951–1954): Military Hospital of Humanitarian 'Sanctuary'?" *Nursing History Review* 28(1) (2020): 93–126. https://doi.org/10.1891/1062-8061.28.93 (accessed 4 July 2024).

Melien, Tor Jørgen. *Forsvarets sanitet: Helse for stridsevne 1941–2016*. Oslo: Dreyers forlag 2016.

Midtgaard, Kristine. *Småstat, magt og sikkerhed: Danmark og FN 1949–65*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2005.

———. "National Security and the Choice of International Humanitarian Aid: Denmark and the Korean War, 1950–1953." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13(2) (2011): 148–74. https://doi.org/10.1162/JCWS_a_00107 (accessed 4 July 2024).

Nielsen, Claus Kjersgaard. "Korea-krigen, 1950–1953." Danmarkshistoriek.dk. https://danmarkshistorien.dk/vis/materiale/korea-krigen-1950-53 (accessed 4 July 2024).

Nilssen, Ragnar Wisløff. *Med Røde Kors i Korea*. Stavanger: Misjonsselskapets forlag, 1952.

Norway in South Korea. "National Medical Center." www.norway.no/en/south-korea/norway-south-korea/national-medical-center/ (accessed 4 July 2024).

Paaskesen, Kristian Ravn. "Hvid elefant i fællesnordiske fodspor." PhD diss., University of Aarhus, 2011.

Park, Ji-Wook. "The Medical Assistance of Swedish Red Cross Field Hospital in Busan during and after the Korean War." *Korean Journal of Medical History* 19(1) (2010), 189–208.

Paus, Bernhard. "National Medical Center." In *NORMASH: Korea i våre hjerter*, edited by Finn Bakke, 82–84. Valdres: Norwegian Korean War Veterans Association, 2010.

Pedersen, Lorentz Ulrik. *Norge i Korea: Norsk innsats under Koreakrigen og senere*. Oslo: C. Huitfeldt Forlag, 1991.

Pharo, Helge. *Hjelp til selvhjelp: Det indisk-norske fiskeriprosjektets historie 1952–1972*. Oslo: NUPI, 1986.

Pharo, Helge, and Knut Einar Eriksen. *Kald krig og internasjonalisering 1949–1965*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1997.

Reitehaug, Per-Ivar, and Lars Ulvestad. *Norske militære feltsykehus i internasjonal tjeneste: Er Norge atter beredt? Organisering, oppbygging og ledelse av seks norske militære feltsykehus for FN*. Report 2003:1. Oslo: Senter for helseadministrasjon, University of Oslo, 2003.

Riste, Olav. *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2001.

Røed, Nils Thomas. "Utdanning for utvikling: The Nordic Tanganyika Centre 1961–1970: nordisk samarbeid om bistand til Tanzania." MA diss., University of Oslo, 2004.

Rønnebu, Gaute Lund. "Mellom Solferino og Berlin: Norges Røde Kors under andre verdenskrig." PhD diss., UiT Norway's Arctic University, 2021.

Saxer, Carl J. "The Korea Question and the Nordic Response: from War Participation to Diplomatic Recognition." *Korea Journal* 57(1) (2017), 128–52.

Security Council Resolutions 82, 83, 84 and 85 1950. www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-1950 (accessed 4 July 2024).

Silva, Charles. "Keep Them Strong, Keep Them Friendly: Swedish-American Relations and the Pax Americana, 1948–1952." PhD diss., University of Stockholm, 1999.

Simensen, Jarle. *Norsk utviklingshjelps historie 1952–1975: Norge møter den tredje verden*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2003.

———. "Norsk misjonsforskning: Paradigmer i utviklingen av historiske studier." In *Internasjonalisering i historiefaget: Global historie og norsk historie i transnasjonalt perspektiv*, edited by Jarle Simensen, 113–129. Oslo: Unipub, 2008.

Skogrand, Kjetil. "Norge og Koreaspørsmålet." MA diss., University of Oslo, 1994.

———. *Norsk forsvarshistorie 1940–1970: Alliert i krig og fred*. Bergen: Eide forlag, 2004.

Stridsman, Jacob. "Sverige och Koreakriget: en studie av Sveriges hållning till Koreakonflikten 1947–1953." PhD diss., University of Umeå, 2008.

Su-Gun Östberg, Sigfried. "Svenska Röda Korset-sjukhuset i Pusan 1950–58: En studie av den svenska insatsen med avseende på dess varierande verksamhetsfokus samt generella utveckling." BA diss., Stockholm University, 2012.

———. "The Swedish Red Cross Hospital in Busan, 1950–58: A Study of its Transition from a Military to a Civilian Hospital." *Korea Journal* 54(1) (2014): 33–156.

Treider, Thore. "Fra vinterkrigen til Korea." In *I krig for fred. 12 personlige fortellinger fra Koreakrigen til Afghanistan*, edited by Haakon Bull-Hansen, 41–64. Oslo: Kagge forlag, 2008.

Weisz, Susanne Marie. "Sykehus istedenfor soldater: Norge – en fredsnasjon i Koreakrigen?" MA diss., University of Stavanger, 2013. https://uis.brage.unit.no/uis-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/3110910/no.uis%3ainspera%3a178827520%3a23189225.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 4 July 2024).

13 Explosive Waste

Scandinavian Anti-Nuclear Movements' Campaign against the Reprocessing of Spent Nuclear Fuel

Melina Antonia Buns

Introduction

On 23 January 1983, the vessel *M/S Sigyn* left the harbour of Barsebäck to sail north to Ringhals where it was met with slogans and blockades from the Danish branch of Greenpeace and Swedish peace activists. Carrying two flasks of spent nuclear fuel from Barsebäck, *Sigyn* passed the busy strait and narrow northern boundary of the Sound (*Øresund*) to pick up two additional flasks from the nuclear power plant Ringhals before it set course towards Cherbourg at the northern coast of France where the cargo was to be reprocessed and later returned to Sweden for disposal.[1] The first voyage of *Sigyn*, which had been designed and built for exactly this purpose as a joint investment between the Swedish Nuclear Fuel Supply Company (*Svensk Kärnbränsleförsörjning*, SKBF) who owned 68% and French Cogema (*Compagnie générale des matìeres nucléaires*) who owned 32%, happened not only against the geopolitical tensions of the Euromissile crisis but also amid intense domestic discussions in Denmark and Sweden around nuclear energy.[2] Three years earlier, the Swedish anti-nuclear movement had lost the public referendum on nuclear energy. On the other side of the Sound, the final decision about whether to build nuclear power plants had been postponed continuously since the mid-1970s although a growing majority of the Danish population and political parties was against it. Since January 1974, the Danish Organization for Information about Nuclear Power (*Organisationen til Oplysning om Atomkraft*, OOA) had challenged the plans to introduce nuclear energy to the Danish energy system, which had been proposed against the backdrop of the oil crisis of 1973 and the soaring energy prices and vulnerabilities, achieving first a moratorium and subsequently generating broad public and political support for their aims: a renewable, non-nuclear energy system in Denmark and the shutdown of the nuclear power plant Barsebäck in Sweden.[3]

Located 20 kilometres from Copenhagen on the other side of the Sound, Barsebäck turned into a "transboundary issue"[4] that by the early 1980s had "put a strain on diplomatic relations" between Denmark and Sweden.[5] Yet, its border location also allowed for transnational collaboration between the OOA and the Swedish People's Campaign against Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-16
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

(*Folkkampanjen mot Kärnkraft och Kärnvapen*, FMKK). Whereas the movements had fallen apart following the 1980 Swedish referendum and due to different priorities,[6] the shipment of spent nuclear fuel from Sweden to the nuclear weapons state of France became an opportunity to gather different anti-nuclear movements and peace movements around one case, while serving different interests on both sides of the border. Though movements cooperated with various intensities, for the political relations between Denmark and Sweden the transport of spent nuclear fuel proved as explosive as the cargo. This chapter analyses how Danish and Swedish anti-nuclear movements created a campaign that connected the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel with nuclear non-proliferation policies, and how this campaign fostered transnational collaboration between different types of social movements that historically have stayed apart. Furthermore, this chapter analyses how the conflict around the shipping of spent nuclear fuel unfolded between the two Scandinavian countries politically.

Using material from the OOA, FMKK, Greenpeace, the Swedish Labour Movement's Archives and Library, as well as the Nordic Council and various agencies, this chapter provides an analysis of transnational cooperation and conflict at various levels. On the one hand, movements collaborated across borders, but also with politicians in their respective countries who supported the case; and on the other hand, different priorities among the anti-nuclear movements did not necessarily result in smooth collaboration – just as at a diplomatic level, there was some tension at grassroots level, too. Nevertheless, while the transportation of spent nuclear fuel caused a political conflict and crisis, it fostered collaboration among civil societal actors.

The conflict around the transportation of spent nuclear for reprocessing purposes that shaped Danish-Swedish relations during 1982 and 1983 occurred against the backdrop of a renewed attention to and societal mobilization around nuclear issues, both nuclear energy and nuclear weapons—a mobilization which the historians Eckhart Conze, Martin Klimke, and Jeremy Varon have described as the "most robust social movements in the human history".[7] For both the anti-nuclear movements and the peace movements, 1979 marked a shift: for one, the partial meltdown of the reactor at Three Mile Island in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania proved the warnings of the anti-nuclear movement correct, and for another, NATO's Double-Track Decision and the possible deployment of intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe in reaction to the deployment of Soviet intermediate-range missiles led to a period of rearmament following the détente of the 1960s and 1970s.[8]

Both international developments had an impact on Scandinavian debates and politics, reflecting a nuclear threat of the civil and the military at the turn of the 1980s, perceived widely in Europe between 1979 and 1985.[9] Although the Danish parliament would not decide on the role of nuclear energy in the domestic energy system until 1985, after the accident at Three Mile Island in April 1979, nuclear energy had been politically dead.[10] In Sweden, the accident was one of the factors that led to a national referendum on the future of nuclear energy, which in 1980 ended with a loss for the Swedish anti-nuclear movement which had campaigned for a phase-out of all nuclear reactors within a decade. However, a majority of the

Swedish citizens voted for the "middle-way": the completion of the six reactors under construction, public ownership of all nuclear power plants, and a phase-out "with reason" in the 2010s.[11]

At the same time, the rearmament put foreign and defence policies on the Nordic agenda. Given the inner-Nordic divide into NATO member states (Denmark, Iceland, and Norway) and non-aligned and neutral countries (Finland and Sweden), matters concerning military affairs were excluded from the policy discussions in the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers. Following 1979 and the debate about the deployment of the so-called Euromissiles, however, the renewed call for a Nordic Nuclear Weapon Free Zone gained traction among Nordic politicians resulting in heated debates within the Nordic Council's annual meetings and the Nordics' national politics in the early 1980s.[12]

The reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel symbolized this entanglement of nuclear energy and nuclear weapons, and linked not only environmental and peace issues but also national with international politics. Pursuing a dual strategy, the sea transportation of spent nuclear fuel was framed around aspects concerning safety, environmental, and health risks, while the export and the reprocessing policy entwined nuclear energy and nuclear weapons and emphasized a disarmament discourse. Hence, the chapter argues that the anti-nuclear movements framed reprocessing as a peace issue and used Sweden's international reputation within the international peace and disarmament negotiations, by means of the campaign on reprocessing, to reach their goals at regional (Barsebäck) and global (nuclear energy and weapons test) levels. As such, the chapter also contributes to a wider discussion on the history of peace and environmental movements during the 1980s and their intertwining during a decade that, with regard to anti-nuclear activism, is wrongfully "remembered as a period of social movement decline".[13] Finally, the chapter offers insights into the understudied multifaceted history of nuclear technologies, cooperation, and conflict in the Nordic region.

Cooperation and Conflict in the Nuclear Norden

The history of nuclear energy and technology in Norden is fused with both cooperation and conflict; cooperation predominately at a scientific level, conflict mainly at political and societal levels, with Denmark and Norway not pursuing nuclear energy production and Sweden and Finland deciding in favour of it. In 1957, when the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established, the Nordic Council also formalized its collaboration on nuclear matters by creating a Nordic Liaison Committee on Nuclear Energy (*Nordiska kontaktorganet for atomenergifrågor*, NKA). In contrast to the IAEA, which had the dual mandate to promote nuclear technology and control its uses through safeguards, the NKA was primarily created to exchange information between the Nordic countries, to increase collaboration among the different agencies and companies, and to strengthen Nordic collaboration within the newly formed IAEA and at European level within the European Atomic Energy Community.[14] This formal cooperation intensified from 1967 onwards with the decision to establish a Nordic Committee for the Cooperation of

Nuclear Activities (*Nordisk Atomkoordineringskomité*, NAK). It was a joint venture by the directors of the three Scandinavian nuclear research institutions and a representative from the Finnish Atomic Energy Commission, and it initiated major joint activities and projects within nuclear research and development.[15] In 1968, for instance, a NKA study argued for the creation of a Nordic Reactor Company in order to ensure reactor supply for the Nordic market, including the development of a Nordic reactor type.[16] Among the Nordic countries, it was in particular the Swedish industry that had ambitions to become a player on the European and American nuclear market.[17] Despite never materializing, the plans and expectations for this cooperation were not limited to the Nordic region as the Swedish plan to export a heavy water reactor to Pakistan as part of Scandinavian development aid in the late 1960s shows.[18]

In the wake of the oil price crisis, energy market cooperation became a prioritized issue among the Nordics. Nuclear energy was promoted as essential to energy safety and reduced dependency on energy supplies from abroad. Within the different Nordic nuclear cooperation fora, nuclear fuel cycle, reactor safety, and radioactive waste emerged on the agenda. More so, already in early 1973, the Nordic countries agreed on new guidelines on nuclear installations in Nordic border regions.[19] By then, seven reactors at three locations were under construction in Sweden, while Finland was building two reactors with Soviet technology at Loviisa.

