

# The European Press and the Question of Norwegian Independence in 1814

Stian A. E. Eisenträger

NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES  
Department of International Environment and Development Studies, NORAgric  
Master Thesis 30 credits 2013



# The European Press and the Question of Norwegian Independence in 1814

The Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, is the international gateway for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB). UMB consists of eight departments, associated research institutions and the Norwegian College of Veterinary Medicine in Oslo. Established in 1986, Noragric's contribution to international development lies in the interface between research, education (Bachelor, Master and PhD programmes) and assignments.

The Noragric Master's thesis is the final thesis submitted by students in order to fulfill the requirements under the Noragric Master's programme "International Environmental Studies", "Development Studies" and "International Relations"; a partnership programme with the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI).

The findings in this thesis do not necessarily reflect the views of Noragric. Extracts from this publication may only be reproduced after prior consultation with the author and on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation contact Noragric.

© Stian A. E. Eisenträger  
Master in International Relations, May 2013  
stian.eisentrager@gmail.com

Noragric  
Department of International Environment and Development Studies  
P.O. Box 5003  
N-1432 Ås  
Norway  
Tel.: +47 64 96 52 00  
Fax: +47 64 96 52 01  
Internet: <http://www.umb.no/noragric>

**Declaration**

I, Stian A. E. Eisenträger, declare that this thesis is a result of my research investigations and findings. Sources of information other than my own have been acknowledged and a reference list has been appended. This work has not been previously submitted to any other university for the award of any type of academic degree.

Signature.....

Date.....



# Preface and Acknowledgments

Having grown up in Askim, only a couple of cannon shots away from the battlefield of Langnes, where the final great violent confrontation between Norwegian and Swedish troops took place on 9<sup>th</sup> August, 1814, I have been aware of this history for a long time. However, my real interest in this was awakened when a group of military history enthusiasts re-enacted the dramatic events of 1814 in August 2002. I covered the re-enactment for the local newspaper, Smaalenenes Avis, and earned my very first front page. Ten years later, I coincidentally came across the 1814 volume of *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* and discovered that the battle of Langnes, among other events in Norway, was reported there. Through some further initial research, I found that the political events of 1814 in Norway had also been reported by a number of other non-Scandinavian newspapers. This would represent the beginning of an exciting research project that has now materialized in the form of this thesis.

Several people, both within and outside the University, have been slightly surprised by my choice of topic for my master's thesis, and have asked with a somewhat sceptical undertone how on earth the study of old, foreign newspapers and the Norwegian independence struggle of 1814 could ever be of relevance for a student at UMB. To these people I have emphasized that firstly, this topic clearly belongs to the study of International Relations; secondly, the methods I have used and the research skills I have acquired through my work on the thesis are universally applicable, independent of time and space. Furthermore, Ås and the UMB campus are more central in the history of the Norwegian independence struggle and the constitution of 1814 than many realise. One of the men who have been dubbed a "constitutional father" of Norway, the jurist Christian Magnus Falsen, was district recorder of Follo in 1814 and resided at the Vollebekk estate in Ås. There he drafted parts of the Norwegian constitution of 1814, which would become widely cited and disseminated in several of the newspapers I have examined for this thesis. His estate was later acquired in order to form the campus for Norway's second institution of higher education in 1859, the Norwegian Agricultural College, which would become the Norwegian University of Life Sciences in 2005.

This thesis is the work that marks the end of my two years at the joint International Relations programme at UMB and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI). I am immensely grateful to a number of people who have helped and inspired me during this

time. First I would like to thank Dr. Halvard Leira, senior researcher at NUPI and my supervisor, for his guidance. Dr. Benjamin de Carvalho at NUPI and professor Rune Ottosen at Oslo University College both encouraged me to embark on this project in the first place and I have not regretted it. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Noragric for allocating me a research grant, as well as the Norwegian Association of Media History for the bestowal of their Master Scholarship 2012.

I am very thankful to Dr. Art. Ruth Hemstad at the National Library for showing an interest in my research and sharing thoughts and material with me. I must also thank professor Ola Mestad at the University of Oslo for inviting me to give a lecture about my project at the Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and letters in March 2013. Another big thank you to all the participants at the seminar for giving valuable feedback and asking thought-provoking questions. Liv Ellingsen, librarian at the Noragric library, has been an invaluable resource during my whole period at UMB, and over the past six months in particular. Thank you for handling my countless orders and queries for the most obscure publications for use in my term papers and this thesis. The librarians at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin also deserve thanks for helping me during my research stay in October 2012. Thank you Stephanie Paersch for helping me translate the strangest 19<sup>th</sup> century German expressions, and thank you Maisie Greenwood for helping me translate several texts from *Le Spectateur*. Any mistakes and deficiencies in this thesis are of course my own, sole responsibility. An irreplaceable resource person during my whole time at UMB has been study coordinator Ingunn Bohmann. She has always been ready to assist and guide her students through the necessary, though sometimes intricate, university bureaucracy, and I owe her a big thank you. I would also like to thank my employer Verdens Gang (VG) for granting me a two-year leave of absence from my position, and thereby making it possible in practical terms for me to pursue my goal of obtaining a master's degree in International Relations.

My dear Lena has, as always, been an understanding and supportive companion. I am also tremendously grateful to my parents for their support through all the years of my education. This thesis is dedicated to them and my grandparents.

# Abstract

The French Revolution, with its alternative legitimating principle of popular sovereignty, challenged and undermined the European old regime's foundation of dynastic-absolutist divine legitimacy. The constitutional fathers of Norway were inspired by the republican revolutions in France and America, and when the country was ceded from Denmark to Sweden according to the Treaty of Kiel in January 1814, they sought to secure Norway's independence through applying popular sovereignty as a legitimating principle.

This qualitative study seeks to contribute to new insights in and understanding of how the dramatic political events of 1814 in Norway were perceived outside Scandinavia by examining historical newspapers from England, France, Prussia, Austria Russia, Saxony, Bavaria and Switzerland.

Using discourse analytical tools this study attempts to shed light upon how the question of Norwegian sovereignty were perceived in 1814, whether Norwegian independence was conceptually possible in the eyes of people outside Scandinavia, and what the thinking about the possibility of a new independent state in 1814 looked like.

The study establishes that there are two distinctly different discursive representations, or perceptions of reality, when it comes to the question of Norwegian independence in 1814: *The Popular Sovereignty Representation* and *The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation*. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that there is a palette of different varieties within these two main representations.



# List of Abbreviations

AAZ	Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung
DB	Deutsche Blätter
ERZ	Erlanger Real-Zeitung
GDL	Gazette de Lausanne
HUC	Staats- und Gelehrte Zeitung des Hamburgischer Unparteyischen Correspondenten
JDB	Journal des Débats
JDE	Journal de l'Empire
LCI	Le Conservateur Impartial
OCR	Optical Character Recognition
OEB	Oesterreichischer Beobachter
RM	Rheinischer Merkur
WZ	Wiener Zeitung

# Table of contents

Preface and Acknowledgments .....	V
Abstract.....	VII
List of Abbreviations .....	VIII
Table of contents.....	IX
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Objectives and motivation for choice of topic.....	3
1.3 Research questions.....	3
1.4 Thesis structure .....	4
2. Methodology .....	5
2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 Research design .....	5
2.3 Methods for data collection .....	6
2.4 Selection criteria.....	7
2.5 Reflections on limitations and weaknesses .....	8
2.6 Secondary literature .....	9
2.7 Insights from discourse analysis .....	9
3. History and theory .....	12
3.1 Introduction.....	12
3.2 Sovereignty: "Westphalia and All That" .....	13
3.3 The International Society.....	15
3.4 Legitimacy: "The Moral Purpose of the State" .....	16
3.5 The importance of ideas in systems change .....	18
3.6 Nationalism and a system of nation-states .....	20
3.7 The Historiography of Norway in 1814.....	23
3.7.1 Internal or external forces?.....	23
3.7.2 "The Freedom as a Gift" .....	24
3.7.3 A mixed perspective .....	25
3.7.4 Theoretical weapon against historical determinism .....	26
3.7.5 Development of national identities.....	27
3.7.6 A Reluctant Norwegian Peasantry .....	28
3.8 Media history .....	28
3.8.1 Development of a Public Sphere .....	29
3.8.2 Censorship, Propaganda, Press freedom.....	30
3.8.3 The importance of foreign news .....	32
3.8.4 How should we read the newspapers of 1814?.....	33
4. Analysis .....	35
4.1 The Popular Sovereignty Representation.....	35
4.1.1 The Examiner .....	35
4.1.1.1 Introduction.....	35
4.1.1.2 The Propaganda War .....	36
4.1.1.3 Fighting the <i>just</i> cause of National Liberty .....	38

4.1.1.4	The Parliamentary Debates and the Cattle Metaphor.....	38
4.1.1.5	National Liberalism and The Anti-Bernadotte Sentiment.....	41
4.1.1.6	Prince Christian Frederick: from Hero to Disappointment .....	43
4.1.1.7	Romanticising the Norwegian Peasantry .....	45
4.1.1.8	Looking towards the Congress.....	48
4.1.1.9	Conclusion.....	50
4.1.2	Rheinischer Merkur.....	51
4.1.2.1	Introduction.....	51
4.1.2.2	“Norway would never bloom more beautiful” .....	52
4.1.2.3	National enthusiasm.....	53
4.1.2.4	“Trading peoples as goods” .....	54
4.1.2.5	Christian Frederick “betraying the people” .....	56
4.1.2.6	Conclusion.....	56
4.1.3	Gazette de Lausanne.....	57
4.1.3.1	Introduction.....	57
4.1.3.2	“Norway continues its revolution” .....	58
4.1.3.3	“All eyes are now fixed on the diet of Christiania” .....	59
4.1.3.4	Speculations on alliances and redistribution of territory .....	60
4.1.3.5	“Prince Christian sacrificed himself for the sake of Norway” .....	61
4.1.3.6	Conclusion.....	62
4.1.4	Journal des débats and Journal de l’Empire .....	63
4.1.4.1	Introduction.....	63
4.1.4.2	Norwegian independence for the greater good of Scandinavia.....	64
4.1.4.3	Drawing a romantic picture of Norway and its people.....	65
4.1.5	Le Spectateur .....	67
4.1.5.1	Introduction.....	67
4.1.5.2	“A counterweight to the English dominance of the sea” .....	67
4.1.5.3	Norwegian independence “in the hearts of all Scandinavians” .....	69
4.1.5.4	Christian Frederick as the “Constitutional Father” .....	71
4.1.5.5	The balance of Power .....	72
4.1.5.6	Conclusion.....	73
4.2	The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation.....	74
4.2.1	Deutsche Blätter.....	74
4.2.1.1	Introduction.....	74
4.2.1.2	Norway must “submit to the Rights of the Victor” .....	75
4.2.1.3	A Natural bond tying Norway and Sweden together.....	76
4.2.1.4	The fear of continued war in Europe.....	77
4.2.1.5	Conclusion.....	78
4.2.2	Erlanger Real-Zeitung.....	79
4.2.2.1	Introduction.....	79
4.2.2.2	“After long years of war and suffering, peace must finally return” .....	79
4.2.2.3	“The Scandinavian Peninsula now belongs to one master” .....	80
4.2.2.4	Conclusion.....	82
4.2.3	Le Conservateur Impartial.....	82
4.2.3.1	Introduction.....	82
4.2.3.2	Pro-independence arguments censored.....	83
4.2.3.3	Conclusion.....	85
4.2.4	Wiener Zeitung and Oesterreichischer Beobachter .....	86
4.2.4.1	Introduction.....	86

4.2.4.2 A tight censorship regime.....	87
4.2.4.3 Norway – a sensitive subject.....	88
4.2.4.4 “This affair is currently too delicate to be commented upon” .....	89
4.2.4.5 “Norway’s destiny has been decided upon” .....	91
4.2.4.6 Conclusion.....	93
4.3 The “Impartial” Enlightenment Newspapers .....	94
4.3.1 Hamburgischen Unparteyischen Correspondenten .....	94
4.3.1.1 Introduction.....	94
4.3.1.2 War-fatigued and wishing for peace?.....	96
4.3.1.3 The diet and the constitution.....	98
4.3.1.4 Swedish propaganda .....	99
4.3.1.5 Massive coverage in an unclear situation.....	101
4.3.1.6 “Peace and security for the Scandinavian peninsula” .....	104
4.3.1.7 “Do you want to oppose the general desire on your own?” .....	106
4.3.1.8 The outbreak of war in the North .....	107
4.3.1.9 Armistice and union.....	109
4.3.1.10 Conclusion .....	112
5. Conclusion.....	113
5.1 Findings.....	113
5.2 Suggestions for further research.....	116
List of references.....	117
Newspapers.....	117
Literature .....	118

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction

1814 was a momentous year in the history of Norway. The events of this year are probably the most covered topic in Norwegian history. Nevertheless, an aspect that there has been carried out very little research on, is the coverage of these events in foreign newspapers. It is a shortage in Norwegian historiography, because the newspapers of 1814 can tell a great deal about how the thinking about the question of Norwegian independence looked like outside Scandinavia at that time. This is something I want to change through this thesis, in which I have examined eleven newspapers published in eight European states. I have studied how the contemporary press outside Scandinavia reported on the political events in Norway in 1814 and the country's transformation from an integrated part of The Danish Empire to an independent state. Furthermore, the study ascertains that Denmark-Norway was one of the many dynastic empires of the time and that the events of 1814 were an expression of the fragmentation of this empire.

Denmark-Norway was involved in the Napoleonic War on the French side, which would turn out to be the losing one. On January 7, 1814, king Frederick VI of Denmark – about to be overrun by Swedish, Russian and German troops under the command of the elected Crown Prince Charles John of Sweden, the earlier French marshal Jean Baptiste Bernadotte – agreed to cede Norway in order to avoid occupation of Jutland. On January 14, the agreement was formalized with the signing of the Treaty of Kiel. However, there was a growing opposition against the treaty and the Danish governor in Norway, Prince Christian Frederick, took the lead of the insurrection. At the constitutional convention at Eidsvoll in May, Norway was declared an independent kingdom. The new state was seeking international recognition, first and foremost from the United Kingdom, but it was all in vain. By the end of July, Sweden began a military campaign against Norway, in order to force the self-declared independent state to surrender and let itself being ceded to Sweden according to the Treaty of Kiel. After a short war, peace was restored with the Treaty of Moss on August 14. By the end

of the year, the Norwegian parliament agreed to join a personal union with Sweden under the Swedish king.

A widespread view among Norwegians is that the Norwegian proclamation of independence in 1814, albeit a very short independence, and the creation of a moderate revolutionary constitution, were something unique. However, in the history of ideas, the Norwegian constitution was not so special. It was one of many constitutions that appeared in the period that was introduced with the American Declaration of Independence in 1776, via the French Revolution in 1789, and which ended with the Congress of Vienna and the victory of reaction in 1815. Politically, the Norwegian constitution of 1814 was a break with the absolutist state, where the king had the divine authority to decide any question. The new constitution was strongly characterized by the sovereignty of the people. Firstly, it prescribes that Norway “is a free, independent and indivisible kingdom” – thus Norway is sovereign. Secondly, the constitution can be changed only by the resolution of the parliament. With the changes made during the fall of 1814, caused by the forced union with Sweden, the Norwegian constitution remained unchanged during the 19<sup>th</sup> century – unlike many other constitutions.

The events in Norway in 1814 were unfolding in a time when there was an intense tug-of-war taking place in Europe between forces that championed the old regime of dynastic absolutist states, and forces fighting for the sovereignty of the people and national independence. The contemporary international society was based on a system of absolutist states and monarchical sovereignty in Europe. The French Revolution with its alternative legitimating principle of popular sovereignty undermined the European old regime’s foundation of dynastic legitimacy and threatened the kings of divine right, and inspired imitators all over the world. Additionally, the concept of national unity – and the idea of the national state – was in the mould.

This qualitative study will contribute to new insights in and understanding of how the events in Norway – and the possibility for a new, independent national state in the North – were thought about outside Scandinavia. Using discourse analytical tools I seek to explore how the question of national independence and popular sovereignty was perceived in 1814 through the coverage of the Norwegian affairs in the European press, and try to show how the contemporary state and state system was conceptualised. The study shows that there existed a palette of different views concerning the question of Norway as an independent state. I link

this up with English school theory regarding the discussion of the myth of the 1648 peace of Westphalia, the development of the sovereign state and the modern state system, and the importance of ideas in systems change.

My study will hopefully bring to attention and raise awareness about the great quantity of nearly unused sources concerning the Norwegian declaration of independence that is available. In addition to an extensive amount of newspapers from the year 1814, the study also builds on relevant literature.

## 1.2 Objectives and motivation for choice of topic

The objective is to improve the understanding of how contemporary European regarded the political events of 1814 in Norway, in addition to their background and outcome. The study will explore how sovereignty and national independence – and more specifically Norwegian sovereignty and national independence – were perceived in European countries that had a larger distance from and fewer emotional connections to the political events in Scandinavia than the Scandinavian countries themselves. In 1814 newspapers, in contrast to books, reached a relatively wide audience throughout Europe. Therefore, the views and ideas expressed in a newspaper had a greater potential of influencing “the masses” than a book. Furthermore, there has been very little research on the non-Scandinavian newspapers’ coverage of the events of 1814 in Norway. The “propaganda war” concerning the issue of Norway has been discussed, but only rather scarcely (Hemstad 2012; Scott 1968). The most recent bibliography concerning Norway and 1814 barely mentions non-Scandinavian newspapers at all (Nilsen 1997: 219).

## 1.3 Research questions

The study will seek to answer the following research questions:

- How was Norway perceived in 1814? And more importantly: how was the question of Norwegian independence perceived?
- Was Norwegian independence conceptually possible in the eyes of people outside Scandinavia?
- What did the thinking about the possibility of a new state in 1814 look like?

## 1.4 Thesis structure

After this introductory chapter, I will present the methods I have used in the study, their strengths and weaknesses, and explain my choice of methods. The criteria for selecting the newspapers, and a short presentation of them, will also be introduced at this point.

In the third chapter I will continue with a discussion of theory and history, through which also the relevant political history will be analysed. The 1648 debate on the emergence of sovereign states and the anarchic states-system, international society, legitimacy principles and the importance of ideas in systems change, theories on nationalism and the debates concerning the events of 1814 in Norway are some of the aspects that will be covered in this part of the thesis. These aspects will help to shed light on and provide explanations to the research questions. Furthermore, I will give a brief overview of the European media landscape, the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere, and an introduction to the terms and conditions the men of the newspapers worked under in 1814. This is to give a better understanding of the universe in which the newspapers that will be examined later were created.

The fourth chapter contains the actual presentation, analysis and discussion of the newspapers – respectively from England, Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Austria, France, Switzerland and Russia – and their coverage of the political events in Scandinavia in 1814. This chapter is divided into three sub-chapters, one for each representation: The Popular Sovereignty Representation; The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation; and The “Impartial” Enlightenment Newspapers.

In the last chapter I will summarize the findings leading to the conclusions and the answers to the research questions. Additionally, I will offer suggestions for further research.



# 2. Methodology

## 2.1 Introduction

“When we study the history of journalism we are principally studying a way in which men in the past have grasped reality”, James Carey wrote in his 1974 *Journalism History* article *The Problem of Journalism History* (Zelizer 2008: 166). With this in mind, I have found it useful to apply discourse analytical tools to the material that I have examined in order to find answers to my research questions. Through the examination of the use of concepts such as state, nation, and sovereignty, I have explored the thinking around the possibility of a new, independent state, in addition to the thinking around legitimacy of authority, and thereby mapped the contesting representations of reality.

## 2.2 Research design

When discourse is the object of research, it can be useful to draw on insights from case study methodology, according to Neumann (2001: 56). This research is thus designed as a case study of the coverage of the Norwegian secession crisis of 1814 in newspapers outside Scandinavia, with the purpose of mapping the different discursive representations present in this coverage. Consequently, the study takes an inductive approach to the relationship between theory and research. This approach, also known as grounded theory, is described by Milliken as “a process of empirical study and abstraction which goes hand in hand, in the sense that theoretical categories are drawn from and answer to the empirical data upon which a study is based”. In other words, I will formulate theory from data by developing provisional categorizations via empirical study and abstraction.

The external validity, or generalizability, of qualitative case study research is low, meaning that it is not possible to generalize the results of this study beyond this specific research context. However, I would say that this is an exemplifying case, because “it exemplifies a broader category of which it is a member” (Bryman 2008: 56; also dubbed “representative” or “typical” case by Yin 2003). By this, I mean that what happened in Norway in 1814 is one example of several independence movements active in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The study explores how such a movement was represented in the contemporary newspapers.

It also has a high degree of replicability. Since all of the material studied is accessible to anyone, other researchers could conduct the study again to test or validate the results of this study (see also under 3.3).

## 2.3 Methods for data collection

Over the last decade, there has been growing interest in the digitization of historical source material. Not only public institutions such as national libraries and university libraries, but also commercial actors such as publishers and privately-owned newspapers have started digitizing their historical collections. Additionally, the Internet service company Google has established partnerships with libraries around the world and has digitized and made available vast numbers of historical books and newspapers.

For researchers this means that the collection of data has been made easier, less costly and less time consuming. It is no longer necessary to wait weeks or months for rolls of microfilms to arrive at your local library by post, nor is it necessary to make expensive trips to foreign libraries. A master's thesis such as this one, which is based on a large body of historical sources from several countries, would have been a lot more difficult and expensive, perhaps even impossible, to realize just a few years ago. The improved availability of historical sources through the Internet has not only led to a general democratization of research, but it also enables researchers to carry out research projects that would probably have been nearly impossible in earlier times because they would have been too resource-intensive and time-consuming.