Since nuclear power plants are in need of vast amounts of water for their cooling systems, all were placed along the coast, and of those, Barsebäck in particular emerged as the centre of bilateral tensions on nuclear power within the Nordic region, although it was certainly not the only transboundary nuclear issue that caused debate.[20] Located 20 kilometres opposite Copenhagen in Swedish Scania, the shutdown of the two reactors at Barsebäck was one of the two major aims of the anti-nuclear movement that emerged in Denmark with the creation of the OOA on 31 January 1974. After the Danish parliament decided against nuclear power within its domestic energy system in 1985, the OOA continued its protest activities and only dissolved as an organization in May 2000 after the closure of Barsebäck I in 1999.[21] Hence, for 25 years, Barsebäck did cast a shadow over political collaboration between the two countries' governments.

Yet, while the future of and faith in nuclear energy production stirred intense political discussions at domestic and inter-Nordic level, nuclear physicists and engineers were collaborating transnationally, as were anti-nuclear activists.[22] Particularly after the OOA had succeeded in their push for a moratorium on the decision about nuclear energy in Denmark in 1976, activists turned their focus towards Barsebäck, often collaborating with Swedish activists on their annual marches which were inspired by pacifist demonstrations and non-violent civil disobedience.[23] In particular, the first joint Nordic March against Nuclear Power which was held in August 1976, one month before the Swedish election from which Thorbjörn Fälldin emerged as a winner with a clear anti-nuclear position, received much media attention as

> some ten thousand activists, mainly from Denmark, Sweden but also a few from Norway and Finland, marched against the plant shouting slogans like "Vad ska väck, Barsebäck! Vad ska in, sol och vind!" (What shall be abandoned, Barsebäck! What shall be introduced, sun and wind!).[24]

While Barsebäck emerged as a joint object of Scandinavian anti-nuclear activism, these "annual demonstrations became symbols of the internationalist, transnational and cross-border character of the anti-nuclear struggle".[25] Yet despite this solidarity, the transnational collaboration between Danish and Swedish anti-nuclear movements was not without conflict. As the historians Arne Kaijser and Jan-Henrik Meyer have pointed out, different priorities led to tensions: whereas OOA "wanted FMA [the Swedish People's Campaign against Nuclear Power] to prioritise the closing down of Barsebäck, […] the FMA's priority was to prevent the building and commissioning of additional nuclear plants rather than the closing of already operating plants."[26] This became especially apparent around the 1980 referendum about the future of nuclear energy in Sweden. Whereas the Three Mile Island Accident of April 1979 turned the winds and led to broad political support for the referendum which the Swedish People's Campaign against Nuclear Power had campaigned for since the beginning of March 1979, the referendum itself resulted in a loss for the anti-nuclear movement that had advocated an immediate shutdown of running nuclear power plants and construction activities. Established ahead of the referendum, the Swedish People's Campaign against Nuclear Power (initially *Folkkampanjen mot Atomkraft*, later renamed into *Folkkampanjen mot Kärnkraft*) "lost much of its strength as a national actor" after 1980,[27] while the Danish anti-nuclear movement was strengthened and diversified when Greenpeace set up a branch in Copenhagen in 1978. As driving forces, OOA and Greenpeace pushed the campaign against the sea transportation and export of spent nuclear fuel for reprocessing purposes, which started to unfold in 1982.

Cross-border Risks of Nuclear Waste Transport

Despite close collaboration between Nordic nuclear engineers and scientists since 1957, only Finland and Sweden built nuclear power plants into their energy systems, resulting in a division into nuclear and non-nuclear Nordic countries. For all the ambitions and visions for the Swedish nuclear industry, in the mid-1970s "advanced plans for a nuclear breeder program" were cancelled and instead, the Swedish nuclear fleet consisted of light water reactors.[28] While Sweden abandoned its programme, other countries, in particular the United Kingdom and France, engaged in this technology that promised to reduce the demand on uranium resources which were anticipated to be limited through reprocessing. More so, expectations were high that, through the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel, the amount of high-level radioactive waste that eventually needed to be stored in final repositories would be reduced. Although Sweden did not have any fast breeder reactors, it started to ship its spent nuclear fuel to the United Kingdom in 1975, and to France in

1983. For one, plans for a national reprocessing plant had not materialized.[29] For another, limited storage capacity for spent nuclear fuel in the cooling ponds on site in the wake of the completion of the central interim storage facility (CLAB) at Oskarshamn in 1985 was given as the official reason for the export.[30]

While the shipments to Windscale in the United Kingdom had passed without any great attention, Danish activists systematically began to protest the Swedish export plans after they had become widely known in Denmark in the summer of 1982. Initially, Danish anti-nuclear activists as well as some Danish politicians, most prominently Margrete Auken from the Socialist People's Party (*Socialistisk Folkeparti*, SF), framed their criticism around aspects concerning safety, environmental, and health risk, environmental justice, and Nordic collaboration. As such, Danish actors criticized the transportation route, challenged the Swedish risk assessment, and placed the issue within the wider history of Nordic environmental cooperation. At the same time, the case provided an opportunity for collaboration for three different organizations with different, yet overlapping agendas: for the Danish branch of Greenpeace, protests against the transportation of spent nuclear fuel could easily be incorporated into the organization's global activism against radioactive waste dumping in general; for the OOA, the Swedish decision to ship radioactive material around Danish land was just another example of environmental injustice and Swedish "arrogance"[31] towards its neighbours and Nordic environmental cooperation more broadly; for the FMKK, the export of spent nuclear fuel was a failure of Swedish responsibility for the radioactive legacies of the country's nuclear industry.

Hence, the silly season of 1982 turned out to be not as slow and uneventful as previous summers. In early July, the Danish press ran several news items on the Swedish plans to transport spent nuclear fuel through the Great Belt and the Sound, not only bringing this to the attention of the wider public but apparently also the Danish Minister of the Environment. Interviewed by *Politiken*, Erik Holst expressed that "the information about the Swedish plans '[was] absolutely new' to him", assuring that "neither [he] nor anyone else from the Danish environmental agencies [had] approved these".[32] Unbeknownst to Holst, however, officials from among others the Danish Environmental Agency had met with representatives from the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency in February and had not objected to the use of either of these straits as routes for the transport.[33]

Despite the fact that the straits are in any case international waters and the Danish agencies and ministries were thus without power, the issue revealed dysfunctions between the Danish Environmental Ministry and the Environmental Agency, and uncovered the malfunctioning of regulations that had been established at a Nordic level. The 1973 guidelines on nuclear installations in Nordic border regions only applied to fixed physical installations, not the transportation of radioactive material. Equally, the 1974 Nordic Environmental Protection Convention (NEPC) regulated information exchange and judicial rights in the officials' interpretations only with regard to pollution risks from permanent installations, not vessels or other moving installations.[34] Margrete Auken, who spearheaded much of the discussions among Danish and Swedish politicians during 1982 and 1983, criticized that the NEPC

had been interpreted "very narrowly" and that the handling showed little "collaborative Nordic spirit".[35]

While what from the Danish side was considered to be lacking collaboration and transparency would over the next year develop into a political crisis between the two neighbouring countries, activists from Greenpeace, OOA, and FMKK "join[ed] forces against the shipment of spent fuel from Swedish nuclear power plants to reprocessing facilities in England and France".[36] In a first phase, Danish activists from OOA and Greenpeace tried to prohibit these shipments by challenging the risk assessments and assumptions about safety and by criticizing the externalization of risk. Their main argument was that the transportation of radioactive material through the heavily trafficked Great Belt and the Sound presented a risk to the environment and the Danish society.[37] PRAV, the Swedish Programme Committee for Radioactive Waste (*Programrådet för radioaktivt avfall*), rejected such criticism. In their initial decision on transportation methods, sea transportation was chosen over road or rail transportation because, as they argued, it was "definitely the safest, cheapest, and fastest method".[38] Activists particularly questioned this as both straits were highly trafficked and came with the risks of collision. With the export of spent nuclear fuel on *Sigyn*, the number of shipments from Sweden was to double, increasing the risk for such accidents.[39] From 1985, this potential threat would grow further as spent fuel from Swedish nuclear plants would be shipped to the central nuclear waste interim storage at Forsmark, which was expected to account for about twofold as many annual transports as to France.[40] In a worst-case scenario, collisions could result in fires and radioactive leakages into the sea, which would be much more difficult to contain to a certain area compared to a similar situation on land. The flasks, in which the highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel, consisting of uranium and plutonium as well as other fission products such as strontium and caesium, were transported, had not been tested for accidents at sea and only for fires lasting up to 30 minutes.[41] SKBF's final risk assessment of the sea transport calculated with a fire of 90 minutes.[42] Experiences from other accidents and fires, however, showed that fires at sea lasted on average for hours or even days. International research from political ecologists, put forward by the OOA, suggested that after a nine-hour fire, "an area of up to 50 km from the accident would need to be evacuated to avoid cancer and fatal incidents as a consequence of an extensive atmospheric pollution with cesium-137".[43]

Essentially, the international transportation of spent nuclear fuel exposes environmental injustices across national borders and jurisdictions, in particular when the transport happened in international waters as in this case. Despite their proximity to Danish land, both straits were juridically speaking international waters—hence, regardless of the position of the Danish government, it had no political power to block the transportation of spent nuclear fuel through these two straits. In case of an accident, however, it would have been the Danish society as well as the marine environment that would have been impacted, and less so the Swedish one who externalized the potential harm across borders. As such, the activists stressed that the "sea transport of radioactive material, and in particular spent nuclear fuel, posed a serious potential threat to the marine environment and human health".[44]

While the Danes were most outspoken about these injustices, representatives from the Åland Islands were equally critical of the expansion of the nuclear waste storage operations on both the eastern and western coasts of Sweden and Finland, respectively.[45]

However, the mistrust in the decision about the transport technology, which according to the OOA exposed Danish society and nature to "unnecessary risks", and the call for land transportation through Sweden were ignored.[46] The "long experience" with which SKBF "justif[ied]" the sea transport did not increase the trust in Swedish agencies and risk assessments, nor in the Danish nuclear agencies.[47] By the late 1970s it had become known that there existed no evacuation plans in case of an accident at Barsebäck. As a result, OOA activists had "challenged the authorities' 'integrity', and accused them of 'blind trust in "experts", who instinctively distrust any critique of nuclear power'."[48]

When *Sigyn* ran aground in the harbour of Barsebäck on 25 November 1982, this firm belief in infallible technologies proved problematic. For one, voices that had criticized the safety of the sea transport were proven right. The report of the special commission on the average of *Sigyn* concluded that, although a wrongly placed ground-marker was a reason for the accident, the ship lacked manoeuvrability and in the future was only allowed to enter Barsebäck harbour in almost windstill conditions and during daylight hours.[49] If the vessel that had been created for exactly the purpose of transporting spent nuclear fuel within Sweden and from Sweden to France and back failed to enter the harbour of Barsebäck safely on its very first tour, concerns and criticism voiced by the anti-nuclear activists seemed to be justified. That *Sigyn* "could neither sail nor leave it"[50] and that sea transportation was not safe seemed to be confirmed with every piece of news about other incidents, such as when it was hit by another vessel in the harbour of Cherbourg on 7 June 1983 or when the production at Barsebäck had to be reduced by 40% because *Sigyn*'s engine had whirled up sea grass which had subsequently clogged the nuclear power plant's crucial cooling water intake.[51]

For another, the political relations between Denmark and Sweden turned tense. At the Nordic Council's annual session in February 1983, Auken confronted Birgitta Dahl, Swedish Minister for Energy and the Environment, on this matter and expressed her frustration over the "Swedish arrogance" which she described as "very burdensome for the relation between" Denmark and Sweden.[52] Reflecting the general public perception, the Danish newspaper *Politiken* equally argued that "the arrogant Swedish attitude damaged Nordic cooperation".[53] Within roughly six weeks, OOA gathered 80,785 signatures from Danish citizens requesting the stoppage of the Swedish nuclear waste transports through the straits, which they submitted to Birgitta Dahl on 9 June 1983, only two days after the accident in Cherbourg.[54] Relations worsened when Dahl kept her Danish counterpart Christian Christensen waiting over her summer holidays before meeting with the environmental minister to discuss *Sigyn* in late August 1983 and neither the FMKK seemed to be impressed over Dahl's "nonchalance".[55] In contrast to Denmark, Sweden's dualistic governance, which grants authorities and agencies autonomy, was potentially explosive domestically.[56] As such, she rejected the Danish request

to stop any further transports with *Sigyn*, which had scheduled two additional tours to France for 1983, although the Danish ministry had requested a temporary halt of the transportations and a new test and risk assessments of *Sigyn*'s maneuverability in heavy sea, which the report of the special commission had noted was lacking.[57]

However, the reasoning of PRAV that sea transport was safe and cheap, might only have covered part of the considerations. By the late 1970s and early 1980s, non-violent occupations of proposed or construction sites of nuclear installations, as well as blockades of streets, rails, and harbours to obstruct the transportation of either nuclear waste or nuclear weapons, had become an integral part of the Western anti-nuclear activists' toolkit.[58] Following the 1980 Swedish referendum, national political discussions had shifted attention towards the matter of nuclear waste. The selection of different sites for test drilling in order to settle on a place for a final repository, however, led to massive local protests with nation-wide networks, among others at Kynnefjäll not far from the Norwegian border.[59] Given these local protests against final repositories as well as nuclear waste export, avoiding demonstrations and blockades by choosing the sea route might have played into Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate's (*Statens kärnkraftinspektion*, SKI) considerations. Trains with casks were not only stopped by anti-nuclear activists across Europe, but in La Hague in France, French activists had also focused their activism on the import and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel from other countries.[60] This activism primarily addressed questions of moral and actual responsibility for the accumulated radioactive waste. Although both Greenpeace and FMKK shared the common goal of stopping further exports from Sweden, both organizations had different priorities and aims: FMKK was mainly concerned about the morality involved in the export of spent nuclear fuel, as well as its reprocessing, and their main policy was to request the return of any Swedish spent nuclear fuel in the UK and France.[61] Greenpeace, on the contrary, was occupied with the safety of marine transport, thus experiencing difficulty in supporting a return of the waste.[62] It is also from this perspective that one needs to see the unsuccessful attempts to board *Sigyn* during its christening; for Greenpeace, *Sigyn* and the Swedish nuclear export was only one part of their global protest.[63] While both organizations "agreed not to make this a big thing in joint activities against the Swedish transports",[64] it was in particular the question about moral responsibility that was utilized intensively once *Sigyn* had taken up its route in January 1983 and the attempt to prevent the shipments had failed.