The historical newspapers from 1814, from which I have collected my data, were sourced through a number of digital databases including: the British Library; the Berlin State Library; the digital library of the Bavarian State Library; Gallica, the digital library of the National Library of France; the digital archives of the Austrian National Library; the digital archives of Les Temps; the digital collections of the Heinrich Heine University in Düsseldorf; and Google Books and Google Newspapers.

All of these digital archives allow their users to download the scanned historical newspapers as PDF files, which can be stored locally on a personal computer. Many of the scanned newspapers have been converted into machine-encoded text with optical character recognition (OCR) technology. Although the OCR software has improved significantly over

the past few years and it is now possible to search for keywords in the scanned newspapers, the results delivered are not yet perfect. In my project, I have used the search function to conduct an initial survey of the prevalence of texts mentioning Norway. In addition, I have manually examined every page of the newspaper titles so as not to risk overlooking important texts concerning Norway.

## 2.4 Selection criteria

When doing research on discourses, the ideal situation is to read as many texts as possible in as many different genres as possible. Foucault even insisted that one should “read everything, study everything”. But as Neumann wisely remarks, that is not possible. “Therefore”, he writes, “one must at some point be able to say with good conscience that one has read enough, even though one has not read everything.” (Neumann 2001, 55). Milliken proposes a solution to the problem of when to stop analysing texts by adopting a grounded theory approach: “An analysis can be said to be complete (validated) when upon adding new texts and comparing their object spaces, the researcher finds consistently that the theoretical categories she has generated work for those texts” (Milliken 1999: 234). Although I will strive to apply this method in the study, I have found it necessary to select which texts to include. The following explains how I went about this.

I have chosen to study a selection of non-Scandinavian newspapers from the year 1814, examining editions published throughout the whole year. The political events that are of interest for this thesis are the Danish defeat in 1813, the secession of Norway in early 1814, the formation of a Norwegian national assembly and the proclamation of Norwegian independence in May 1814, the Swedish-Norwegian war and the negotiations in the aftermath of the war. As postal services were slow in 1814, there was always a certain delay between when the actual event took place, and when it was reported in the newspaper. Therefore, it was natural to limit the selection of material to the year 1814.

The newspapers have been selected on the criteria of relevance, contemporary importance and availability. Of course, not all newspapers of 1814 are relevant to this study. Some newspapers only published news on local events and personalia. Some newspapers exclusively published items such as official announcements and decrees, new laws and summons to military service. I have chosen newspapers that report on foreign affairs.

Furthermore, I have tried to select newspapers that were significant in some way, for example because of their size or their independent reporting.

## 2.5 Reflections on limitations and weaknesses

At the end of the day, the selection of newspapers was also affected by the question of their availability. With limitations regarding time and resources, I have had to limit the sample to newspapers from 1814 that were relatively easy to get my hands on through online databases and in the Berlin State Library. I have also had to limit the sample to newspapers published in languages that I can read and understand.

That said, I must emphasize that my mother tongue is Norwegian and I have professional working proficiency in both English and German, but I would describe my proficiency in French as elementary. As a consequence, the examination of the French language newspaper took somewhat longer, as it was necessary to use the dictionary to a larger extent than with the English and German language newspapers. I also had to consult a language specialist in order to fully understand one of the French newspapers. The examination of the German language newspapers also consumed more time than expected because they were printed with Gothic letters, which were hard to read at first.

It is also worth taking into consideration that all of the languages mentioned have developed significantly since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Several times, I have stumbled upon words and sentences that, at first, made very little sense to me. However, after having consulted the dictionaries, and in special cases persons with better knowledge in the languages than myself, I have been able to understand the meaning of all the texts that I wanted to include in the study. I must mention that there is of course a risk of misinterpretation, although I consider this risk to be a minor one.

Given that this study covers only a selection of European newspapers and only one case, it is not possible to generalize the results. Furthermore, my study does not include other kinds of publications, such as academic journals, pamphlets or books. Neither does my study examine genres that were meaningful in the public sphere and important in the formation of opinion, such as poetry, songs and plays. However, the findings in my study give an indication of how issues regarding state, sovereignty, legitimacy and Norwegian secession were perceived outside Scandinavia in 1814.

I find it necessary to emphasize that the reporting on the affairs of Norway was not the main concern for the newspapers that I have examined in this study. I mention this because the study, which focuses on the representation of these Norwegian affairs, could easily give the impression that this was a top priority in Europe's newspapers and government offices. That was, however, not the case. Nevertheless, I would say that what was going on in this "remote corner of Europe" received a significant amount of attention during the year 1814 in terms of both space and positioning in the newspapers.

If I were to conduct a similar examination of press coverage of a more recent event, it would have been natural to use interviews as an additional method. Obviously, it is impossible to conduct interviews with editors and correspondents who worked in 1814. It has therefore been necessary to bring in relevant background information from secondary literature in order to contextualize the world in which these editors and their newspapers operated.

## **2.6 Secondary literature**

This thesis builds upon a large body of secondary literature concerning themes such as Norwegian and Scandinavian history, general media history (both national and international) and international relations, in addition to biographies and other works of reference.

There is a lack of literature dealing with how the events of 1814 in Norway were covered in the contemporary media, both in Norway and internationally (some of the few examples are Ellingsrud 2011 and; Leiren 1975). Additionally, there is a very limited amount of literature concerning contemporary international thinking (outside Scandinavia) on the Norwegian struggle for independence in 1814, including research that puts the Norwegian case in context with similar contemporary cases. At the time of writing there is an on-going research project carried out by Ruth Hemstad, studying the propaganda war in 1814, which together with this study will contribute to fill some of the gaps in the literature (one of the outcomes of the project is so far Hemstad 2012).

## **2.7 Insights from discourse analysis**

I will use elements of discourse analysis to explore whether Norwegian independence was conceptually possible in 1814. Discourse analysis is a non-intrusive research method, where existing material - in this case, newspapers - are studied. The purpose of discourse analysis is

to analyse the linguistic and material content of a discourse, by studying and analysing the linguistic content of texts. In this frame of reference, the word *text* is understood in a broad sense, i.e. social processes could also be construed as text. Of course, this does not mean that everything *is* text, but that everything can be read *as* text. Because language is situated between man and the world, nothing can *be* independently from text (Neumann 2001: 23). Bryman's textbook *Social Research Methods* (2008: 500) categorizes discourse analysis as *anti-realist*. However, like Neumann, I find it more satisfactory to adopt a stance that is closer to a realist position, such as Laclau & Mouffe (1985: 108; cited in Neumann 2001: 63):

“The fact that every object is constituted as an object of discourse has nothing to do with whether there is a world external to thought, or with the realism/idealism opposition. An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, in the sense that it occurs here and now, independently of my will. But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of ‘natural phenomena’ or ‘expressions of the wrath of God’ depends upon the structuring of a discursive field. What is denied is not that such objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute themselves as objects outside of any discursive condition of emergence.”

The basis for the study of the political and the social is, for the discourse analyst, that the world appears to us as in flux. Neumann underscores that it makes no sense to say that the world is like this or like that without specifying how it became like that, how this world is sustained, and how it is challenged by other possibilities. The discourse analyst is not primarily preoccupied with *the being*, but *the becoming*. Consequently, it is epistemological questions that are central to the analysis, while the ontological are pushed into the background (Neumann 2001: 29). What is written and what is read are acts – speech acts. In 1814, these acts could even result in e.g. imprisonment. These speech acts are my data of analysis, regardless of what status they have as “truth”.

As Neumann emphasizes, methods are often understood as a procedure for representing something given from an external point of view. Discourse analysis do not see the possibility of finding such a standpoint outside of the social, from where the researcher can analyse something without being implicated himself. This description of methods is not just inappropriate with regards to discourse analysis, he states, it is generally inappropriate as well, because it is impossible to realize (Neumann 2001: 15). The researcher cannot be considered “objective”, and “objectivity” is not necessarily an ideal. It is, however, essential that the researcher understand that he is subjective by nature. In order to conduct a discourse

analysis, it is also necessary to have a good knowledge and understanding of the topic of analysis, before the analysis begins. I have therefore also decided to bring in contextual background information where I deem it necessary throughout this study.

A discourse analysis can be conducted in many different ways. One method, as suggested by Neumann (2001: 50-99), is to examine delimitation, representations, stratification and materiality. The general goal of reading texts is to find regularity in the perception of reality, and whether such regularities are connected with well-established lingual structures and how power relations are contributing to extend the patterns. It is important that all the steps should be based on the discourse, in other words that delimitation, representations, stratification and materialization should be discovered through the discourse, and that one should not presume to know what a discourse look like beforehand. Yet some features may be highlighted. Delimitation refers to how one discourse relates to other discourses with regard to time and space. By the representations of the discourse, we mean its different perceptions of reality, i.e. regularities in perceptions of reality. There is a perpetual battle between different discourses about how to define the categories and phenomena that constitute our world. This production of realities happens among other places in the newspapers, such as those that have been examined in this thesis. Stratification refers to how some parts of the discourse are more durable than others, and are thus more difficult to alter. The durable parts are usually an expression of an underlying consensus between the different representations. Finally, materialization has to do with the power that permeates the discourse, how it is sustained and what social practices and institutions reproduce the discourse.

Although what happened in Norway was covered in many European newspapers, it is important to underline that we cannot talk about a broad “Norway discourse” in Europe in 1814. However, I have treated the coverage of the Norwegian affair as a discourse and applied instruments from discourse analysis in order to build up a general picture of the thinking around a new, independent Norwegian state.

# 3. History and theory

## 3.1 Introduction

This thesis is based on a significant quantity of empirical material, and is subsequently empirical in its character. Although I will utilize discourse analytical tools in the analysis and set out new theoretical categories from the empirical material, I will draw on theoretical insights from the English School. This is a historical and institutional approach to the study of International Relations, which claims that ideas, rather than only material capabilities, shape the conduct of international politics. We could say that the English School is a middle way between realism and liberalism (Dunne 2010: 142). As this study will show, the importance of ideas was recognized by the governments in 1814 through the simple fact that they sought to control the dissemination of them. The control practices include propaganda, censorship and privileges. As mentioned earlier (chapter 2) the dissemination of ideas are speech acts, which at the time could have material consequences, such as imprisonment.

The French Revolution, with its alternative legitimating principle of popular sovereignty, undermined the European old regime's foundation of dynastic legitimacy. The constitutional fathers in Norway were inspired by the republican revolutions in France and America, and when Norway was ceded from Denmark to Sweden with the Treaty of Kiel in January 1814, they sought to secure Norway's independence through applying popular sovereignty as a legitimating principle. As we will see through the study of the contemporary press, this was perceived and represented as a challenge to dynastic legitimacy and absolutist regimes – and as a threat to the order of the international society. In France, as Bukovansky (Bukovansky 1999: 200) points out, “revolutionary ideas had strengthened the state by facilitating a new level of social mobilization for warfare.” Clearly, through parts of the press coverage, it seems to have been expected that the same level of mobilization would also take place in Norway.