Reprocessing as a Threat to Peace

In December 1982, before *Sigyn* had set out on its tour to Sweden and had had its accident in the harbour of Barsebäck, representatives from OOA and Greenpeace sent a joint letter to Alva Myrdal. Having recently received the Nobel Peace Prize for her relentless work for disarmament, Tarjei Haaland and Janus Hillgaard approached Myrdal with the request to stop the Swedish government's plans to send spent nuclear fuel for reprocessing purposes to La Hague in France so that "it [could] keep its reputation as a pioneer for nuclear disarmament".[65] Though Myrdal

later declined this request, with the export approval of spent nuclear fuel from the two power companies *Sydsvenska Värmkraft* and *Statens Vattensfallsverk* that was given in early January 1983, Danish and Swedish activists tried to pressure the Swedish government through a stronger emphasis on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.[66]

By the beginning of the 1980s, increased attention to the technological interconnection of nuclear energy and nuclear weapons and the continuous challenging of "the strict distinction between civilian and military uses of nuclear energy" by environmental and peace movements allowed for greater exchange and cooperation.[67] Amid increased geopolitical Cold War tensions, the artificial division into the "civil" and "military" atom, which first had been promoted by US President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his infamous Atoms for Peace speech in front of the United Nations General Assembly in December 1953 that in 1957 would result in the IAEA, began to erode as well. Stressing the entanglement between nuclear energy and nuclear weapons technologies and businesses, Greenpeace, the OOA, and FMKK criticized Sweden for its direct and indirect contribution to the latter. In a joint statement addressed to the Swedish government in July 1982, FMKK, OOA, and Greenpeace had already argued that

> by exporting fissile material from the so-called peaceful uses of nuclear energy, Sweden contributed to those countries' [Britain and France] production and testing of nuclear weapons in the moment of when reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel in England and France was started.[68]

For one, the material component of the transports, the uranium and plutonium, was argued to contribute directly to France's nuclear weapons programme. For another, the financial obligations set in the reprocessing contract presented an indirect contribution to the country's military endeavours.[69]

In fact, reprocessing plants challenged this artificial distinction as they were tightly intertwined with the fast breeder reactor technology which had been developed during the 1960s and 1970s. Building on the knowledge from military production programmes where plutonium was extracted from irradiated uranium through reprocessing, fast breeder reactors were designed to produce more fuel than they would consume, including fissile plutonium. Instead of running on natural or enriched uranium only, fast breeders also ran on plutonium, created through the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. Due to their plutonium-separating capacity, reprocessing technologies became a "target for attack by the environmental movements and non-proliferation policies", as historian Nuno Luís Madureira has argued in his article on the plutonium economy.[70] Analyzing the history of the nuclear power plant Superphénix in Malville, Claire Le Renard has equally stressed that "its reliance on a plutonium-based fuel made fast breeder technology a prime target of anti-nuclear protests, because plutonium was associated with nuclear weapons, the concerns about proliferation, and safety and security concerns".[71] The concern about proliferation and nuclear armament also motivated the Jimmy

Carter administration to “suspend work on commercial fast breeder reactors”.[72] The 1977 decision against fast breeders and reprocessing of uranium of US origin was partly made in reaction to India’s successful nuclear test for which it had used plutonium and heavy water obtained for their “civil” nuclear programme.[73] While the United States without doubt had geopolitical interests in prohibiting an international plutonium trade made possible by reprocessing businesses, reprocessing and breeder technology as symbols of a plutonium economy received criticism from politicians, peace movements, and anti-nuclear movements. As such, reprocessing ties into the “themes around the arms race [which] corresponded well with concerns about environmental protection as well as the nuclear power debate” and facilitated opportunities for collaboration between these different organizations.[74]

When *Sigyn* eventually started its operation two months later than scheduled in January 1983, the anti-nuclear movements, which had already been actively protesting the international transport and export of spent nuclear fuel, thus reframed their campaign to focus on nuclear weapons, primarily with the aim to win the peace movements to their case. OOA made an appeal directly to the Swedish peace movements following the approval of the export application and as a result, Swedish peace movements together with the FMKK met with Minister Dahl on 23 January, requesting that the government terminate the contract with Cogema as Sweden contributed to the “French plutonium factory” at La Hague.[75]

The reprocessing plant at La Hague, 20 kilometres from Cherbourg, had been in operation since 1967. Constructed as a complement to Marcoule, whose “primary purpose [was] to recover plutonium for the nuclear weapons program”,[76] La Hague expanded its reprocessing activities to spent nuclear fuel from light water reactors in the early 1970s.[77] By the late 1970s, SKBF and Cogema had signed two contracts, one for spent nuclear fuel removed before the end of 1979 and one for the 1980s, covering 57 and 670 tonnes respectively.[78] It was those 57 tonnes that *Sigyn* shipped to France during 1983 and that ignited the transnational campaign of anti-nuclear activists. These contracts gave critics a reason to argue that Sweden—together with Japan, West Germany, and Switzerland—financed the French plutonium industry which had been promising an upscaling of the production at La Hague through the construction of a third reprocessing plant which would also deliver fuel to the Superphénix reactor.[79]

The matter was all the more delicate because the expansion of La Hague was generally considered as a “necessary precondition for the plutonium production for the expansion of the French nuclear weapons programme”.[80] Since France had not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was controlled by the IAEA, experts from the Swedish SKI had not been allowed to visit La Hague,[81] and the 1977 contract estimated a 3% loss of plutonium during reprocessing (a figure SKI experts considered “unusually high” as internal minutes reveal),[82] the export gave ample opportunity and room for speculation about what happened with the Swedish plutonium. Insecurity about the fate of the plutonium after reprocessing, whether it would be sold or returned, also existed because the Swedish fuel was

of American origin who had rejected commercial reprocessing out of concerns for non-proliferation and held the decisive rights over an eventual return of plutonium.[83] In an appeal sent to newly re-elected Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme already in October 1982, Janus Hillgaard, head of Greenpeace Denmark, offered a simple solution: "avoid reprocessing of Swedish spent nuclear fuel, avoid production of plutonium, do not contribute to the possibility to produce nuclear weapons".[84]

Before regaining office in early October 1982, Palme had chaired the International Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues which had been established by the United Nations General Assembly in September 1980 in response to the renewed tensions between East and West. The report of this international non-governmental commission, *Common Security*, which was published "in June 1982 as the Euromissile crisis was nearing its peak",[85] recommended among others "the reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons [as well as] compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty."[86]

Ironically, from its start in 1945, the Swedish nuclear research programme contained both a "civil" and a "military" dimension, highlighting the political rather than technological distinction between these two. Whereas Eisenhower promoted the "peaceful atom" in December 1953, head of the Swedish research programme Sigvard Eklund—who in 1961 would become director of the IAEA—envisioned not only a domestic nuclear fuel chain but also the construction of heavy water reactors which could produce weapons-grade plutonium and thus materialize plans to construct ten plutonium bombs by 1963.[87] Around the same time as the extensive research and development activity, known as the Swedish Line, was initiated in the mid-1950s, which included the development of nuclear technologies and the pursuit to create a self-sufficient nuclear energy supply and industry, the question of nuclear weapons developed into a public controversy after "the Swedish Supreme Commander advocated Swedish nuclear weapons".[88] While the domestic nuclear power programme has continued until today, the dual-usage nuclear programme of the Swedish Line was officially abandoned when Sweden signed the NPT in 1968 and Sweden became one of the key drivers in the international negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation with prominent figures such as Alva Myrdal and Olof Palme.[89]

It was this reputation that anti-nuclear activists used to pressure the Swedish government to terminate the contract with Cogema, which covered the export and reprocessing of 727 metric tonnes of uranium, which through reprocessing were estimated to produce about 6 metric tonnes of plutonium.[90] In various letters to the Swedish government, the OOA, Greenpeace, and FMKK jointly and individually appealed to the Palme government's "great sympathy for the peace movements",[91] its international engagement on disarmament (for instance within the United Nations),[92] as well as its work for nuclear weapon–free zones and a ban on nuclear weapon testing to convince it to terminate the contract with Cogema.[93] The reprocessing of the nuclear fuel as a means of waste management was irreconcilable with "a genuine commitment to peace" for which Sweden was known internationally, as Swedish peace movements voiced in a critique of its government[94] – critiques that deflected off Palme and Dahl who shot down the criticism

by refusing to consider any dual uses of the reprocessing facilities and by firmly believing in the IAEA's safeguards system.[95]

Conclusion

After more than three decades of service and distance covered equalling three circumnavigations of the world, *Sigyn* retired in 2013.[96] Although spent nuclear fuel, its transport, reprocessing, and nuclear waste would continue to be discussed in and among the Nordic countries through the 1980s in particular, and essentially until today, it was the export of 57 tonnes of spent nuclear fuel during 1983 that turned politically explosive. By focusing on spent nuclear fuel and reprocessing during the early 1980s, this chapter has analysed the making of a transnational campaign against nuclear energy and nuclear weapons during the "era of unprecedented anti-nuclear protest".[97] Against the geopolitical backdrop of Cold War tensions, rearmament, and the Euromissile crisis, the sea transportation and export of spent nuclear fuel emerged as an issue that, despite the strains it put on the already tense relations between Denmark and Sweden on nuclear matters, also offered opportunities for cooperation between disarmament and anti-nuclear movements, between non-proliferation and energy policies, between the local and the international, but also between different Scandinavian countries.

The shipment of spent nuclear fuel from Sweden to the nuclear weapons state of France became an opportunity to gather different anti-nuclear movements around one case while serving different interests on both sides of the border at a time when collaboration between these had fallen apart. In reaction to the publication of the Swedish transportation plans in the summer of 1982, Greenpeace initiated the collaboration with OOA and FMKK on this matter. Throughout 1982 and 1983, the activists developed a campaign with a dual focus: regionally, the activists' framing focused on environmental protection, health concerns, and risk assessment, tying into the question about international collaboration, trust, and justice; geopolitically, the activists raised awareness about the intertwined nuclear energies and nuclear weapons, connecting it to disarmament in times of geopolitical militarization and nuclear weapons–free zone discussions. This dual focus was as much the result of different priorities among the three organizations involved as of the combined civil and military nuclear threat at that time.

This cross-border conflict concerning the sea transport and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel furthermore has shown how Danish movements and individual political actors jointly worked for their case which resulted in different dynamics between the two countries. Thus, while a broad majority of the public and politicians sided with the anti-nuclear movements in Denmark in their criticism of Sweden, the Swedish movements had to work against their own government. In the years following, this campaign against the shipment and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel was not only embedded in a greater campaign against and public debate on nuclear waste and its storage, but the Nordic countries collaborated on nuclear waste and reprocessing within international organizations.