In the following discussion, I will present some of the theoretical insights and presumptions from English School thinkers that make up the foundation of my analysis. First, I will present the emergence of the sovereign states-system and the international society, legitimacy, nationalism and the importance of ideas in systems change, before



continuing with a review of the historiography of 1814 in Norway and concluding with contextualization through media history.

## 3.2 Sovereignty: "Westphalia and All That"

My point of departure and foundational claim is that the sovereign state as we know it today - the primary subject matter of International Relations and fundamental unit of analysis - is too often taken for granted. In early modern Europe, the political system consisted of dynastic agglomerations rather than sovereign-territorial states. The politics of the early modern era also lacked a very important feature of contemporary politics: nationalism (Nexon 2009: 94). In 1948, the influential international law professor Leo Gross published an article in relation to the tercentenary of the Peace of Westphalia in which he emphasized how important a turning point in the development of the organization of Europe that 1648 represents. He wrote, "the Peace of Westphalia, for better or worse, marks the end of an epoch and the opening of another. It represents the majestic portal which leads from the old into the new world" (Gross 1948: 28). Historical and historiographical scholarship over the past two decades has made great efforts to demolish the myth of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 (some of the myth-busters include: Beaulac 2004; Krasner 1995; Osiander 2001; Teschke 2003). However, the small towns of Münster and Osnabrück are still "presented as the place where the big modern idea of the sovereign state and the anarchic states-system exploded into being and where the life of empires and other hierarchical political formations ended" (de Carvalho et al. 2011: 736).

The scope of this thesis does not include tracing the origin of state sovereignty. It is necessary to point out, however, that the idea of rulers having final authority over their territory had already been established a century earlier (with the Peace of Augsburg in 1555) and the treaties of 1648 in fact limited this idea, representing a step backwards. As Tilly and others argue the European state development has not been a unilinear process (1992). Although it could be claimed that the treaties of Westphalia advanced the states' right to have their own foreign policy and form alliances, this only applied to the polities of the Holy Roman Empire, not the whole of Europe, and was not a new idea (de Carvalho et al. 2011: 740; Krasner 1995: 141). Furthermore, the principle that princes should not intervene in the

domestic affairs of other states was not developed as an explicit principle until the 1760s, by the Swiss international jurist Emmerich de Vattel and Christian Wolff (Krasner 2001: 20).

The year 1648 played a certain role in the creation of a European sovereign-territorial states-system, however it was not “a ‘watershed’ or ‘revolutionary’ moment in this process” (Nexon 2009: 265).

The assumption that a system of modern sovereign states emerged in a “big bang” at Westphalia conceals the fact that there was a proliferation of international imperial-hierarchies in the era following 1648. These were made up of single sovereign imperial powers, standing on top of a conglomerate of dependent non-sovereign polities – such as for example the Danish Empire, for example (Østergård 2002). What is often forgotten, or ignored, is exactly this: that Denmark was a heterogeneous composite state – an empire consisting of territorial units on four continents – with Copenhagen as its centre (Bregnsbo & Jensen 2004). Glenthøj (2010) emphasizes that the increased centralization of power in the Danish state – or more correctly the Danish states, as the state formation was referred to at the time – and Copenhagen’s strengthened position, must not be interpreted along national lines: The city was not the capital of Denmark, but the capital of the Danish-Norwegian-German conglomerate state.

This type of dynastic-absolutist states dominated the European states-system in the post-1648 era. Dynastic sovereignty, however, has little in common with modern, popular sovereignty. The dynastic conglomerate state had centralized, yet personal power. In other words, “sovereignty was personalized in the monarch who regarded and treated the state as the private patrimonial property of the reigning dynasty” (Brown et al. 2004: 52). Although they dominated, we must not forget that very different types of states co-existed with the dynastic-absolutist state in the European states-system in the 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries: The Holy Roman Empire maintained its status as a confederal elective monarchy until 1806; The Dutch General Estates established an independent oligarchic merchant republic; Poland was a “crowned aristocratic republic”; Switzerland a free confederation of cantons; and finally, England turned into a parliamentary and constitutional monarchy, which would be an important model for the future system (Brown et al. 2004: 51-52). Interestingly enough, England was the one major state that was not represented at Westphalia. “And yet it was Hobbes’s England, not Bodin’s France, which was to go on to play the leading role in extending the sovereign form of rule beyond Europe and defining the institutional form of the

global states-system of today” (Rosenberg 1994: 138). Benjamin de Carvalho et al. argue that the emergence of sovereignty and the anarchic territorial-sovereign states-system was the result of a long, gradual process rather than a clear-cut break with the feudal system in 1648, and that the sovereign state did not become the generic political unit until well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century (de Carvalho et al. 2011: 740-741). Moreover, as Spruyt importantly points out, there was nothing inevitable about the rise of the states-system, nor about the fact that the sovereign nation-state was to become the successor to the feudal system (Spruyt 1996).

### 3.3 The International Society

The English School operates with the three categories *system*, *international society* and *world society*, where most emphasis is often put on international society. It begins with the realist assumption that an international system is formed when two or more states have a certain degree of interaction (Bull 1977: 9). According to Hedley Bull’s definition, international society is formed when “a group of states, conscious of certain interests and common values, forms a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions” (Bull 1977: 13). International law, especially the mutual recognition of sovereignty by states, is one of these institutions (as are war, the balance of power and the great powers). The act of mutual recognition is the indicator of the presence of a social practice, and is the first, fundamental step in the construction of an international society (Dunne 2010: 143). When Norway proclaimed itself an independent state in 1814, founded on the ideas of the sovereignty of the people, there was clearly interaction between Norway and other European states, meaning that Norway was a part of the states-system. However, as a consequence of the cession of Norway to Sweden following the Treaty of Kiel, neither the principle of the sovereignty of the people nor Norway’s independence were recognized, Norway was thus excluded from being part of the international society until it was forcefully unified with Sweden.

Why was this the case? According to the English School’s explanation, it was to sustain international order. Without order, the system’s stability would be thrown into doubt, and consequently so would the survival of the units (the states). The first goal is to preserve the system and the society of states in themselves. The second goal is to sustain independence

or external sovereignty for individual states. As Bull argued, however, “international society has often allowed the independence of individual states to be extinguished, as in the great process of partition and absorption of small powers by greater ones, in the name of principles such as ‘compensation’ and the ‘balance of power.’” This led to a steady decline in the number of states in Europe from the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 until the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The third goal is one of peace, although this is not meant as a universal or permanent peace, but as the absence of war. Fourth, according to Bull, are “the elementary goals of all social life”, namely “the limitation of violence resulting in death or bodily harm, the keeping of promises and the stabilisation of possession by rules of property” (Bull 1977: 16-18).

### 3.4 Legitimacy: “The Moral Purpose of the State”

Although the practice of sovereignty never fits into the pure principle of a state having absolute authority within its borders and the absence of a higher authority on the outside, sovereignty remains a powerful theoretical assumption. Hedley Bull wrote that, “The starting point of international relations is the existence of states, or independent political communities, each of which possesses a government and asserts sovereignty in relation to a particular portion of the earth’s surface and a particular segment of human population” (Bull 1977: 8). Constructivist scholars, such as Janice Thomson (1994: 13, 151) on the other hand, argue that sovereignty “is a variable, social, and practically constituted regime” and that “while sovereignty differs from heteronomy in theoretical and empirical ways, there can be much variation in the authority claims within sovereignty.” (cited in Reus-Smit 1999: 32, 158)

As the scholars mentioned earlier, Christian Reus-Smit argues that, “a system of sovereign states certainly emerged around the time of Westphalia”. He emphasizes, however, that, “it was a system based on decidedly premodern principles of political legitimacy, principles alien to the modern mind, not familiar.” (Reus-Smit 1999: 120-121). He assigns sovereignty a secondary, dependent value – and emphasizes that sovereignty is “an organizing principle, no more or no less:”

“It is a principle that specifies *how* power and authority will be organized, a principle that mandates territorially demarcated, autonomous centres of political authority. There is nothing in the principle of sovereignty, though, that specifies *why* power and authority should be organized in such a fashion; the only way to justify this form of political organization is by appealing to a set of higher-order values that sovereign

states are thought to realize. In other words, the legitimacy of the state rests on values other than the principle of sovereignty.”

Reus-Smit employs the concept of the *moral purpose of the state* to conceptualize these justificatory values, suggesting that different hegemonic ideas about the moral purpose of the state have given sovereignty different meanings in different historical contexts (Reus-Smit 1999: 159). The complexes of values that define state identity which he conceptualizes as “constitutional structures”, are:

“coherent ensembles of intersubjective beliefs, principles and norms that perform two functions in ordering international societies: they define what constitutes a legitimate actor entitled to all the rights and privileges of statehood: and they define the basic parameters of rightful state action” (Reus-Smit 1999: 30).

During the so-called Revolutionary Era a gradual shift starts to take place, from the constitutional structures of the absolutist states to those of the modern state. Of course, this could never be conflict-free, and as Habermas puts it, “If, in a worst-case situation, actors disagree about what constitutes a legitimate social agent, then society itself is threatened.” (Habermas 1979: 3-4, cited in; Reus-Smit 1999: 28).

**Table 1 - Constitutional Structures and the Fundamental Institutions of International Societies (extracted from Reus-Smit 1999, 8)**

<i>Societies of States</i>	<i>Absolutist Europe</i>	<i>Modern Society of States</i>
Constitutional Structures		
1. Moral Purpose of State	Maintenance of Divinely Ordained Social Order	Augmentation of Individuals’ Purposes and Potentialities
2. Organizing Principle of Sovereignty	Dynastic Sovereignty	Liberal Sovereignty
3. Systemic Norm of Procedural Justice	Authoritative Justice	Legislative Justice
Fundamental Institutions	1. Natural International Law 2. “Old Diplomacy”	1. Contractual International Law 2. Multilateralism

Reus-Smit draws up two types of systems change: *purposive change*, which involves a redefinition of the moral purpose of the state, leading to shifts in the meaning of sovereignty and procedural justice, is exemplified by the transition from the absolutist to the modern systems; *configurative change* involves not only a shift in the moral purpose that the system is build upon, but a change in the organizing principle that governs the distribution of authority. The shift from feudalism to absolutism was this type of change, according to Reus-Smit (Reus-Smit 1999: 164). It is such a purposive change that materializes itself with the Norwegian constitution of 1814.

### 3.5 The importance of ideas in systems change

Reus-Smit emphasizes that it is only when we recognize that ideas are more than just rationalizations that we can explain why one set of foundational institutional practices emerged in absolutist international society and not in any other: “Only by understanding that the ideology of divine-right absolutism contained its own institutional logic, can we explain why naturalist international law and old diplomacy reached high points at this time” (Reus-Smit 1999: 121). The importance of ideas does, of course, not exclude material factors from the explanation: it is important to keep the two together. In Marshall Sahlin’s words, it is rather that “material effects depend on their cultural encompassment” (Sahlin 1976: 194, cited in; Reus-Smit: 121).