Notes

1 OOA, Lokalgruppe-udsendelse, 18 January 1983, DNA, 10451, 128. Research for this article has been funded by the Research Council of Norway, project no 324293. I would also like to thank the reviewer and the editors, as well as the other contributors for their feedback on earlier versions of this chapter.
2 SKBF, Leaflet about Sigyn, undated, SNA, 2718.03, F 1, box 1047.
3 For a history of nuclear energy in and its relation to society in Denmark, see e.g. Meyer, " 'Atomkraft – Nej tak'."
4 Kaijser and Meyer, "Nuclear Installations at the Border," 10.
5 Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant'," 98.
6 E.g. Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant'."
7 Conze, Klimke, and Varon, "Introduction," 6.
8 E.g. Fazzi, "The Nuclear Freeze Generation," 146.
9 On this geopolitical situation, see e.g. Conze, Klimke, Varon, eds, *Nuclear Threats, Nuclear Fear, and the Cold War of the 1980s*; Nuti, Bozo, Rey, Rother, eds, *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War*.
10 Rasmussen, *Sære Alliancer*, 158.
11 Holmberg and Asp 1984, 90, quoted in Kaijser, "The Referendum that Preserved Nuclear Power," 250.
12 E.g. *Nordiska rådet 1982, del 1*.
13 Conze, Klimke, and Varon, "Introduction," 6.
14 *Nordiska rådet 1958*, 1063–67. On the IAEA and its dual mandate, Roehrlich, *Inspectors for Peace*.
15 NAK existed between 1968–92; Marcus, *Half a Century of Nordic Nuclear Co-operation*, 66.
16 Nielsen et al., "Risø," 80f.
17 Nielsen et al., "Risø," 81.
18 *Nordiska rådet 1966*, 1381.
19 Nordisk kontaktorgan for atomenergispørgsmål, Retningslinier for kontakt vedrørende nukleare anlæg ved grænser mellem Danmark, Finland, Norge og Sverige for så vidt angår sikkerhedsmæssige spørgsmål, 23 January 1973, DNA, 2002-14, box 487, folder 801.
20 The NUCLEARWATERS project, led by Per Högselius, is currently rewriting nuclear history by putting water at its centre; see e.g. Per Högselius, "Atomic Shocks of the Old". On nuclear installations in border regions and the role of international organizations, see most recently, Meyer, "Nuclear Power and Geography."
21 The second reactor at Barsebäck was shut down in 2005.
22 For the cooperation and conflict around the nuclear power plant at Barsebäck, see Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant';" Meyer, "Trust or not to Trust?"
23 Buns, "Marching Activists."
24 Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant'," 84.
25 Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant'," 84. For the same argument, see also Buns, "Marching Activists".
26 Kaijser and Meyer, " 'The World's Worst Located Power Plant'," 84.
27 Kaijser, "The Referendum that Preserved Nuclear Power," 249f. and 258, quote 258.
28 For a history of the Swedish fast breeder programme, see Fjaestad, "Fast Breeder Reactors in Sweden," here 86.

29 A 1976 report mentioned a national reprocessing facility as part of nuclear waste treatment but plans for Swedish reprocessing plant were abandoned together with the breeder plants in the late 1970s; Fjaestad, “Fast Breeder Reactors in Sweden,” 106; *Använt kärnbränsle och radioaktivt avfall*.
30 Oversigt Januar 1983, DNA 10451, box 128.
31 OOA, Landssekretariatet, Tillæg til oplæg om ‘OOA og de svenske affaldstransporter’, 17 September 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128. This and all other translations by the author.
32 Olesen, “Danmark har ikke sagt ja til atomskibe i Øresund.”
33 Snitkjær, “Minister holdt for nar af sine egne embedsmænd.”
34 Miljøministeriet, J.nr. D2702-353, 30 September 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128. For a history of the Nordic Environmental Protection Convention, see Buns, “Making a Model.”
35 Auken, “ ‘Svenskt plutonium i franska bomber’.”
36 Pressemeddelelse, Greenpeace udvider kampagnen mot A-affald til Sverige og Japan, 21 July 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128.
37 E.g. OOA, Åbent brev til den svenske regering, 17 December 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128, 2.
38 Bo Gustafsson, Programrådet för radioaktivt avfall (PRAV), to Sjöfartsverket, 8 June 1977, DNA, 10451, box 128.
39 Pressemeddelelse, Greenpeace udvider kampagnen mot A-affald til Sverige og Japan.
40 Kort beskrivelse af Det svenske søtransportprogram, Faren ved transporten/risiko for uheld, oparbejdning, kontrakten og bomberne, politisk, internationalt, undated (most likely November 1982), unsigned, DNA, 10451, box 128.
41 Kort beskrivelse af Det svenske søtransportprogram.
42 Telex, Janus Hillgaard, to Sjöfartsverket, 17 January 1983, SNA, 420631, F 1, box 36.
43 Kort beskrivelse af Det svenske søtransportprogram.
44 Folkkampanjen mot kärnkraft, Organisationen til Oplysning om Atomkraft, Greenpeace-Danmark, Til den svenske regering, 21 July 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128.
45 *Nordiska rådet 1983, del 1*, 148f.
46 Til Pressen ifm. underskriftindssamlingen, 80.000 danske underskrift mod de svenske atomaffaldstransporter, DNA, 10451, box 128.
47 Janus Hillgaard, Greenpeace-Danmark, untitled, undated, DNA, 10451, box 128.
48 Meyer, “To Trust or not to Trust?,” 569.
49 G. Steen, Statens Haverikommission, Sjöfartens haverikommission, to Chefen för kommunikationsdepartementet, SIGYN-utredningen, 29 December 1982; Kaj Janérus, Bengt Erik Stenmark, Sjöfartsverket, to Komunikationsdepartemenet, Åtgärder i anslutning till haverikommissionens preliminära rapport med anledning av SIGYNs grundstötning i inloppsrännan till Barsebäck, 22 December 1982, both in SNA, 420631 F 1, box 36.
50 *Nordiska rådet 1983, del 1*, 129.
51 Til Pressen ifm. underskriftindssamlingen, 80.000 danske underskrifter mod de svenske atomaffaldstransporter; “Ny rapport om missöden med Sigyn.”
52 *Nordiska rådet 1983, del 1*, 129.
53 *Nordiska rådet 1983, del 1*, 320.
54 Til Pressen ifm. underskriftindssamlingen, 80.000 danske underskrifter mod de svenske atomaffaldstransporter.
55 “Danmark får sitt möte om Siygn;” quote “Kritik mot Dahl för svar om Sigyn.”
56 “Sigyn ett problem för regeringen.”
57 “Svenskerne vil ikke stoppe ‘Sigyn’.”

58 Balz, "'We Don't Want Your 'Peace' …'," 38.
59 Kaijser, "The Referendum that Preserved Nuclear Power," 252.
60 Telex, Paris Diplo to Bonn AA, Betr: Wiederaufarbeitung deutscher Brennelemente in La Hague, hier: Agitation französischer Umweltschützer und der den Sozialisten nahestehenden Gewerkschaft CFDT gegen die Wiederaufarbeitung ausländischer Brennelemente in Frankreich, 31 August 1981, BA Koblenz, B 295, 1414, Bd. 6.
61 Pressemeddelelse, Greenpeace udvider kampagnen mot A-affald til Sverige og Japan.
62 Janus Hillgaard, Meeting in Gothenburg, 20 June 1982, spent fuel, DNA, 10451, box 128.
63 OOA, Landssekretariatet, Tillæg til oplæg om 'OOA og de svenske affaldstransporter'.
64 Hillgaard, Meeting in Gothenburg.
65 Tarjei Haaland and Janus Hillgaard to Alva Myrdal, 11 December 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128.
66 Industridepartementet to Statens vattenfallsverk, and Industridepartementet to Sydsvesnka Värmekraft AB, both letters from 5 January 1983, both in DNA, 10451, box 128.
67 Mende and Metzger, "Eco-pacifism," 125.
68 Folkkampanjen mot kärnkraft, Organisationen til Oplysning om Atomkraft, Greenpeace-Danmark, Til den svenske regering, 21 July 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128.
69 E.g. Udkast til en underskrivelsesaktion fra Janus, Greenpeace; Tarjei Haaland, Elisabet Stadler, Per Faurby, Til den svenske presse: Fra OOA til energiminister Birgitta Dahl, 80.000 danske underskrifter mod Sigyn, 09 June 1983, both DNA, 10451, box 128.
70 Madureira, "Reckless Proliferation and Guardianship of Proliferation," 836.
71 Le Renard, "The Superphénix Fast Breeder Nuclear Reactor," 109.
72 Fjaestad, "Fast Breeder Reactors in Sweden," 103.
73 Walker, "Nuclear Power and Nonproliferation," 221.
74 Mende and Metzger, "Eco-pacifism," 124.
75 Pressemeddelse af Elisabet Stadler, Jørgen Steen Nielsen, Annette Holm Per Fauerby, Marianne Juul-Nyholm, OOA, 6 January 1983, DNA, 10451, box 128, 2; for the quote, Svenska Freds og Skiljedomsföreningen, Kvinnor för fred, Kristna Fredsrörelsen, Internationella Kvinnoförbundet for Fred og Frihet, Svenska Fredskommittén, Folkkampanjen mot Kärnkraft, Pressmeddelande, 24 January 1983, ARAB, 4324, F 1, box 40.
76 Aktiebolaget Atomenergi, Reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel at La Hague, 19 October 1977, 420756, F 5, box D 1, 1.
77 Aktiebolaget Atomenergi, Reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel at La Hague; Göran Ekberg, Sydkraft, till Regeringen, 11 September 1977, both 420756, F 5, box D 1.
78 *Nordiska rådet 1984, del 2*, 2054.
79 E.g. Pressemeddelse af Elisabet Stadler, Jørgen Steen Nielsen, Annette Holm, Per Fauerby, Marianne Juul-Nyholm, OOA, 6 January 1983, DNA, 10451, box 128, 2. Figures that were discussed at that time vary in the different documents, but were around 200 to 300 million depreciated Swedish kronor that had been paid by 1983. Exact figures are difficult to extract. On La Hague, see also Zonabend, *The Nuclear Peninsula*, 15–18.
80 Pressemeddelse af Stadler, Nielsen, Holm, Fauerby, and Juul-Nyholm.
81 Birgitta Hambraeus, Reservation till SSI:s yttranden över ansökan av Sydsvenska Värmekraft AB om tillstånd till fortsatt drift av Barsebäck 2, SNA, 420756, F 5, box D 1.
82 Statens kärnkraftinspektion, Anteckningar från sammanträde SKI – Sydkraft 1977-09-27 angående upparbetningsavtal för Barsebäck 2, 30 September 1977, SNA 420756, F 5, box D 1, 2.

83 Gilinsky, "Plutonium, Proliferation and the Price of Reprocessing," 375.
84 Janus Hillgaard, på vegne af Greenpeace-International, to statsminister Olof Palme, 28 October 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128, 1.
85 Schmidt, "The Euromissile Crisis," 348.
86 Schmidt, "The Euromissile Crisis," 356.
87 Kaijser, "The Referendum that Preserved Nuclear Power," 241.
88 Jonter, "Sweden and the Bomb," 11.
89 Jonter and Rosengren, "From Nuclear Weapons Acquisition to Nuclear Disarmament."
90 Erik Svenke, SKBF, to Greenpeace, 09 September 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128.
91 Janus Hillgaard, på vegne af Greenpeace-International, to statsminister Olof Palme, 28 October 1982, DNA, 10451, box 128, 2.
92 OOA, Åbent brev til den svenske regering, 3.
93 Lena Warrer, Rolf Nilsson, Janus Hillgaard, Åbent brev til Statsminister Olof Palme, 26 September 1983, DNA, 10451, box 128, 1.
94 Svenska Freds og Skiljedomsföreningen, et al., Pressmeddelande.
95 *Nordiska rådet 1983*, del 1, 129f.
96 Svensk Kärnbränslehantering, "Snart pensjonsdag för Sigyn."
97 Conze, Klimke, and Varon, "Introduction," 5.

Sources

Archives

Danish National Archive (Rigsarkivet, DNA)
Federal Archives Germany (Bundesarchiv, BA)
Swedish Labour Movement's Archives and Library (Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek, ARBARK)
Swedish National Archive (Riksarkivet, SNA)

Bibliography

Använt kärnkränsle och radioaktivt avfall. Betänkande av Aka-utredningen. SOU 1976:30. Stockholm. 1976.

Auken, Margrete. "'Svenskt plutonium i franska bomber'." *Dagens Nyheter*, 8 December 1982.

Balz, Hanno. "'We Don't Want Your 'Peace' …': The West German Antiwar Movement, Youth Protest, and the Peace Movement at the Beginning of the 1980s." *German Politics and Society* 115(3) (Autumn 2015): 28–48.

Buns, Melina Antonia. "Marching Activists: Transnational Lessons for Danish Anti-Nuclear Protest." Environment & Society Portal, *Arcadia* 18 (Summer 2017). Rachel Carson Center for Environment and Society.

———. "Making a Model: The 1974 Nordic Environmental Protection Convention and Nordic Attempts to Form International Environmental Law." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 48(1) (2023, pre-published online 2022): 93–115.

Conze, Eckart, Martin Klimke, and Jeremy Varon, eds. *Nuclear Threats, Nuclear Fear, and the Cold War of the 1980s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

———. "Introduction: Between Accidental Armageddons and Winnable Wars: Nuclear Threats and Nuclear Fears in the 1980s." In *Nuclear Threats, Nuclear Fear, and the Cold*

War of the 1980s, edited by Eckart Conze, Martin Klimke, and Jeremy Varon, 1–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

"Danmark får sitt möte om Siygn." *Dagens Nyheter*, 15 July 1983.

Fazzi, Dario. "The Nuclear Freeze Generation: The Early 1980s Anti-Nuclear Movement between 'Carter's Vietnam' and 'Euroshima'." In *A European Youth Revolt: European Perspectives on Youth Protest and Social Movements in the 1980s*, edited by Knud Andresen and Bart Steen, 145–58. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Fjaestad, Maja. "Fast Breeder Reactors in Sweden: Vision and Reality." *Technology and Culture* 56(1) (2015): 86–114.

Gilinsky, Victor. "Plutonium, Proliferation and the Price of Reprocessing." *Foreign Affairs* 57(2) (Winter 1978): 374–86.

Högselius, Per. "Atomic Shocks of the Old: Putting Water at the Center of Nuclear Energy History." *Technology and Culture* 63(1) (2022): 1–30.

Jonter, Thomas. "Sweden and the Bomb: The Swedish Plans to Acquire Nuclear Weapons, 1945–1972." *SKI Report* 01(33), 2001.

Jonter, Thomas, and Emma Rosengren. "From Nuclear Weapons Acquisition to Nuclear Disarmament – the Swedish Case." *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 30(S1) (2014): 46–63.

Kaijser, Arne. "The Referendum that Preserved Nuclear Power and Five Other Critical Events in the History of Nuclear Power in Sweden." In *Pathways into and out of Nuclear Power in Western Europe: Austria, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, and Sweden*, edited by Astrid Mignon Kirchhof, 238–93. München: Deutsches Museum Verlag, 2020.

Kaijser, Arne, and Jan-Henrik Meyer. "Nuclear Installations at the Border: Transnational Connections and International Implications: An Introduction." *Journal for the History of Environment and Society* 3 (2018): 1–32.

———. "'The World's Worst Located Power Plant': Danish and Swedish Cross-Border Perspectives and the Barsebäck Nuclear Power Plant." *Journal for the History of Environment and Society* 3 (2018): 71–105.

"Kritik mot Dahl för svar om Sigyn." *Sala Allehanda*, 27 June 1983.

Le Renard, Claire. "The Superphénix Fast Breeder Nuclear Reactor: Cross-Border Cooperation and Controversies." *Journal for the History of Environment and Society* 3 (2018): 107–44.

Madureira, Nuno Luís. "Reckless Proliferation and Guardianship of Proliferation: The Fast Breeder Nuclear Reactor and the Plutonium Economy." *Technology and Culture* 60(3) (2019): 833–65.

Marcus, Franz R. *Half a Century of Nordic Nuclear Co-operation: An Insider's Recollections*. Roskilde: Nordic Committee for Nuclear Safety Research, 1997.

Mende, Silke, and Birgit Metzger. "Eco-pacifism: The Environmental Movement as a Source for the Peace Movement." In *The Nuclear Crisis: The Arms Race, Cold War Anxiety, and the German Peace Movement of the 1980s*, edited by Christoph Becker-Schaum, Philipp Gassert, Martin Klimke, Wilfired Mausbach, and Marianne Zepp, 119–37. New York: Berghahn Books, 2016.

Meyer, Jan-Henrik. "'Atomkraft – Nej tak!'. How Denmark did not Introduce Commercial Nuclear Power Plants." In *Pathways into and out of Nuclear Power in Western Europe: Austria, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, and Sweden*, edited by Astrid Mignon Kirchhof, 74–123. München: Deutsches Museum Verlag, 2020.

———. “To Trust or not to Trust? Structures, Practices and Discourses of Transboundary Trust around the Swedish Nuclear Power Plant Barsebäck near Copenhagen.” *Journal of Risk Research* 25(5) (2022, pre-published online 2021): 562–76.

———. “Nuclear Power and Geography: How the European Communities Failed to Regulate the Siting of Nuclear Installations at Borders in the 1970s and 1980s.” *Historical Social Research* 49(1) (2024): 167–92.

Nielsen, Henry, Kjeld Nielsen, Flemming Petersen, and Hans Siggaard, “Risø and the Attempts to Introduce Nuclear Power into Denmark.” *Centaurus* 41 (1997): 64–92.

Nielsen, Jørgen Steen. “Atomkraft og atomvåben som siamesiske tvillinger.” *Information*, 15 December 1982.

Nordiska rådet 1958, 6. sesjon, Oslo. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet, 1958.

Nordiska rådet 1966, 14. session, København. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet, 1966.

Nordiska rådet 1982, 30:e sessionen, Helsingfors, del 1. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet, 1982.

Nordiska rådet 1983, 31. sesjon, Oslo, del 1. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet, 1983.

Nordiska rådet 1984, 32:a sessionen, Stockholm, del 2. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet, 1982.

Nuti, Frédéric Bozo, Marie-Pierre Rey, and Bernd Rother, eds. *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War*. Washington D.C/Stanford, CA: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2015.

“Ny rapport om missöden med Sigyn.” *Upsala Nya Tidning*, 15 June 1983.

Olesen, Mogen Møller. “Danmark har ikke sagt ja til atomskibe i Øresund.” *Politiken*, 10 July 1982.

Rasmussen, Søren Hein. *Sære Alliancer: Politiske bevegelser i efterkrigstidens Danmark*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 1997.

Roehrlich, Elisabeth. *Inspectors for Peace: A History of the International Atomic Energy Agency*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2022.

Schmidt, Wolfgang. “The Euromissile Crisis, the Palme Commission, and the Search for a New Security Model.” In *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War*, edited by Leopold Nuti, Frédéric Bozo, Marie-Pierre Rey, and Bernd Rother, 348–65. Washington D.C/Stanford, CA: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2015.

Snitkjær, Aage. “Minister holdt for nar af sine egne embedsmænd.” *Ekstra Bladet*, 12 August 1982.

“Sigyn ett problem för regeringen: Regeringen riskerar ställas inför krav om ministerstyre.” *Karlshamns Allehanda*, 13 July 1983.

“Svenskerne vil ikke stoppe ‘Sigyn’.” *Fyens Stifstidende*, 24 August 1983.

Svensk Kärnbränslehantering. “Snart pensjonsdag för Sigyn.” 30 April 2023, https://skb.se/nyhet/snart-pensionsdags-for-sigyn/ (accessed 14 June 2024).

Walker, J. Samuel. “Nuclear Power and Nonproliferation: The Controversy over Nuclear Exports, 1974–1980.” *Diplomatic History* 25(2) (Spring 2001): 215–49.

Zonabend, François. *The Nuclear Peninsula*. Translated by J.A. Underwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

14 Epilogue

What was "Nordic" about Nordic Civil Society?[1]

Mary Hilson

The title of this epilogue is inspired by an opening lecture given to the Nordic Labour History Conference in 1999 by David Kirby, which posed the question "What was "Nordic" about the labour movement in Europe's northernmost regions?"[2] The reflections that follow are mostly about the "Nordic" part of the title, but it seems appropriate to start with a few words about "civil society". The term has a long pedigree, and this is not the place for an in-depth exploration of how its meanings have evolved. A useful starting point might be Craig Calhoun's encyclopaedia definition of civil society as, "the institutions and relationships that organize social life at a level between the state and the family".[3] That distinction between state and civil society emerged in European political thought in the eighteenth century, and its evolution has been closely connected to debates about the public sphere and public opinion. As the editors note in their introduction, civil society has often been understood in relation to American and Western European experiences, which were not necessarily typical for the Nordic countries. The term civil society only really became established in the Nordic region during the 1990s and after, initially as part of critiques of the social democratic welfare state.[4]

Civil society is therefore a very broad and inclusive category, and one that might encompass many types of organisations that go under various names, including voluntary associations, popular movements, social enterprise or the third sector. Historian Torkel Jansson observed that even the Scandinavian terms *folkrörelser* and *folkelige bevægelser* do not necessarily carry the same meanings across the region, nor over time.[5] For the purposes of this discussion the definition put forward by the editors of this volume will do very well, when they write that civil society is,

> a space of social self-organisation between the state, the market and the private domain… a social sphere where individuals associate around common interests, purposes and values, forming clubs and societies, cooperatives and foundations, local, national and regional voluntary associations and professional, non-governmental national and international organisations (NGOs/INGOs).[6]

DOI: 10.4324/9781003488286-17
This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND license.

As the editors also note, there are different ways of approaching the study of civil society. Sectoral definitions of civil society include *all* forms of voluntary associations, including those which have worked explicitly for non-democratic or exclusionary goals.[7] Normative approaches, by contrast, emphasise the "civil" in civil society, where civil society associations are understood as essential to the smooth functioning of modern ("civilised") democratic states – mobilising citizens, articulating grievances, negotiating diversity and solving conflicts. In earlier research on the Nordic countries, the dense network of voluntary associations that emerged during the first half of the nineteenth century was understood as part of the relatively smooth transition between the corporatist social order of the early modern period and the democracy and individualism of the modern era.[8] A more recent example might be how Sámi civil society organisations have mobilised community interests in order to tackle historical injustices, including through art and literature as discussed in Suze van der Poll's contribution to this volume.[9]

An example of the normative approach to Nordic civil society can be found in a recently published volume on "associative governance", where "the plurality and plethora of self-governed associations" is seen as "a civilizing factor enabling a particular variant of Nordic associative democracy".[10] In the present volume, Mads Mordhorst, Louise Karlskov Skyggebjerg and Mathias Hein Jensen offer an interesting take on this issue, with their discussion of how the civil society concept can be mobilised rhetorically, as a positive resource for "hybrid" organisations – cooperatives, savings banks and corporations – positioning themselves between "good" civil society and the "evils" of the market.

Following Risto Alapuro, there are two types of question one could pose about Nordic civil society.[11] First, it is relevant to ask how civil society has contributed to shaping *Norden* and the Nordic model of democracy and welfare, as it developed over the twentieth century. Second, one could ask how common features of Nordic historical development have shaped civil society and whether there is a "Nordic model of civil society" influenced by these developments. A similar flexibility might be noted in considering the "Nordic" part of Nordic civil society.[12] On the one hand, it implies the way in which *Norden* or Scandinavia has been used in research as a natural unit for comparison. That includes comparisons *between* the different Nordic countries, *and* comparisons of the Nordic region with other units of analysis, for example in contrast to the Anglo-American sphere, or with other parts of western, central or eastern Europe, or more recently with other parts of the Baltic Sea region.[13] In this sense, the concept of the "Nordic model" – of welfare, or democracy for example – has functioned as an ideal type, against which empirical examples could be compared.[14]

At the same time, however, the Nordic model has itself also had strong normative meanings. As frequently noted, the Nordic countries have been widely cited as positive examples of well-functioning, prosperous, democratic societies, which other less fortunate communities might hope to emulate. One does not need to search too far to find positive references to Nordic civil society as part of a democratic model worthy of admiration, especially during the middle part of the

twentieth century. During the 1930s, and especially after the Second World War, the "rhetorical figure" of "Nordic democracy", to use Jussi Kurunmäki and Johan Strang's term, became firmly established, and the popular movement tradition was seen as part of this.[15] A joint production by the five Nordic social ministries published in 1953 claimed that,

> [a]ll five [Nordic] peoples are organization-minded to an exceptional degree and the relatively smooth working of political democracy must be viewed against the background not only of their highly organized political parties, but also of their thriving organisational life in general.[16]

The nineteenth century popular movements were moreover perceived to be, "a vital factor by serving as training schools in practical democracy."[17] One example of this was the cooperative movement, which was noted not only for its contribution to managing the economy, but also in the development of democracy. In 1921, the American Frederic C Howe wrote that "[t]he cooperative movement is the great cohesive element in the democracy of Denmark. It has brought the farmers together in all kinds of activities".[18]

What *was* Nordic about Nordic Civil Society?

There is a well-established research tradition of comparing civil society across the Nordic region.[19] In his survey of the history of Nordic associations, Henrik Stenius argued that Nordic similarities were the legacies of the post-Reformation period. These legacies included: the weak notion of opposition; the autonomy of local parishes and their institutions, which promoted inclusion; and a relatively smooth trajectory of political, economic and social development, which left little room for militant conflict.[20] In the nineteenth century and even into the twentieth a distinguishing feature of Nordic civil society was its largely rural character, reflecting the fact that industrialisation often took place in the countryside.[21] The relatively egalitarian nature of rural communities facilitated the formation of open associations and dense contacts between them.[22] Religious organisations were important, not only the dominant Lutheran Church but also the various Protestant revivalist movements.[23] Another similarity was the relatively strong affinity between civil society and the state.[24] As Søren Christensen and colleagues have noted, "the distinctiveness of the Nordic model *cannot* be attributed to a strong, independent civil society in opposition to the state."[25] Put another way, it has often been assumed that the nineteenth-century Nordic states, and the ruling classes associated with them, were relatively open to popular demands, and thus avoided the confrontations seen elsewhere in Europe. In the twentieth century, this led to what has been described as "associative governance", where civil society has functioned not in opposition to the state, but as its partner in negotiating compromises between the state and organized interests.[26] This partnership should not be overstated, however, for there is ample research pointing to equally strong traditions of "contentious politics" and the ever-present *possibilities* of direct confrontation, sometimes violent, between

state and society and between different social groups.[27] The "confrontation" in the title of this volume is thus no less important than the "cooperation".

"History matters", was the conclusion of Risto Alapuro: in other words, that the historical legacies of Nordic state-formation and legal-constitutional traditions were crucial in explaining the characteristics of civil society in the Nordic countries, especially when these were contrasted with other Baltic Sea region states for example.[28] There were undoubtedly continuities in the legal-constitutional traditions in Sweden and Finland on the one hand, and Denmark and Norway on the other, even after the watershed of 1809/1814. But there were also important differences across Norden, for example in the arrangements for local government and political participation in municipal institutions.[29] Writing in 1980, Niels Steensgård noted that, "the constitutional positions and economic circumstances of the Nordic countries were perhaps more different during the nineteenth century than at any other point in their history, and the research traditions of these four countries have followed rather different paths."[30] Not only were there differences between "West Norden" (the old Danish realm) and East Norden (the Swedish), but also between the "new" states (Norway, Finland and Iceland), where civil society was connected to mobilisations for national independence, and the two older ones (Denmark and Sweden). In the present volume, Andreas Önnerfors' discussion of the fraternal orders registered under an 1803 Swedish decree, and Margrét Gunnarsdóttir's analysis of two societies in late eighteenth/early nineteenth Iceland within the Danish *helstat*, underline the importance of acknowledging these earlier legacies.