The interplay of ideas and material factors is thus also important in the process of change from an absolutist to a modern states-system, and in relation to the eventual non-reestablishment of Norwegian independence in 1814. This happened not only because Norway did not have the material capabilities to sustain independence, but also because of the conflicting legitimating principles of the international system of absolutist states and that of a modern nation-state. Monarchical divine legitimacy clashed with that of popular sovereignty. It is worth to note that Prince Christian Frederick was a conservative ruler during his reign as King of Denmark from 1839 until his death in 1848 (no revolution overthrew him). It is questionable how liberal he actually was, and several historians have pointed to facts indicating that he was not that liberal after all. Nevertheless, in this study what matters is how he was perceived out there in Europe – in the newspapers. His ultimate goal was obviously to reunite Norway with Denmark in the end, rather than establishing an independent,

Norwegian nation-state. Nonetheless, any other solution to the issue than that which was decided through the Treaty of Kiel would, in the end, have been difficult to swallow for the allied powers.

The moral purpose of the absolutist state was namely the preservation of a divinely ordained, hierarchical social order. Law was defined as the command of a superior authority, as God had bestowed supreme authority upon the monarchs of Europe. Not only was sovereignty justified on this basis, it also shaped the basic institutional practices of absolutist international society, licensing the development of naturalist international law and old diplomacy over contractual law and multilateralism (Reus-Smit 1999: 120-121). Under the new rationale, political community would be reconceived in a fundamental way. In the United States Declaration of Independence of 1776, the state's new reason of being is expressed more clearly than anywhere else:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” (cited in Reus-Smit 1999: 128)

The French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen would promote the same principle of legitimate statehood 13 years later. Although the Norwegian constitution of 17<sup>th</sup> May 1814 did not express the new moral purpose of the state in the same explicit way, it did indeed include the principle of division of power and the people's representation in a parliament. Under the new rationale, the state was considered a creation of its human members, instead of being regarded a natural component of a divinely induced order. As Reus-Smit emphasizes, the state was the outcome of a social contract for some, the product of history, sentiment, and experience for others, “but in both cases the existence of the ‘people’ or the ‘nation’ was attributed to human, not divine, will”. This idea was crucially important in the new account of state authority, because it made the rule according to natural and divine law make less sense. “In the end, ‘God’s will’ and the ‘general will’ proved equally amorphous and manipulable sources of government policy, but this shift in the source of legitimate state authority had profound implications for notions of procedural justice and, in turn, the institutional structures of both national and international governance.” (Reus-Smit 1999: 127-129).

### 3.6 Nationalism and a system of nation-states

During the early modern era, the nation played a much lesser role as a subject for loyalty and identity than it does today. The Danish states were in theory ruled by a sovereign by the grace of God, and loyalty to the king was the most important collective identity. Glenthøj has documented that there existed collective Danish and Norwegian identities in the elites of the two countries, but it is problematic to talk about a national identity. Among the common men and women, loyalty to the king, regional identities and local affiliation played bigger roles as identity markers than fatherland and state (Glenthøj 2012: 61). To be able to identify with an abstract, imagined community demands for a higher educational and economical surplus, which was not present among the common people. At the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, he argues, Danes and Norwegians could at best be described as ethnic groups, cf Anthony D. Smith's definition "as: a named human community occupying a homeland, and having common myths and a shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members" (Smith 2001: 13). The emergence of nationalist trends did not start until halfway into the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when the transition between patriotism and nationalism in both Norway and Denmark was under way. To grasp some of the nuances and demonstrate the process that went on, Glenthøj (2010: 27) also suggests to employing Odd Arvid Storsveen's (1997) concept of *national patriotism*. With the establishment of a Norwegian sovereign nation-state in 1814, it is possible to talk about a Norwegian political nationalism. This is supported by Miroslav Hroch, who dated the beginning of his phase B, defined as, "an epoch characterized by active patriotic agitation: the fermentation-process of national consciousness" from 1814 (Hroch 1985: 23, 34). However, Glenthøj points out that when a national monarchy was established at Eidsvoll in 1814, it was the new king that was celebrated. The constitution and the parliament did not gain the most importance until the post-1814 era, during the union with Sweden.

Osiander points out that although nationalism was nothing new, it had never previously been associated with any political programme. The "flirtation between radical politics and nationalism" after 1789 posed a mortal threat to the old order (Osiander 1994: 184). Mlada Bukovansky (1999: 213) points out that the French revolution had altered "the traditional ideas of what the state was and was capable of," and consequently the idea of international politics as being "a state of nature" became more prominent. In terms of scope and destructiveness, the only comparable set of wars that occurred before the revolution, were



the post-Reformation wars of religion, whose “universalistic discourse” bears comparison, according to Bukovansky. She emphasizes that the revolution “accelerated the shift in the European system” and “laid the groundwork for a states-system made up of nation-states rather than dynastic states” as the dominant model of political order (Bukovansky 1999: 200-202). Furthermore, European statesmen had learned a lesson about how societies could be mobilized for war by “the mutation of the popular sovereignty principle into militarized nationalism” (Bukovansky 1999: 213). It is clear that what was going on in Norway in 1814 was perceived and interpreted as revolutionary and in nationalist terms by observers in Europe. I will show that several of the newspapers were referring to the events as a revolution, and that those newspapers that did not mention the “frightening” word were thinking along the same lines.

Meadwell (2001: 170-173) is another scholar who has theorised around the dynamics at play in the interaction of dynastic states in an interdependent social system when it is confronted with republican revolution. He assumes that there is a social system comprised of a number of political territorially organized communities, all of which are dynastic states, and that revolution breaks out in one of the communities. He argues that a revolution is local, but that it has universal implications. The goal of regime change is to transform the subjects of a monarch into citizens of a democratic republic. However, all the dynastic states are similar, organized around courts and the household economies of the ruling family. To cut a long argument short, Meadwell’s point is that the stability of local republicanism depended on system-wide change in the long run. Thus, “the interdependent choices that were generated within it spanned all of the social system and they were not identified simply with the territorial boundaries of particular communities.” The democratic republican moment of the French Revolution was not intrinsically French, he argues. Therefore, revolution threatened to overthrow princes wherever they were located. As a consequence, the princes would have to co-ordinate against revolution, because they were threatened in the same way. Subsequently, the aim of such a reactionary alliance “is not to eliminate or regulate war among princes but to eliminate revolution. (...) Peace is not incidental, but it is a by-product of the desire to avoid revolution.”

Osiander argues that the pre-revolutionary era had been stable not because there were dynasties, but because of the existence of, “a stable, hierarchical social order in which political authority presupposed high rank owed to birth.” The Congress of Vienna reaffirmed the

constitutional values of absolutist international society (Reus-Smit 1999: 123) and the principle of dynastic legitimacy was reformulated as the “monarchical principle”. Not because it contributed much to political stability, but because if the monarchism were to survive it had to be defended as such: an old, non-egalitarian order (Osiander 1994: 222). The essence of this “monarchical principle” was that “if kingship was in danger anywhere, all rulers had a duty to intervene to uphold it” (Osiander 1994: 221). This contributed to the non-establishment of earlier non-dynastic actors, according to Meadwell, who mentions Genoa, Venice and Poland in this context (2001: 171). I would also say that this contributed to the non-reestablishment of Norway as a sovereign state in 1814. By challenging the international order and the “code of conduct” for states, the Norwegian proclamation of independence was perceived as something revolutionary, something that threatened the established international society, even though Norway was being led by a Prince.

The revolutionary governments of France and the United States challenged the institutional practices of absolutist international society and called for a new diplomatic and legal order based on the principle of legislative justice. This principle would not start characterizing state practices until the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century, when a distinct modern international institutional architecture would begin to emerge gradually over time. During the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, the modern ideas of the moral purpose of the state only influenced the international order in a negative way: “they were reacted against, not acted upon” (Reus-Smit 1999: 133-134). The Congress of Vienna constructed a new international order that would shape relations between European states for years to come. Indeed, the importance of the principle of balance of power is highlighted in the record of these negotiations. The British foreign minister Lord Castlereagh and his Austrian counterpart, Prince Metternich, are usually credited for this new order. Reus-Smit calls attention to the fact that this only tells half of the story and that legitimacy is another important structuring principle that was at play here. He points out that Prince Talleyrand, the French representative, upheld the moral purpose of the absolutist state as the sole basis of legitimate political authority. Thereby he also rejected the ideas of democracy and nationalism that fuelled the French Revolution. This would ultimately define which political units would constitute legitimate states. “In a situation where old territorial boundaries had been obscured and overrun by years of warfare, and where a myriad of sovereign claims competed for recognition, the principles of legitimacy and equilibrium jointly structured the new international order.” (Reus-Smit 1999: 135). In other

words, was this an attempt at establishing a membership criterion in the states-system of Europe, and Norway's time had obviously not yet come.

## 3.7 The Historiography of Norway in 1814

The events of 1814 are one of the most debated topics in Norwegian historical research. Did Norway's independence come as a natural consequence of a growing sense of nationalism, or did it arrive as a "gift" from the outside? In the following, I will introduce the most important literature, traditions and schools of thought concerning the year 1814, supported by Odd Arvid Storsveen's historiography (2000). In later chapters, we will see how the European newspapers of 1814 newspapers reflect some of these understandings, interpretations and representations of the events that year.

### 3.7.1 Internal or external forces?

There are two main schools of thought about the events of 1814: The national democratic Left-tradition, which explains 1814 as a result of forces *inside* Norway; and the consensus-seeking Right-tradition, which sees 1814 as a consequence of forces at play *outside* Norway. This is part of the political and cultural struggle between the first two parties in Norway: Venstre (Left, the liberal party) and Høyre (Right, the conservative party). The founder of the former school was Henrik Wergeland, the son of a delegate to the constitutional assembly at Eidsvoll in the spring of 1814, Nicolai Wergeland. His main argument in *Norges Konstitutions Historie* (The History of Norway's Constitution) was that *Grunnloven* (the Constitution) must be regarded as a creation with deep roots in Norwegian history, not as a result of coincidences. He claimed that the Constitution originated from the Norwegian people, not merely from a handful of individuals, and additionally that there was a natural development towards national and political freedom through history. Wergeland's constitutional history built a foundation for much of the later research, and has been an important contributor to legends connected to the history of the Constitution (Storsveen 2000).

A more open political period was introduced when king Charles John died in 1844. The following year, Jacob Aall, a delegate to Eidsvoll just as Wergeland's father published his processed diary notes in a book named *Erindringer som Bidrag til Norges Historie 1800-1815*

(Memories as Contributions to Norway's History 1800-1815). Contrary to Henrik Wergeland, Aall was much more critical of the national motives and projects.