Two general points might be made here. The first is about the historical dynamism of Nordic civil society or a Nordic model of civil society.[31] If the first half of the nineteenth century was a period of divergence and difference, then the decades after about 1870 perhaps saw more *convergence* and similarity. This was stimulated by a wave of inter-Nordic contacts and exchange starting from the 1860s and also by the import of ideas and organisational forms from outside the region.[32] But here too the differences should not be overlooked. As Erik Bengtsson has shown, Sweden largely lacked the popular agrarian movements – above all the farmers' cooperatives – that dominated late nineteenth-century Denmark for example, and this meant that the farmers could be mobilised by the nationalist right against parliamentary democracy in the so-called "farmers' march" (*bondetåg*) of 1914. Only after the First World War did Swedish farmers develop the sorts of organisations and politics that eventually took them into the 1933 crisis agreement with the Social Democrats.[33]

The second point is that if history matters, then so too does geography. Civil society organisations undoubtedly had a key role in national integration and nation-building in the nineteenth century. But there is an important point here about the rural nature of Nordic society and the organisation of public affairs in relatively small and isolated communities. That included not only the larger territories of Norway, Sweden and Finland, where there were often large distances between settlements, but also presumably Denmark, where there were many small island communities. Civil institutions in small rural communities – the village cooperative store for example, or the local parish hall or "people's house" – might have served

concrete material needs but were also important for sociability. Reading some of the chapters in the current volume, one question that comes to mind concerns the places where civil society was located. Where did the shooting societies discussed by Odd Arvid Storsveen hold their competitions? Where did the Icelandic societies in Margrét Gunnarsdóttir's chapter hold their meetings and how did they communicate in a society where the population of 50,000 was presumably fairly scattered (Reykjavík, we are told, was a small town at this time)?

Although beyond the scope of this volume, civil society organisations are excellent subjects for local case studies, and there has indeed been a strong tradition of this in the Nordic context. Such studies can provide a window on the day-to-day operation of these institutions, and presumably help to complicate the idealistic image of well-functioning orderly associations, smoothing over conflicts and training people in how to keep minutes or take part in meetings. We might also ask, what happened when things went wrong and civil society became uncivil? These questions raise interesting challenges, not least because as historians we rely on the minutes of meetings, annual reports and member magazines as sources for studying civil society. But we are all familiar with meetings where the most interesting remarks are always prefaced with the comment "not for the minutes" and the real business actually takes place during the coffee break.

Transnational Nordic Civil Society

One of the key contributions of this volume is its focus on the transnational aspects of Nordic civil society. As Ruth Hemstad notes in Chapter 10, although civil society is most usually understood in relation to the nation state, this perception is challenged by the strength and depth of transnational civil society cooperation within the Nordic region. In her previous work, Hemstad has demonstrated the importance of this transnational cooperation between 1860 and 1905, and how this influenced the development of Nordic regional integration more broadly.[34] In this volume she asks whether there, "is – or ever has been – something like a *common* Nordic civil society, understood as a transnational space and sphere of institutionalised border-crossing social activity, aiming to pursue common goals."[35] Hemstad's mapping finds a distinction between associations pursuing idealistic, explicitly pan-national goals, and those with more pragmatic aims, emerging from the late eighteenth century onwards. Overall, Hemstad finds almost 100 Nordic associations formed during the "long nineteenth century" and a similar number of Nordic meetings, in addition to the Scandinavian associations formed abroad.[36]

Other chapters in the volume are concerned with transnational cooperation during the twentieth century. Peter Stadius' chapter examines the Nordic Federation of Public Administration (Nordiska Administrativa Förbundet). This was founded as an organisation for top civil servants in 1918 and brought together individuals who were presumably at the forefront of thinking about the

evolving relationship between state and civil society, not only theoretically but also practically in their daily work, especially in the "younger" states such as Finland that had only recently become independent. As Stadius shows, it also had an important influence in shaping the transnational relationships that led to the start of official Nordic inter-governmental cooperation with the founding of the Nordic Council in 1952. Further, it provides an insight that can illustrate some of the practices of Nordic civil society cooperation, including the importance of personal relationships.

Finally, there is no doubt that civil society associations have played an important role in mediating contacts between Norden and the wider world. This is the case before 1945, whether examples might include Christian mission and labour movement internationalism, and after, as explored in the two final chapters of this volume by Melina Antonia Buns and Sunniva Engh respectively. A recent history of Swedish overseas aid has shown how civil society organisations played an important role in early efforts to establish an infrastructure for overseas development aid from the early 1950s, through the Central Committee for Swedish technical assistance (CK) set up in 1952.[37] Sunniva Engh's chapter shows how the three Scandinavian Red Cross societies took joint initiatives in response to the Korean War, leading to the establishment of a National Medical Centre in Seoul. As with Melina Antonia Buns' example of the Scandinavian anti-nuclear movements, these actions took place not only in partnership with Nordic governments, but also in protest against them, or frustration at their inaction. Both chapters raise interesting questions about the "civilian" nature of civil society, in contexts where the borders between military and civilian activities were ambiguous.

The Nordic model has certainly had a "moment" during the past 10 or 15 years, to the point where references to it seem to have become ubiquitous. Moreover, civil society has undoubtedly been part of these most recent iterations of the model, supported by the proliferation of international indices ranking countries in terms of factors like social trust, transparency, anti-corruption, democratic accountability and the like.[38] High levels of voluntary organisation, and in particular the interactions between civil society and the state, are seen as essential ingredients in positive portrayals of the Nordic societies, connected in turn to high levels of trust and social capital.[39]

There clearly are similarities between the Nordic countries, which make them obvious cases for comparative analysis. Generally, the similarities seem to be more apparent when we compare the Nordic region with other parts of Europe, while comparisons between the Nordic countries are often more likely to highlight differences. As chapters in this volume have demonstrated, similarities were shaped not only by structural factors but perhaps even more importantly by transnational contacts and exchange. These took place not only *within* the region but also through the import of ideas and organisational models from outside it. At the same time, we should be careful about overstating similarities, and in particular, we should pay attention both to the historical dynamics of convergence and divergence over time, and to the geographies of civil society and state interactions.

Notes

1 This short essay is a reworked version of a lecture delivered to the closing seminar of the UiO:Norden Nordic Civil Societies research group, University of Oslo, 21 September 2023. I would like to thank the organisers Sunniva Engh, Klaus Nathaus and Ruth Hemstad for the invitation to participate, and all those involved in the group for inspiring discussions.
2 Kirby, 'What was "Nordic"?'.
3 Calhoun, 'Civil society and the public sphere', 701.
4 Trägårdh, 'The "civil society" debate in Sweden'; Götz, 'Civil society in the Nordics'.
5 Jansson, 'The age of associations', 323, n. 2.
6 See the introduction to this volume, p. 1.
7 For a further discussion of the political theory of the distinction between market, state and civil society, see Sand's contribution to this volume.
8 Lundkvist, *Folkrörelserna i det svenska samhället*; Jansson, *Adertonhundratalets associationer*; Jansson, 'The age of associations'.
9 See also Toivanen, 'The Saami people'.
10 Christensen et al., 'Introduction', 2.
11 Alapuro, 'Introduction'.
12 See Strang et al., 'A rhetorical perspective'.
13 For example: Alapuro and Stenius, eds., *Nordic Associations*; Götz and Hackmann, eds., *Civil Society*.
14 Here I draw on a recently finished collective research project on 'Nordic models in global entanglements, 1970-2020' (Independent Research Fund Denmark, grant no. 8018-00023B), with Andreas Mørkved Hellenes, Carl Marklund and Byron Rom-Jensen. The concept is discussed further in our forthcoming volume *Globalising the Nordic model: From exceptionalism to entanglement* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming 2025). See also Rom-Jensen et al., 'Modelizing the Nordics'; Byrkjeflot et al., *The Making and Circulation*.
15 Kurunmäki and Strang, 'Introduction'.
16 Nelson, ed., *Freedom and Welfare*, 35.
17 Nelson, ed., *Freedom and Welfare*, 36.
18 Howe, *Denmark*, 59. See also Hilson, 'Popular movements'.
19 This is not the place for a comprehensive survey of the literature, but some examples can be mentioned. A special issue of *Scandinavian Journal of History* appeared in 1980 on the history of popular movements and voluntary organizations during the first half of the nineteenth century, with contributions from Henrik Stenius (Finland), Lars Svåsund (Norway), Vagn Wåhlin (Denmark) and Sven Lundkvist (Sweden). A further special issue followed in 1988 as the result of a Nordic project 'From Associations to Mass Organizations – Social Change and the Emergence of the Modern Association Movement in a Comparative Nordic Perspective', which included a comparative Nordic survey by Torkel Jansson, and articles on Finland (Henrik Stenius; Ilkka Liikanen), Denmark (Niels Clemmensen), Iceland (Hrefna Róbertsdóttir) and Norway (Hans Try), women's organisations (Ingrid Åberg). Henrik Stenius also co-ordinated (with sociologist Risto Alapuro) the network 'European Voluntary Associations in the Modern and the Contemporary Period', which took the study of Nordic associations into the early twenty-first century and compared the Nordic countries with other European examples. I have myself contributed to the 2010 volume from this project: Hilson, 'The Nordic

consumer co-operative movements'. See also Wijkström and Zimmer, eds., *Nordic Civil Society*.
20 Stenius, 'Nordic associational life'.
21 Kirby, 'What was "Nordic"?'
22 Götz et al., 'Nordic cooperation', 51.
23 For a discussion of Nordic civil society from a Weberian perspective on religion, see Byrkjeflot's contribution to this volume. See also Kayser Nielsen, *Bonde, stat og hjem*.
24 Alapuro, 'Introduction'.
25 Christensen et al., 'Introduction', 6. Emphasis added.
26 Lund et al., *Associative Governance*. See also Syberg's contribution to this volume.
27 There is an extensive literature on this. See for example, Mikkelsen et al., eds., *Popular Struggle and Democracy*.
28 Alapuro, 'Conclusion'.
29 These differences are discussed and compared in detail in Jansson, 'The age of associations'.
30 Steensgaard, editorial.
31 See also Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
32 Götz et al., 'Nordic cooperation'; see Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
33 Bengtsson, 'The social origins of democracy'.
34 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter*.
35 See Hemstad's contribution to this volume.
36 On the Scandinavian associations abroad, see also Hemstad, 'Organised into existence'.
37 Berg et al., *En svindlande uppgift*.
38 Rom-Jensen et al., 'Modelizing the Nordics.
39 See Andersen and Dinesen, 'Social capital'.

Bibliography

Alapuro, Risto. "Introduction: Comparative approaches to associations and civil society in the Nordic countries." In *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*, edited by Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, 11–28. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010.

Alapuro, Risto. "Conclusion: How history matters in putting Nordic associations into a European perspective." In *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*, edited by Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, 309–17. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010.

Alapuro, Risto and Henrik Stenius, eds. *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010.

Andersen, Rasmus Fonnesbæk and Peter Thisted Dinesen. "Social capital in the Scandinavian countries." In *The Routledge Handbook of Scandinavian Politics*, edited by Peter Nedergaard and Anders Wivel, 161–73. London: Routledge, 2017.

Bengtsson, Erik. "The social origins of democracy in Sweden: The role of agrarian politics." *Social History* 47, no. 4 (2022), 419–55.

Berg, Annika, Urban Lundberg and Mattias Tydén. *En svindlande uppgift: Sverige och biståndet 1945–1975*. Stockholm: Ordfront, 2021.

Byrkjeflot, Haldor, Mads Mordhorst and Klaus Petersen, eds. *The Making and Circulation of Nordic Models, Ideas and Images*. London: Routledge, 2021.

Calhoun, Craig. "Civil society and the public sphere: History of the concept." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by James D. Wright, 701–06. Second edition, vol. 3 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.03070-1

Christensen, Søren, Anker Brink-Lund, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Benjamin Ask Popp-Madsen. "Introduction: Scandinavian perspectives on associative governance." In *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by "Combining Together"*, edited by Anker Brink Lund, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Søren Christensen, 1–20. London: Routledge, 2024.

Götz, Norbert. "Civil society in the Nordics." nordics.info, 2019. Available at: https://nordics.info/show/artikel/civil-society; last accessed 25 June 2024.

Götz, Norbert and Jörg Hackmann, eds. *Civil society in the Baltic Sea Region*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Götz, Norbert, Heidi Haggrén and Mary Hilson. "Nordic cooperation in the voluntary sector." In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang, 49–68. London: Routledge, 2016.

Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter. Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsuppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008.

Hemstad, Ruth. "Organised into existence: Scandinavianism and pan-Scandinavian associations within and beyond the region." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius, 158–79. London: Routledge, 2023.

Hilson, Mary. "The Nordic consumer co-operative movements in international perspective, 1890-1939." In *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*, edited by Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, 215–240. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010.

Hilson, Mary. "Popular movements and the fragility of the Nordic democracies during the first half of the twentieth century." *Journal of Modern European History* 17, no. 4 (2019), 469–85.

Howe, Frederic C. *Denmark: A Co-operative Commonwealth*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921.

Jansson, Torkel. *Adertonhundratalets associationer*. Uppsala: Studia Historica Upsaliensis, 1985.

Jansson, Torkel. "The age of associations: Principles and forms of organization between corporations and mass organizations. A comparative Nordic survey from a Swedish viewpoint." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 13, no. 4 (1988), 321–43.

Kayser Nielsen, Niels. *Bonde, stat og hjem: Nordisk demokrati og nationalisme – fra pietismen til 2. verdenskrig*. Aarhus: Aarhus universitetsforlag, 2009.

Kirby, David. "What was 'Nordic' about the labour movement in Europe's northernmost regions?" In *Lokalt och internationellt. Dimensioner i den nordiska arbetarrörelsen och arbetarkulturen*, edited by Pauli Kettunen, 13–32. Tammerfors: Sällskapet för forskning i arbetarhistoria i Finland, 2002.

Kurunmäki, Jussi and Johan Strang. "Introduction: 'Nordic democracy' in a world of tensions." In *Rhetorics of Nordic democracy*, edited by Jussi Kurunmäki and Johan Strang, 9–36. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2010.

Lund, Anker Brink, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Søren Christensen, eds. *Associative Governance in Scandinavia: Organizing Societies by "Combining Together"*. London: Routledge, 2024.

Lundkvist, Sven. *Folkrörelserna i det svenska samhället 1850–1920*. Uppsala: Studia Historica Upsaliensis, 1977.

Mikkelsen, Flemming, Knut Kjeldstadli and Stefan Nyzell, eds. *Popular Struggle and Democracy in Scandinavia 1700-Present*. London: Palgrave, 2018.

Nelson, George R., ed. *Freedom and welfare: Social patterns in the Northern Countries of Europe*. Copenhagen: Ministries of Social Affairs of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, 1953.

Rom-Jensen, Byron, Andreas Mørkved Hellenes, Mary Hilson and Carl Marklund. 'Modelizing the Nordics: transdiscursive migrations of Nordic models, c. 1965-2020', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 48, 2 (2023), 249–71: 261–3.

Steensgaard, Niels. Editorial. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 5 (1980), 149–50.

Stenius, Henrik. "Nordic associational life in a European and an inter-Nordic perspective." In *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*, edited by Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, 29–86. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010.

Strang, Johan, Jani Marjanen and Mary Hilson. "A rhetorical perspective on Nordicness: From creating unity to exporting models." In *Contesting Nordicness: From Scandinavianism to the Nordic brand*, edited by Jani Marjanen, Johan Strang and Mary Hilson, 1–33. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2021.

Suodenjoki, Sami. "Land agitation and the rise of agrarian socialism in south-western Finland, 1899–1907." In *Labour, Unions and Politics under the North Star: The Nordic Countries, 1700–2000*, edited by Mary Hilson, Silke Neunsinger and Iben Vyff, 175–96. New York: Berghahn, 2017.

Toivanen, Reetta. "The Saami people and Nordic civil societies." In *Civil Society in the Baltic Sea Region*, edited by Norbert Götz and Jörg Hackmann, 203–16. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Trägårdh, Lars. "The 'civil society' debate in Sweden: The welfare state challenged." In *State and Civil Society in Northern Europa: The Swedish Model Reconsidered*, edited by Lars Trägårdh, 9–36. New York: Berghahn books, 2007.

Wijkström, Filip and Annette Zimmer, eds. *Nordic Civil Society at a Cross-roads: Transforming the Popular Movement Tradition*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2011.

Index

Note: Endnotes are indicated by the page number followed by "n" and the note number e.g., 111n5 refers to note 5 on page 111.

American Revolution 59
anti-nuclear movement: anti-nuclear mobilization in eighties 242, 253; Barsebäck plant 241–42, 244–45, 248; Danish Organisation for Information about Nuclear Power (OOA) 241, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253; Double-Track Decision on nuclear missiles 242; Euromissile crisis 241, 243, 252, 253; Greenpeace (Danish branch) 241, 242, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 252, 253; Non-Proliferation Treaty 251, 252; Nordic Contact Group for Nuclear Energy (NAK) 243; Nordic Committee for the Cooperation of Nuclear Activities (NKA) 243–44; Nordic March against Nuclear Power 244–45; Nordic Nuclear Weapon Free Zone campaign 243, 253; occupation and blockade tactics 249; referendum on nuclear energy (Sweden) 241, 242–43, 245, 249; Swedish People's Campaign against Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons (FMKK) 241–242, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253; Three Mile Island meltdown 242; transnational collaboration 242, 244–45; waste repositories, protests against 249; *see also* spent nuclear fuel export for reprocessing
Arendt, Hannah 40
associative governance 2, 23, 29, 261, 262
Auken, Margrete 246, 248
Axelsson, Linnea 160–63, 166, 167
Bellona 26
Berzelius, Jacob 189
Bhabha, Homi 156, 158
boundary institutions between social sectors 37, 39, 41, 48, 49
bureaucracy: balance of bureaucracy and politics 14, 16–17; Calvinist vs. Lutheran development of 17, 18; classic bureaucracy vs. modern control system bureaucracy 26; clergy–bureaucracy cooperation 17; as general principle of organization 16; in Germany 16, 18; good governance, correspondence with 16; passive democratization by 20, 28; rationality and alienation 16; recruitment from civil society 26; revivalist influence on 22; standards and professionalism, development of 18; tax collection as stimulus 18; *see also* organizational structures of associations

Central Committee for Swedish Technical Aid to the Less Developed Areas 221
Central Support Fund for Scandinavians Abroad 187
civil society: Anglo-American vs. Nordic perspectives on 2; autonomous vs. interactive 36, 42; definition of 1, 36, 37, 38, 39–40, 42, 260; critical and evaluative function 37, 42; as discursive ideal type, not empirical category 118, 120, 132; as marker of social virtue 119; mutual dependency with state 139, 149; national–transnational tensions 2, 3; normative vs. sectoral perspective

on 3–4, 261; open interaction function 37; paramount to democracy 3; processual-relational analysis of 42; as recent concept 118; state–civil society interpenetration 22, 27; state–civil society tensions 2, 4, 29
Clara Lachman Foundation 186
Committee for Cooperation on International Relief (Denmark) 220
cooperatives in Denmark: Arla 121, 124, 126–27, 132; bottom-up formation 126; Cooperative Committee 126; corporate behaviour, growing tendency towards 124, 126–27, 132; Danish Crown 124, 126–27, 132; democracy, contribution to development of 262; distribution of profit 123; globalized enterprises 121, 124, 126–27, 132; inherent ambiguity 125; joint liability 123; as major economic force in late nineteenth century 125, 126; member-based ownership 130; origins of 121, 125; positive self-representation as democratic 119, 120, 123, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132; rapid rise of 125–26; regulatory legislation, lack of 125, 131; as rural business model 121, 123, 125–26; voting rights 123
corporate pluralism 29
corporations in Denmark: Carlsberg 124; corporate environmentalism 124; corporate social responsibility 124–25, 132; distribution of profit 123; foundation-owned corporations 124; high-risk infrastructure projects 122, 123; liberal nineteenth-century environment 122; mergers and consolidation 121, 123–24; limited liability 122, 123; Maersk 124; multinationals as drivers of economy 123, 124; negative portrayal as purely profit-seeking 119, 130; Novo Nordisk 121, 124; origins of 121, 122; post-WWII increasing dominance of 123–24; private market regulation 123; privatization of state-owned enterprises 124; profit motive, increasing domination of 123, 124; scandals and frauds 123; state regulation 123, 125, 131; shareholders 122–23, 124, 130; triple bottom line 124; urban growth of 121, 123; voting rights 123
corporatism 4, 5, 29, 119, 200, 261

Dahl, Birgitta 248, 251, 253
Danish-Icelandic Society 186
democracy: associational life and 18, 28, 261; bourgeoisie, rise of 4; bureaucracy unescapable in 16; church-like vs. sect-like development of 19–20; civil society essential to 1, 3, 28, 36, 38–39; constitutions as structural coupling between citizens and state 46; elections as linkage between civil society and state 45–46; liberation of individuals and political rights 43; passive democratization by bureaucracy 20, 28; social democracy 43, 49, 190, 191, 205, 260; welfare state as precondition 37; *see also* political parties
Denmark: bureaucracy 16, 18; Cold War orientation 217, 219, 222; corporate law (1917) 122, 123, 125, 131; democracy, transition to 121; Free Trade Act (1857) 121, 122; industrialization 128; labour unions 49; revivalism 20, 21–22, 23, 28; Second Schleswig War (1864) 120, 121, 126, 185, 189; *see also* cooperatives in Denmark; corporations in Denmark; savings banks in Denmark

Economic and Social Council 141
Einarsson, Ísleifur 82, 87, 88
Eisenhower, Dwight D. 250, 252
Endresen, Michael 225, 226
Ekeberg, Birger 208

farmers' movements 22, 25, 27, 127, 263; *see also* cooperatives in Denmark
Feodoroff, Pauliina 168
Finland: bureaucracy 18; Cold War orientation 243; fraternal orders 65, 66; independence 103, 263, 265; nuclear power 243, 244, 245, 248; revivalism 21; Russian rule 63; Winter War 104, 114n49, 227; World War II 114n49
Florelius, Sten 225, 226
Foucault, Michel 40, 41
Foundation for Help to the Under-Developed Areas (Norway) 221
fraternal orders: administrative culture 68; Bavarian Order of Illuminati 59, 66; contribution to political vocabulary and progressive discursive capital 75; definition of 60–61; four distinctive types 60, 70–71; Freemasons 59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 70, 73–74; Goodtemplars 62; *Gula Rosen* 74; naming practices 72–73; *Narcissaner Orden* 72; national identity

66, 75; origin in court sociability 61; overlaps with concept of civil society 61; pedagogical change promoted by 64–65; *Pro Lantura* 71–72; from secret societies to subscription organizations 65; as Swedish social craze 73; Templars 66; top-down and bottom-up dynamics of 62; *La Tolerance* 71; trade unions influenced by 62; variety of associational forms and aims 60, 61–62, 65–66, 75; welfare state, precursor of 62–63; *see also* Swedish governmental regulation of fraternal orders
French Revolution 59, 61, 65, 66, 67, 74, 83

Gemeinschaft vs. *Gesellschaft* 62
Germany: bureaucracy, overdevelopment of 16, 18, 27, 28; as church-like society 19, 28, 30n26; conformist associational landscape 20; late imperial colonization 107; Lutheranism 15–16, 17; Nazism 20; party politics, underdevelopment of 15–16, 17, 20, 27; Prussian bureaucratic reforms 18; suspicion and restriction of voluntary associations 65, 66–67, 68
government commissions 24
Groth, Carl Erik 228–29, 229–30
Grundtvig, Nicolai F. 21–22, 27, 28, 103

Habermas, Jürgen 40, 64
Hammarskjöld, Bo 208–09
Hammerich, Kai 223, 224, 230, 232, 233
Hauge movement 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 47
health and social care 22, 24, 37
Henderson, Ebenezer 83, 84

Iceland: Althing as contested national symbol 81–82, 83, 91, 92; as antiquarian repository of Nordic heritage 79, 80, 81, 92; Commonwealth period, contested interpretation of 82–83, 90; evening wakes 84, 90; *Jónsbók* affair 87–88, 91; Jörgensen's Revolution 86–87, 88, 91; as province of dual monarchy 79; Royal High Court of Justice 81–82; unionist nationalism 82–83; *see also* Icelandic Society; Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries
Icelandic Society: anti-union sympathies 85, 91; attention to international affairs 83–84; democratic principles 81; dissolution 89; disunity on board 84; domination of printing and publishing 84, 86, 87, 91; Enlightenment orientation 79, 81, 90, 91; financial irregularities 88; foundation of 79, 80; General Trade Petition 81; Jörgensen's Revolution, associated with 86–87, 91; large membership 81; *Minnisverd Tídindi* 83–84, 91; promotion of knowledge and education 80; Stephensen's presidency 80–81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86–89, 90, 91; Thorkelin's attacks on 85; undemocratic structure 84–85
Italy 20, 101

Jannok, Sofia 158–59
Johnson, Gunnar 225, 226

labour unions and labour movement: as boundary institutions 49; from conflict to cooperation with state 23, 200; emergence of as specialization 42; fraternal orders, influence of 62; General Agreements with state 48–49; influence on welfare provision 48; revivalist movements as forerunners 22, 25; as stimulus to trans-Nordic associational cooperation 190, 191, 205; as vital expression of civil freedoms 48
legitimacy 139–40
Letterstedt Foundation 181, 184, 186, 191
Luhmann, Niklas 38, 40, 41, 52

Marakatt-Labba, Britta 157, 169n16
Myrdal, Alva 249–50, 252

Nansen, Fridtjof 142
neo-corporatism 29, 119
Nilssen, Ragnar Wisløff 230, 232, 233
nongovernmental organizations (NGOs): close cooperation with and funding by state 119, 217; inter-Nordic international NGOs 179, 180; major development role 5, 217; as memberless voluntary organizations 26; National Medical Centre (Korea) as pioneer of development aid 218, 220–21, 232–34; *see also* Scandinavian Red Cross societies in Korean War
Norden: *see* Nordic Model
Nordic Advisory Council for Aid 221
Norden Associations 183, 185–86, 191, 199, 202–03