Along with Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, the historian Johan Ernst Sars participated in politics and was active in the Liberal Party (Venstre). Sars became one of the party's most central theorists and contributed to its presentation of 1814. This is visible in *Historisk Indledning til Grundloven* (A Historical Introduction to the Constitution), a pamphlet that was published before the election campaign in 1882. He claimed that an intellectual movement among the Norwegian people, which foreshadowed freedom and independence, had been taking place long before 1814. He referred in particular to the Norwegian farmers and their ancient freedom, arguing that this had contributed to raise the Norwegians' national sentiment and give them trust and belief in their people's future. Also in his principal work *Udsigt over den norske Historie* (Overview of the Norwegian history) he emphasizes the internal forces in Norway, and the fact that great ideas had been developed throughout history and culminated in the events of 1814. Nevertheless, he did also admit that external events, in which Norway did not participate, had been necessary in 1814 (Storsveen 2000).

Historian Yngvar Nielsen, a political conservative and supporter of the union with Sweden, was Sars' opposite in the debates over 1814 and the union. He was putting more emphasis on European power politics and their influence on events. Nielsen was also one of the first scholars to point out prince Christian Frederick's constructive role in 1814. Later historians such as Sverre Steen, Jens Arup Seip and Knut Mykland have adopted this point of view (Storsveen 2000).

### 3.7.2 “The Freedom as a Gift”

Between 1905 and 1945, the Liberal Party's interpretation of 1814 was established as the prevailing interpretation in the educational system, bureaucracy and media. The class conflicts between the labour movement and the bourgeoisie during this period raised awareness about the country's social problems, and the focus of historical research shifted from the great heroes and political elites to the people itself. Halvdan Koht was one of the leading historians in taking the research further in this direction. In the jubilee year of 1914 he published a book titled *1814 : norsk dagbok 100 aar efterpaa* (1814 : Norwegian diary 100 years afterwards). Through this, he presented a broader version of events than the drama including only the “bad guys” and the “good guys” of the elite, the dominant version until then. Sverre Steen

applied an even starker class perspective on the events of 1814. He stressed that the national assembly had been aristocratic and consisted of representatives of the society's upper class. We should therefore be careful about presenting the national assembly as an expression of the people's will, "if we do not then make the upper class the manager of the people's will", he argued. Another proponent of the explanation through internal forces was Arne Bergsgård. In his book *Året 1814* (The year 1814) from 1945, he concludes that the Norwegian uprising got its strength from "the Norwegian people itself, an ancient feeling of freedom, law-abidingness and sense of responsibility, the demand for justice and law". This national perspective was dominant in the educational system until the 1960s (Storsveen 2000).

Sverre Steen, who in his earlier scholarship had supported the understanding of 1814 that originated from the tradition of Sars and Koht, later changed his mind and turned to the tradition of Yngvar Nielsen and Jacob Aall. In 1951 he published the first book in a series of six volumes about the history of Norway from 1814 to 1840 named *Det frie Norge* (The liberated Norway). Here he presents the view that the Norwegian people had received their independence as "an unexpected gift". To a much larger extent than the Left tradition would admit, the events of 1814 were caused by coincidences, especially on the international arena, far outside Norway's borders. He took criticism on behalf of the whole profession of historians, and concluded that the issue of 1814 was complicated and that we would never know why the result turned out as it did. Jens Arup Seip supported Steen, and in 1952 he authored a review of Steen's book *1814*, published in the newspaper *Arbeiderbladet*. The review was titled *Friheten i gave* (The Freedom as a gift), and this expression has become synonymous with a distinct interpretation of 1814, although the expression has older origins and was already used by Sars. Seip argued that the historian's fate was both to create myths and to destroy them, and praised Steen for undermining the national myth of the struggle for independence. Strangely enough, Seip himself contributed to another historical myth, whereby what happened in 1814 is understood as a stroke of luck resulting from fortunate coincidences. The downplaying of the role of internal forces in 1814 became even clearer throughout the 1960s (Storsveen 2000).

### 3.7.3 A mixed perspective

Professor of history Knut Mykland continued the tradition of Steen and Seip. He was especially preoccupied with the relationship between Prince Christian Frederick and his

cousin King Frederick VI, and the importance of this for the Norwegian uprising in 1814. However, he also continued to focus on internal national and ideological prerequisites back to the 1780s. Mykland talks about a catalyst effect when Christian Frederick was following his own plans: up to a certain point it could be united with the Norwegians' wish for a constitution, but later on the actors became mutually dependent on each other and influenced each other to move in directions they had not predicted. Historian Kåre Lunden heavily criticized Mykland's mixed perspective. In 1984 he published an article in *Nytt norsk tidsskrift* (New Norwegian Journal) where he confronted the Steen and Seip tradition, and argued that it was necessary to return to the theories of Johan Ernst Sars. However, Lunden was challenged in 1987 by Øystein Sørensen, who claimed that the events of 1814 did not fit into Sars' historical scheme and concluded that the fundamental features of the 1814 theory of Steen and Seip were standing on solid ground. Lunden replied that Sars had managed to examine and analyse a broad range of causes and conditions. According to Lunden, the internal circumstances of Norway played the most important part. Odd Arvid Storsveen also discussed the internal preparations before 1814 in *Norsk patriotisme før 1814* (Norwegian Patriotism before 1814) in 1997 (Storsveen 1997; 2000).

### 3.7.4 Theoretical weapon against historical determinism

During the last few decades, international research on nations and nationalism has had a more constructivist perspective, whereby it is argued that identities and cultural differences are constituted in certain historical spaces and by certain actors. In the case of Norway and its national history, this development has led to a critical re-examination of the explanation models offered by Steen and Seip. According to the constructivist perspective, the Norwegian nation or state is neither a natural nor an unchangeable unit, but rather a community that is always constituted and re-created. Writing history is one way of doing this. According to Øystein Sørensen, the events of 1814 represented one of many nation-building projects introduced by national elites between 1770 and 1945. In 2004, Sørensen published the book *Historien om det som ikke skjedde. Kontrafaktisk historie* (The History of What Didn't Happen. A counterfactual History) (Sørensen 2004). He draws on a number of events from Norwegian and world history, including 1814, and discusses how things could have developed differently. Sørensen argues that counterfactual history can work as a tool in order to provide a perspective of what history really is: It makes clear that history is full of possibilities, most of

which were never realised. Firstly, counterfactual historiography is about explaining real alternatives and probable courses of events. The scenarios must satisfy certain demands in order to be considered as plausible intellectual experiments. Secondly, the alternatives must have large and far-reaching consequences. These are often set off by small, coincidental factors, while the consequences are seldom seen and apprehended by the actors in the historical event. In an interview in the Norwegian online science magazine *Forskning.no*, Sørensen argues that, “the history of humanity cannot be compared with a sharply drawn line, where everything has happened by necessity, where everything has been and is unambiguously determined by external immanent forces. Counterfactual history is above all a theoretical weapon against all forms of historical determinism” (*Forskning.no* 2004).

### 3.7.5 Development of national identities

Some of the most recent research includes the work of the Danish historian Rasmus Glenthøj. His doctoral dissertation *Fælles kultur – forskellige nationaliteter* (2010) (Common culture – different nationalities), which is also adapted into a book entitled, *Skilsmissen. Dansk og norsk identitet før og efter 1814* (2012) (The Divorce. Danish and Norwegian Identity before and after 1814), is the first work to have made a thorough evaluation of the importance of the separation of Norway and Denmark from a Danish point of view, even though the loss of Norway is the largest loss of both territory and population that the Danish state has ever experienced. He discusses the interaction between Danish and Norwegian identities in the period between 1807 and 1830 and its importance for the development of a national identity in the two countries. Glenthøj also contributes knowledge about how the Norwegian national identity was expressed and refutes some of the ideas in the Norwegian historiography. Among other things, he argues that 1814 cannot be seen as a question of either a break or continuity in Norwegian history, but as an expression of both. He rejects “the purely modernist interpretation of nationalism as exclusively connected with the demand for a national state, which makes the events of 1814 appear more detached from prior development than they necessarily are” (2010, 277). At the same time, he rejects the Left-tradition’s strong emphasis on continuity and the connection of the national identity to the farmers during this period. However, Glenthøj argues that Norway emerged as a nation in the modern sense of the word after 1814, but that this nation did not grow suddenly and without roots from of the heads of the elites after the separation from Denmark. He is of the same opinion as Odd Arvid

Storsveen, who argues that there already existed a Norwegian *national patriotism* before 1814, which was used to develop a real national identity (Storsveen 1997).

### 3.7.6 A Reluctant Norwegian Peasantry

A recent Swedish contribution is written by Martin Hårdstedt (2010). Although the book, *Omvälvningarnas tid: Norden och Europa under revolutions- och Napoleonskrigen* does not offer more than a short chapter on the Norwegian constitution and independence struggle in 1814, it does emphasize that a common representation in Norwegian historiography is exaggerated. He points out that the earlier historiography has put too much emphasis on a “hunger for independence” among Norwegian commoners and an alleged antipathy towards Denmark. “It was not like that,” he writes, it was first and foremost a number of influential men from the elite, together with Christian Frederick, who initiated the Norwegian rebellion (2010: 369). Hårdstedt also writes that the participation of volunteers in Norway in 1814 has been highly exaggerated. Christian Frederick did not want a popular rebellion such as that of Spain, he writes. The young king wanted total control over the army and was sceptical about the volunteers. Thus, Hårdstedt argues, there are similarities between the Norwegian uprising of 1814 and the state controlled mobilization in Prussia in 1813.

Morten Nordhagen Ottosen (2012) makes another recent contribution to research on the Norwegian independence in 1814. In his doctoral dissertation, *Popular Responses to Unpopular Wars: Resistance, Collaboration and Experiences in Norwegian Borderlands, 1807–1814*, he draws quite a similar picture as Hårdstedt of the situation at the time. While earlier historians have told the story of the freedom-seeking Norwegian farmers, the main message in Ottosen’s work is that the common farmers did not want Norwegian independence in 1814. This does not mean that these people were especially Swedish-friendly. In fact, it was quite the contrary. They simply wanted to be left alone and maintain the status.

## 3.8 Media history

One early consequence of the printing revolution was a consolidation of the wildly divergent dialects that would eventually merge to form modern English, German, French, and other languages. Along with the Bible, many other works were translated into native languages, leading to a standardized national language. The increased circulation of printed books in the



home language created a standard for writing and speaking a language that was, at the time, still highly unsettled. As a result, printing also "created a new instrument of political centralism [that was] previously unknown," according to Marshall McLuhan (1962). However, just as the printing revolution first enhanced and then challenged the central control of religion, printing also helped to expand challenges to established political thought. "Printing was an active force in history," said historian Robert Darnton, "when the struggle for power was a struggle for the mastery of public opinion (Darnton & Roce 1989).

### 3.8.1 Development of a Public Sphere

The influential book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* by the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas (1989 [1962]) has been used by many historians as a theoretical basis for their studies of political culture. Habermas argues that the development of a *public sphere* started in the early modern era and that this was partially brought on by merchants' need for information from distant markets. Furthermore, the emergence of the public sphere is linked to the growth of democracy, individual liberty and popular sovereignty and the emergence of a self-conscious bourgeoisie and a "reasoning public". This new public operated in the space between private individuals and government authorities - *the public sphere* - where people could meet and have critical debates on public matters. The exchange of information and ideas was made possible by factors such as a press and a reading public and a new institutional context for political action was created through these developments. It is important to keep in mind that "public opinion" did not include the whole population, and that the "public" was often juxtaposed against its other, the "mob" (Barker & Burrows 2002: 10).

The newspapers, which emerged in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, were to become the first real mass media. They differed from the older books through the speed of the reporting and the selection of contents based on the the criteria of being something new: the news. The first newspapers in the German-speaking countries appeared in in Strassburg and Wolfenbüttel. Relation was the first in 1609, and more weekly newspapers emerged during the following years in Berlin and Frankfurt am Main. The first daily newspaper *Einkommenden Zeitungen* appeared in 1650 in Leipzig. Most publications, however, retained the weekly rhythm for many years to come because postal delivery, and therefore the supply of news, generally occurred once a week (Böhn & Seidler 2008). Before a regular postal service was established

in Denmark, a letter sent between Copenhagen and Lübeck could take anything between ten days and four months. As late as the year 1800, it would take a week for a letter from Paris to arrive at the German border (Høyer 1995: 48). In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, newspapers gained more importance and readership. In 1700 about 70 newspapers with a circulation of 300-400 copies existed in Germany. A newspaper usually switched hands several times and reached a readership of about 200,000 to 250,000. A century later, there existed about 200 different newspapers, reaching a readership of about 3 million people.

Thus, newspapers and journals contributed to the constitution of a public sphere, which also led to the political self-understanding of the bourgeoisie. In the feudal society, people were born into a certain estate of the realm and could normally not influence or change their societal position. The new means of information and communication gave the bourgeoisie the opportunity to articulate a self-consciousness for the first time and motivated to political participation. The establishment of the newspaper as a new medium supported this, because it both satisfied the demand for information and served as a forum for the determination of the societal and political role of the bourgeoisie (Böhn & Seidler 2008). Benedict Anderson (2006) argues that the media are transmitters and creators of “imagined communities” – such as nations – in his influential work carrying the same name. Although many other forces combined to create the idea of the modern nation-state, printing was indeed an important factor in the process (Kovarik 2011: 26).

### **3.8.2 Censorship, Propaganda, Press freedom**

Many governments in the 18<sup>th</sup> century were quick to recognize the increasingly important role of public opinion in the affairs of the state and the growing degree to which the press was utilized as a political instrument. This caused state countermeasures and rigorous censorship systems were established by drawing upon early modern precedents to regulate the flow of ideas (Taylor 2003: 129). From the rulers’ point of view, the danger of displeasing information or unpleasant meanings being brought into circulation was far too great. The more current the publication was, the more extensive the censorship. Newspapers were more strictly censored than journals, which were in turn more censored than books. Generally, small publications up to a certain size were subjects to pre-censorship, while larger publications were submitted to the censor after being printed. The less page-rich publications were the most current and dangerous, while the economic risks for the publicist were far

higher with the larger publications, since the production costs were higher. This meant that publicists practised a certain degree of self-censorship in order to prevent a ban after printing and resulting economic damages. Besides the above-mentioned methods, other approaches to censorship included the licensing of print companies, taxation and stamps on regular publications, in addition to prosecution for sedition against the government or libel of individuals (Kovarik 2011). What we know today as Germany consisted in 1814 of a number of smaller states which all had a long history of press censorship. This was interrupted only by a brief period of liberalization during the Napoleonic period, when different regimes were practiced. For instance, the Prussian authorities tolerated liberal nationalist newspapers such as *Rheinischer Merkur*, if they opposed Napoleon (Green 2001; Kovarik 2011). In this study I will therefore look at newspapers from different German states in order to display the variety that existed.

Not only the stick, but also the carrot - such as giving privileges - was used as a state control instrument of public communication. This could materialize as sales monopoly for government-friendly or uncritical publications, or more direct rewards such as money or positions. We must remember that it was the exception rather than the rule that full-time editors edited the newspapers: in most cases editing a newspaper was combined with another job. Furthermore, propaganda - that is "a deliberate attempt to persuade people, by any available media, to think and then behave in a manner desired by the source" - was an important instrument used by sovereigns to shape attitudes and knowledge, and disseminate their views and representations of the world (Starr 2004: 70; Taylor 2003: 7).

We can say that press freedom, as we understand it today, first emerged in England through the expiration of the old Long Parliament's Licensing Act in 1695. The press would henceforth be free from official censorship prior to publication. This new system allowed the publication of any news and opinions, of course within the boundaries of national security (Taylor 2003: 129). During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the demand for press freedom increased in connection with the emancipation of the bourgeoisie. Press freedom was included in the American declaration of human rights in 1776 and appeared in more and more in the constitutions of modern states, including in the Norwegian constitution of 1814.

### 3.8.3 The importance of foreign news

The supply of and demand for news dramatically increased with the French revolution and the Napoleonic wars. As Lundell observes, “political radicalism and titillating profanity sold, as did war. The flood of news literally called for space, and hence other features, such as letters to the paper, had to relinquish their places” (Lundell 2011: 13). In his renowned study of French, German, English and American newspapers from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, Jürgen Wilke (1987) shows that foreign affairs had a more dominant position in news coverage than domestic affairs. In the newspapers published between 1674 and 1856, the foreign news was always given the highest priority and presented first. There was only one exception, in 1796, when 61% of the articles in *La Gazette Nationale ou le Moniteur Universel* in Paris were domestic news, while the other newspapers only published 37.5% domestic news articles.

There are several explanations as to why foreign news had a more prominent position in the historical newspapers. Wilke suggests that the coverage of foreign affairs was influenced by both domestic factors and external political variables. He concludes that censorship and control of the press had a “positive” effect on the foreign coverage. By permitting foreign news, the need for information could be satisfied to a certain extent, while at the same time attention could be diverted from more pressing, domestic matters. Consequently, the reason why *La Gazette Nationale* published more domestic than foreign news in 1796 is explained by growth in domestic freedom in the aftermath of the French Revolution (Wilke 1987: 174).

Dooley (2010), on the other hand, suggests that early journalism emerged in order to communicate information about matters that were not normally “known by the usual word-of-mouth sources in the public streets and squares” (Dooley 2010: 287). Both of them also suggest that distances and methods of transmitting news to other countries had an impact on some countries’ newspaper coverage of other countries. Wilke points to a tendency of regionalism, which he explains through *proximity* as a news factor. For example, there is greater coverage of Eastern Europe in German and French newspapers than in British and American newspapers. Wilke’s study also claims that the Scandinavian countries “always were in the shadow of international attention” (Wilke 1987: 164). The fact that Norway’s place in Europe was perceived to be far on the outskirts, can be illustrated by the following quote from the London newspaper *The Morning Post* on August 25, 1814:

”Accustomed as we have been to peruse the accounts of those magnitudiuous [sic] and dreadful combats which have given peace to nearly the whole of Europe, we can scarcely persuade ourselves that the torch of war is yet furiously burning in one of its remotest and insignificant corners.”

### 3.8.4 How should we read the newspapers of 1814?

However, as my study will show, the dramatic political events in Scandinavia in 1814 in fact received a significant deal of attention in European newspapers, even though the editors’ knowledge of Scandinavia in general, and Norway in particular, was limited. This may have contributed to some exaggerated reports and even some cock-and-bull stories about what was going on in this mythical place, far up north. But as Barker and Burrow puts it, “early newspapers relied above all on foreign newspapers and hand-written newsletters, which they recycled shamelessly” (2002: 7). Although many newspapers in 1814 were still written and published in the spirit of enlightenment and the presentation of pure facts and many rumours that were reported were repudiated as false claims, some stories were let through without correction.

One interesting example of these *canards des journaux* is the reports about the alleged “Norwegian Amazon Corps”, a story that was clearly inspired by Norse mythology and national romantic imaginings about the Norwegian people. Following the war between Sweden and Norway in the summer of 1814, several newspapers reported that a military division consisting of about 400 Norwegian girls had participated in furious fighting against the Swedish forces. Some of them were reported killed, while others had apparently been taken as prisoners of war. The HUC was the first non-Nordic newspaper to convey the story about “die Norwegischen Schildjungfrauen” on August 24<sup>th</sup>. The Examiner in London reported in August 28<sup>th</sup> that, “It is even said, that a Norwegian young Lady has raised a corps of her own sex, a report, which though possible to be true, and under all the particular circumstances not even improbable, serves at least to show what the prevalent feeling is with regard to Norwegian spirit.” The story spread southwards and was published in AAZ on September 1<sup>st</sup> (1814) and in ERZ on September 2<sup>nd</sup> (1814) The story even reached America, and was published in the Federal Republican in Georgetown on November 25<sup>th</sup> (1814). None of these newspapers revealed the source of the story. The Dutch newspaper *Opregte Haarlemsche Courant* (1814), however, offers an indication that the story’s origin might have been in Norway, as it put the story below the heading: “Noorwegen. Christiania, den 10

Augustus”. Four decades later, the story is repeated in a Norwegian history book (Giessing 1852: 97-98), and the circle is complete.

The idea of female soldiers was not an impossibility, as we know that women fought in the French Revolutionary Army (Hopkin 2009). However, there are no other sources that could confirm, or even further indicate, that women participated in military actions in Norway in 1814. The story of the “Norwegian Amazon Corps” probably originates from a letter from a lady that was published in the Norwegian newspaper *Intelligenz-Seddler*. The woman presents herself as organizing and leading an army corps consisting of women, “like another Amazon or Shieldmaiden” (Blom 1869: 196; Glenthøj 2010: 115; Schnitler 1911: 22). This passage was, most likely then, mistranslated and started living its own life in the newspaper reports about the dramatic events in Norway.

This example illustrates one of my main points when examining the coverage of Norway in European newspapers in the pivotal year of 1814. The newspapers disseminate different ideas through a variety of discursive representations and are more concerned with “rituals of identity formation rather than any positivist contribution to knowledge about the world,” as Carey puts it, “the symbolic function of journalism in establishing and maintaining communities has a more significant role than its informational component” (Carey 1989, cited in; Conboy 2012: 4). The newspapers of 1814 must first and foremost be read as disseminators of ideas, rather than factual information.

# 4. Analysis

In the following, the selected newspapers will be analysed. For the sake of order and clarity, the newspapers will be examined individually. The newspapers are categorised according to the different representations they belong within: The Popular Sovereignty Representation, The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation, and The “Impartial” Enlightenment Newspapers.

## 4.1 The Popular Sovereignty Representation

### 4.1.1 The Examiner

#### 4.1.1.1 Introduction

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, London was “the newspaper capital of the world”, as Høyer puts it (2010). The London newspapers were generally far ahead of the newspapers in the rest of Europe, in terms of both the size and the sophistication of text production. The reasons for this are probably to be found in London’s large population in comparison with other metropolitan centres of the time, in addition to relatively high levels of literacy and press freedom, when compared, of course, with other European countries (Høyer 2010: 451). The Examiner was one of most liberal political London newspapers, and in the first issue in 1808 the editor stated that the newspaper would pursue “truth for its sole object”. In 1814 it gave Norway and its new constitution a prominent place on the agenda. The Examiner stands for the most outspoken and radical coverage of the Norwegian affairs, and in many ways the newspaper demarcates the boundaries for what was acceptable to say about the issue in 1814.