Nordic cooperation: civil society cooperation as foundation of 176; "freeze" after dissolution of Swedish-Norwegian union 106, 183; "here-but-not-further" approach 204; integral to civil society development 5; labour organizations 205; network of associational collaboration 175, 178; Norden Associations 186, 191; Nordic Council 200; "Nordic" defined by 177; nuclear protest and 248; pan-national ideological collaboration 179–80, 185; post-WWI 191, 199; post-WWII 108, 176, 206; scientific 189; sharpshooting associations 108; pragmatically motivated collaboration 178, 179, 180, 187; tensions and conflicts 2; *see also* Nordic Federation of Public Administration
Nordic Council 8, 108, 176, 192, 200, 209, 221, 234, 242, 243, 248, 265
Nordic Council of Ministers 176, 179, 181, 192, 194n43, 243
Nordic exceptionalism 2, 167, 207
Nordic Federation of Public Administration (NAF): administrative harmonization, advocacy of 206, 213; Danish members 199, 202, 203, 205, 210; eschewal of state integration 204; Finnish members 199, 202–03, 205–06, 206–07, 209–10, 211; founding of 202; general meetings 202, 209–11; gradual broadening of membership 205–06; high-level political legitimacy 200; Icelandic members 199, 202, 203, 205, 209; informal dimension 201, 211–13; international administrative congresses, attitude to 204–05; justice, perceived Nordic tradition of 207–09, 213; labour market interests of civil servants 200, 206, 207; Nordic history of cooperation as context for 200; *Nordisk Administrativt Tidskrift* (*NAT*) 202, 203, 205, 207, 209; Norwegian members 199, 202, 206, 209; separate national organizations 202–03, 205; social events 211–213; Swedish members 199, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 211; as top-down paternalistic organization 205, 211
Nordic Inter-Parliamentary Union 190
Nordic Jurist Meetings 202
Nordic Model (*Norden*): associative governance crucial to 2; civil society integral to 1, 3, 265; clergy–bureaucracy cooperation 17; compromise-oriented forms of governance 43; cooperatives as core element 125; as ideal type 261; normative meaning of 261–62; post-Reformation legacies 262; rural communities, importance in development of 262, 263–64; state–civil society cooperation 4–5, 138, 139, 150, 200, 201, 262, 265; transnational and international dimension 2, 4, 5–6, 177, 201
Nordic Surgeons' Association 189
Nordic winter 185, 190, 199
Nordism 178, 187, 211
Norway: bureaucracy 18; Cold War orientation 217, 219, 222, 226; dissolution of Norwegian-Swedish union 177, 182, 185, 187, 190, 199, 204; historical duty of social participation 46–47; labour unions 49; missionary endeavours 220; poverty question 47; revivalism 20, 21, 22, 23, 28, 47; welfare state, historical development of 46–48; *see also* Norwegian Refugee Council
Norwegian Confederation of Sports 25
Norwegian Refugee Council: as advisory body 140, 147; centralizing and coordinating mission 140, 142; close affiliation with state, legitimacy gained by 145–47, 148, 149; closure threat (1957) 141, 143–44, 145, 146, 147–48; domestic moral legitimacy, conferred on state by 143–44, 149; establishment of 140; Father Pire dispute 144–45; fundraising 142, 145, 148, 149; Hungarian Crisis 139, 142, 143, 147; international moral legitimacy, conferred on state by 142–43; public legitimacy, careful management of 144–45, 148, 149; relief abroad, switch to focus on 148, 149; state funding 140, 145–46, 147, 148, 149; UNHCR and 142, 143, 147, 148, 149
Norwegian Women's Public Health Association 24

organizational structures of associations: church-like vs. sect-like 19–20, 23, 27–28; horizontal integration 24; memberless organizations 26; membership model 24–25, 28; network model 26; people's movements 26; umbrella associations 24, 25; vertical integration (three-tier structure) 24, 26, 28
origins of civil society 1

Palme, Olof 162, 252, 253
passport union 209
people's movements 25–26, 27, 28, 113n26, 155
political parties: autonomous power of party organizations 46; funding 46; internal democratic procedures 46; as linkage between free citizens and state authorities 45–46, 50; member-based organization 46; party politics crucial to democracy 15–16, 17, 20; as separate sphere between state and civil society 39; underdevelopment in Germany 15–16, 17, 20, 27
publishing and media 51, 63
Pufendorf, Samuel 63

Rafn, Carl Christian 89, 90
rationality 3, 16, 60, 66
Red Cross societies *see* Scandinavian Red Cross societies in Korean War
renaissance of civil society 1
religion: Calvinism 16, 17, 18, 20–21, 22, 27, 28; capitalism and 16; Christian lay movement 22; church vs. sect organization 19–20, 23; Lutheranism 15–16, 17, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 262; missionary societies 22, 220, 265; post-Reformation religious landscape 17; revivalism 21, 23, 27, 28, 262; welfare state development and 30n5
right-wing populism 29
Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries: Dano-Icelandic environment 89, 189; foundation of 79, 89; global network 89; inclusiveness as aim 91; Old Norse publishing mission 89, 91; popular support 90; promoting common Nordic heritage 89

SAMAK 191, 202
Sámi art and literature: *Ædnan* (Axelsson) 160–63, 165, 166–68; assimilation trauma 162; *Bajándávgi* (Somby) 165; double identity 162; epic genre 161; family novel genre 160, 163, 167; global indigenous discourse 159, 167, 168; nationalist indigenous discourse 157, 167; Norwegian national narrative, critique of 165, 167; oral narrative tradition 160; over realism 165–66; personal experience as point of departure 157, 158, 161, 166, 167; *Pile o'Sapmi Supreme* (Sara) 159–60, 166; political-juridical discourse 157, 167; resort to arts and languages of the "other" 160, 166, 167, 169n26; Sámi community internalization of exclusionary practices 163, 164, 165, 168; silence, culture of 162, 163; Swedish national narrative, critique of 162, 166, 167; unprecedented mobilization of 157; *Våke over dem som sover* (Skåden) 163–68; Venice Biennale (2022) 154, 156, 168; victimhood narrative, critique of 164, 165; *WE ARE STILL HERE* (Jannok and Sunna) 158–59, 165; *yoiks* 160; *see also* Sámi people
Sámi people: Alta Conflict 155–56, 168; assimilation policy 154; environmental movements, alliance with 155; forced migration 160; Fosen Conflict 154–55, 156; Girjas case 155, 158; Nordic Sámi Council 155; Norwegian Sámi Association 155; parliaments, establishment of 154, 156; recognition as indigenous people 154; Reindeer Convention 161; Sámi Association of Finland 155; Swedish Sámi National Association 155; transnational indigenous collaboration 155, 168; Truth and Reconciliation committees 154, 168n4; *see also* Sámi art and literature
Sara, Máret Ánne 157, 159–60, 166, 167, 168
savings banks in Denmark: commercial banks, growing resemblance to 124, 128, 129, 130; consolidation and centralization 128; credit, growing focus on 127; deregulation 128; economic significance 127, 131; farmers' banks 127; origins of 121, 127; mergers with commercial banks 121, 129; parish banks 127; positive image self-representation as philanthropic 120, 127, 128–29, 130, 131; regulatory legislation 127–28, 131; rural growth of 121; savings as initial focus 127; tension between for-profit goals and nonprofit ideals 128–29; as top-down process 127
Scandinavian Association of Natural Scientists 188–89
Scandinavian Association in Rome 181
Scandinavian Literary Society 183, 184
Scandinavian Red Cross societies in Korean War: as alternative to military contribution 222, 224, 226, 227, 228,

229, 230, 233; Cold War context 217–18, 219; Danish contribution (*Jutlandia* hospital ship 223–24) 219, 222–24, 230; high motivation of Red Cross societies 218, 233; impact on Korean medical system 220; military vs. humanitarian orientations 219–20, 223–24, 225, 226, 227, 229; National Medical Centre (NMC) 217, 221, 230–33, 234; Norwegian contribution (NORMASH) 219, 224–27, 230; Swedish contribution (Swedish Red Cross Hospital) 219, 227–30
Scandinavian Seamen's Mission 189
Scandinavianism 8, 177, 178, 185, 187, 189, 190, 191, 199, 200
schools: *Almenn* schools 49; as boundary institutions 49; church organization of 49; as core local civil society institutions 49; *folkskolan* 64; Grundtvigian people's high school movement 103; as linkage between civil society and municipalities 50; *medborgskola* concept 64; privatization of 29
Semb, Carl 226, 230–31, 232, 233
sharpshooting associations: Academic Shooting Society 101; adopted as mass "people's" sport 100, 101; age constraints, lack of 104–05; armed forces, links with 103, 106, 107; Central Association for the Spread of Body Exercise and Weapon Practice 101, 102; Denmark 103; ease of access 105; in Finland 103–04, 107, 108, 109; inventing new sports 108–10; lack of scholarly attention to 100–01; *Leidangen* 106–07; liberal left ties 101–02, 107; neutrality and peacefulness as ideals 107–08; non-violent Nordic culture as paradoxical context 100; Nordic Championships 105–06, 108; in Norway 101–03; origins in European sport reforms 101; patriotism 101, 106, 107; post-WWII Nordic cooperation 108; as social regulation of arms culture 111; in Sweden 102, 103; Swedish Shooting Movement 103; technical developments 104; Voluntary Shooter Service 103, 107; women members 105
Skåden, Sigbjørn 160, 163–68, 169n26
social capital 25, 60, 64, 265
Society for Nordic Art 189
Society for the Welfare of Norway 85
sociocultural lifeworld 39
Somby, Marry Áilonieida 165
spent nuclear fuel export for reprocessing: Cogema 241, 251, 252; Denmark–Sweden diplomatic tensions 248–49, 253; dual-usage Swedish programme 252; export policy for Swedish fuel 245–46; La Hague reprocessing plant 249, 251; moral national responsibility for waste 249; as political nexus issue 243, 253; regulatory blind spot 246–47; safety objections 246, 247–48, 253; *Sigyn* grounding 248; *Sigyn* protest 241; as solution to waste problem 245, 252; Swedish Nuclear Fuel Supply Company (SKBF) 241, 247, 248, 251; Swedish Programme Committee for Radioactive Waste (PRAV) 247, 249; transnational collaborative protest 247–48, 251, 253; weapons potential, objections to 250–53; *see also* anti-nuclear movement
Stephensen, Magnús 80–81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86–89, 90, 91
Sunna, Anders 158–59, 165, 167, 168
Sweden: Ådalen massacre 107; bureaucracy 18; Cold War orientation 218, 219, 222, 228, 229, 230; corporate law (1848) 122; dissolution of Norwegian-Swedish union 177, 182, 185, 187, 190, 199, 204; *folkskolan* 64; labour unions 49; loss of Finland and Swedish Pomerania 64; privatization of schools 29; revivalism 20, 23; welfare state central to national identity 63, 162; *see also* Swedish governmental regulation of fraternal orders
Swedish governmental regulation of fraternal orders (1803): avoiding offence to morality, religion and social order 59, 67, 68; Boheman affair 73–74; European climate of suspicion against voluntary associations 65, 66–67, 74; police access 67, 68; responses submitted to police 68–70; secrecy, acknowledgement of 68; *see also* fraternal orders

technology and knowledge society: commercial transnational control of technologies 44; digitalization as challenge to voluntarism 29; generalized systematic infrastructures and communicative systems 42, 44, 45, 51; industrialization 43; more efficient

markets 43; professionalization of politics 37; risk society 52; specialization of sectors 37, 42, 43, 44
traditional civil society model blurred by 45, 51
think tanks 26
Thorkelin, Grímur 82–83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91
Thrane movement 47
Tocqueville, Alexis de 4, 138–39, 149, 177
Torgersen, Arne 143, 146, 148
transnational Nordic associations: associations as engine of integration 176–77; bilateral societies 186; diaspora associations 180, 184, 186–87, 190; external threats as motivation 177, 199; high density of civil society ties 175, 179, 264; labour movement as stimulus 190, 191; meeting traditions 181–82; national reactions against 178, 184, 185; nationally based networking associations 180; neo-Scandinavianism 185; nineteenth-centry growth of associational system 177, 180–81, 182–83, 187, 192; Norden Associations 183, 185–86, 191, 199, 202; "Nordic added value" 192; Nordic-level organization 180; as Nordic subsystem of civil society 176, 178–79, 186, 192; pan-national ideological orientation 179, 180, 183–87; political unification as goal 184, 185, 187; pragmatically oriented cooperation 177, 179, 180, 187–92, 199
trias of civil society, state and market: agonistic/republican model of public space 40; blurred by new technology and knowledge society 45, 51, 52; boundary institutions 37, 39, 41, 48, 49; discursive model of public space 40; hybrid blurring of categories 118, 119, 120, 124, 129, 132; liberal model of public space 40, 50; modernity defined by 39, 52; overlapping and closely linked in Nordic states 43, 50, 51, 119; political parties as separate sphere 39; specific logics of state and market vs. civil society open function 37, 38, 39

United Kingdom: bombardment of Copenhagen 85; Danish agricultural exports to 125, 126; Jörgensen's Revolution in Iceland 86–87; Protestant capitalists 30n26; late imperial colonization 107; nuclear power 245, 246, 249, 250; state regulation of associations 65, 66, 67, 68, 74; strong associational landscape 20
United States: Goodtemplars 62; Korean War 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229; nuclear fuel reprocessing 250–51, 252; as sect-like society 19–20, 27, 28, 30n26
Utsi, Paulus 160, 167

Weber, Max: bureaucracy 16, 18, 26, 27; Calvinism 16, 19, 20–21, 27, 30n26, 31n33; church-like vs. sect-like organization 19–20, 27, 28, 29; German politics, critique of 15; Lutheranism 16, 19, 21, 27, 28, 30n26, 31n33; religion as central cleavage in European history 17
welfare state: bureaucracy as precondition for 30n5; comprehensive general pensions 48; decentralized 24, 48; fraternal orders as precursor 62–63; as Nordic identity 63; as Nordic priority 37; increasing state involvement 47, 50; insurance reforms 47–48; Lutheran foundational values 17, 30n5; from paternalistic to participatory decision-making 63; pension schemes 48; poverty question 47; as precondition for reciprocity in governance 23; private/voluntary organizations 47, 48, 51
Wolff, Christian 63
World Bank 141
World War II 51
women's movement 23, 25