The weekly newspaper was in favour of political reforms in England and was therefore looked upon with suspicion by those in power. Its editors, the brothers John and Leigh Hunt, were prosecuted more than once by the government for political offences, but they were acquitted every time. In 1813, however, an attack on the Prince Regent resulted in prosecution and a two-year sentence of imprisonment for both brothers. This, however, gave the publication a boost, and on the day of their sentence The Examiner sold 10,000 copies. The government had hoped that the verdict also would mean the end of the newspaper, but

instead it made *The Examiner* the most popular liberal newspaper of the time. His prison terms were not too strict, to put it mildly, and through all of his imprisonment, Leigh Hunt continued to edit *The Examiner*. He was also allowed to be joined by his wife and children, and receive friends. Among the visitors to his cell were many of the prominent, radical figures of the time, such as James Mill, Charles Lamb and Jeremy Bentham (Motion 1999: 56-62; Stephen 1885: 268).

This newspaper clearly falls within the category that I call *The Popular Sovereignty Representation*. The Hunt brothers were connected to a radical circle where we also find Lord Byron, the poet Percy B. Shelley and the essayist William Hazlitt. They struggled for a romantic project, thinking in a visionary way, unbound by traditions. The Norwegian constitution and the country's struggle for independence in 1814 fitted perfectly into this project. These liberals regarded the Norwegian constitution as an expression of a suppressed nation's struggle for freedom, and the Norwegians were idealized as a free people, pure and uncorrupted by the societal structures that were found in the rest of Europe – just as Malte-Brun did from his writing chamber in Paris (see chapter 4.1.4). During 1814, *The Examiner* regularly published pieces on Norway, in addition to minutes from parliamentary debates on the issue. When the war between Norway and Sweden broke out in August, these events received the full attention of the editor. Through August and September, every issue of *The Examiner* had an essay on Norway as the front-page story. Some of the titles are quite colourful, such as, *Imitation of Bonaparte's conduct by the invaders of Norway*, *The Norwegians and their invader*, and, *The Norwegians, and the pretender to their crown*. On the fourth front page, where Norway is headline news, the editors say, "We make no apology to our readers for continuing this subject." In the following, I will present some of the most distinct features of *The Examiner's* coverage of Norway in 1814 and their thinking concerning Norwegian independence.

#### **4.1.1.2 The Propaganda War**

The Propaganda War concerning Norway was going on both within and outside Scandinavia (Hemstad 2012). *The Examiner* took an active part in this war of words against both foreign publications and other national and London publications. The editors of *The Examiner* have a clear self-awareness and a great belief in their own role and ability to influence peoples' thinking, inside and outside England, with their writing. They are obviously aware of



London's relatively high degree of press freedom, compared with other cities in Europe. They write that "we have reason to think, that the English journals just now receive a more than ordinary degree of attention in foreign quarters," and therefore it was their duty "to counteract the pernicious expedencies which are practised by some of them, and which, besides dishonouring the character of the press, would bring the commonest principles of the nation into contempt" (August 7, no. 345). The editors obviously have a reflected relationship to source criticism, saying, "almost as little reliance is to be placed on the Danish accounts of this business, as the Swedish" and, "we know the liberties which official bulletins can take with the truth; and articles like the present, which come in disguise, are not likely to be more scrupulous" (September 18, no. 351).

On several occasions, *The Examiner* attacks *The Times* for being too uncritical of official sources and for supporting the Crown Prince of Sweden, Charles John. For example, the newspaper points out that, "(...) some of our journalists, the *Times* and others, who would have fired Paris in all quarters, but shudder at the idea of a nation's fighting for its freedom against Bernadotte, pretend to congratulate humanity on the settlement of Norwegian affairs" (September 4, no. 349). *The Examiner* also points out that although Bonaparte had fallen, he had left imitators, "who can play a still more insolent game than himself, by adopting his conduct upon the very ground of having put him down for it" (September 11, no. 350). Furthermore, it is written that, "if Bonaparte had his *Hauterives* and others whose business was to pioneer the way for him with newspaper paragraphs (...), Bernadotte has his *Staëls* and his *Schlegels* to puff and trumpet him wherever he goes, and to show that injustice and usurpation in him are not the same things as in other people" (September 11, no. 350).

*The Examiner* even uses war metaphors when writing about the press and Charles John's propaganda apparatus. In one instance (September 18, no. 351) it is written that although there is no new intelligence regarding "the war between Norway and Bernadotte", there is no reason that the attention on Norwegian affairs should be diminished as Charles John has "resorted to such a change of weapon, as cannot be equally met, and brings up his German hirelings to carry on a fresh kind of battery by means of the press." *The Examiner* literally perceives itself as a defender of Norway's right to independence by standing up for the country through the use of words:

"The Norwegians, unused to this species of warfare, and not able, like their enemies, to press the attention of general readers into its service, have a double claim upon every

honest pen that is to be found among other nations; and most assuredly they shall not want ours, as long as it can serve to keep alive the sense of their injuries elsewhere, or to intercept one single stab, written or practical, at the manly heart of their country” (September 18, no. 351).

#### 4.1.1.3 Fighting the *just* cause of National Liberty

One of the main characteristics of The Examiner’s coverage of the Norwegian affairs, is that what is happening in Norway is represented only as an act of defence against a foreign invader, not as a revolution or uprising against a sovereign. In this way, The Examiner differentiates itself from other liberal newspapers, such as Gazette de Lausanne and Le Spectateur, which are both labelling what is happening in Norway as a revolution. This contributes to legitimizing the Norwegian armed resistance against Sweden and delegitimises the “transfer of one people to another”, on which I will elaborate below. Obviously, The Examiner’s editors are clearly supporters of the modern legitimizing principles of national liberty and the sovereignty of the people. They write that every journal “that does not take part with the Norwegian people, now fighting in the same cause as the Spaniards, Russians, and Germans, and that does not speak of one unprincipled Frenchman in as plain, honest terms as it did of another, shows that it was either a hypocrite with respect to Bonaparte, or is a time-server and a coward with regard to his enemies” (August 28, no. 348).

When reports arrive that Charles John has promised to allow the Norwegians to keep their new constitution in a union with Sweden, the background for this is explained not only through the sturdy “spirit of the Norwegians” but also “the manifest justice of their cause”:

“Indeed the whole of his late conduct has to us a very curious look, and by no means induces us to conclude that the Norwegian business is finished. His consenting to a Convention at all was a greater acknowledgement of weakness than he seems to have been aware; for according to his own previous account, what had he to do with Prince Christian, or with ‘rebels’ of any kind?” (September 18, no. 351)

Above, we see that the word *rebels* is put between quotation marks, which is yet another indication that what is happening in Norway is not perceived as an illegitimate rebellion.

#### 4.1.1.4 The Parliamentary Debates and the Cattle Metaphor

The catalyst of the great interest in Norway shown in The Examiner seems to be the parliamentary debates. Up until May, the newspaper more or less refers to official statements, private letters and travellers, reporting the news of what is happening in Scandinavia. It was

only when after publishing a summary of a discussion in the parliament between Lord Holland, the Earl of Liverpool and Earl Grey over the blockade which “has for its object to force the people of Norway to submit to a foreign power” (May 1, no. 331), that the interest for the Norwegian sake really first started to manifest itself by letters to the editors and opinion articles.

On May 15 (no. 333) *The Examiner* published an opinion piece, which used a metaphor that would be much used later: “What is the broad principle, upon which objections are made to the conduct of Ministers with regards to Norway it is this, that *no one government has a right to transfer a whole people to another, like a herd of cattle.*” It is followed by some concrete examples, taking the problem home: “the English government would have no right to transfer Ireland to an enemy in order to settle matters with him, nor would a Scotch Government, if they had the management of the United Kingdom, have any right to transfer us, the English people, to the Government of France.”

In the continuation of the cattle-transfer metaphor, what is happening with the people of Norway is also compared with slave-trade:

“They (who are opposed to Norwegian independence) lose sight (...) of all which constitutes national existence and is able to confer a separate independence, (...) of the *people* of Norway, their good character, and the extent of their country, and think, like true slaves, of nothing but the *masters* in question, nothing but the herdsmen, the cattle-proprietors, the dealers what Sir James Macintosh has very pregnantly termed a “white slave-trade”.

The cattle-transfer metaphor used in the opinion piece was also used by Earl Grey, during a debate in the House of Lords on May 10, which is summarized in the same edition of *The Examiner*: “The rights of Sovereigns over their subjects are not the rights of property - (Hear, hear!) - they do not confer the privilege of transferring them from one owner to another like the cattle of the soil - (Hear,hear)”. Earl Grey continues by saying that the King of Denmark had no right to transfer the sovereignty of Norway without the consent of the Norwegian people. “He might absolve them from their allegiance to him, but nothing more: and it then became their right to decide to whom their allegiance should be given,” Earl Grey holds forth, referring to jurists such as Grotius, Pufendorf, and Vattel. “Norway was a distinct people, and though under the sovereignty of the King of Denmark, it was independent of Denmark, as Ireland used to be of England.” Grey received support from Lord Greenville in the argument

against an English blockade of Norway. Greenville emphasized that “the same army and navy that once protected liberty” would now possibly be “enforcing slavery”.

Earl Grey also argued that the Crown Prince of Sweden had failed to perform his part of the treaty, by turning against Denmark after the battle of Leipzig instead of joining the attack on Napoleon’s France. Furthermore, Grey argued that it would be in England’s own interest that Norway should be independent of both Sweden and Denmark, referring to the fact that England had supported the rights of the people of Spain when King Ferdinand ceded Spain to France: “How then can we now, with any consistency, act so opposite a part, as to compel the submission of Norway.”

Consistency and principles were not the only important ideas that Earl Grey was promoting. Honour and grace were obviously important as well, and represent ideas that are perhaps not much considered in Western politics today. Grey said that, “The Norwegians were now gallantly struggling for independence,” and that the government should not allow England to be, “disgraced by the inglorious undertaking of starving an independent nation into submission. Whatever might be the result, as to the displeasure of Sweden and Russia, humanity and justice demanded that we should cooperate in the glorious cause of Norway.” Furthermore, he characterised the people of Norway as “unoffending”, and encouraged the prevention of “any hostile measure being taken to force the submission of that nation to a foreign yoke, (...) of a people nobly struggling for the maintenance of their natural rights.”

The counterarguments, as put forward by the Earl of Harrowey, emphasized a notion of the “general good”:

“(...) the Law of Nations depended on the fact of its being established, no matter when or by whom. Looking, therefore, at the practice for many years, it would be seen that cessions of whole states had been repeatedly made. He would allow that no Monarch could cede the whole of his dominions; but, when sorely pressed, he might cede a part to save the remainder, and the inhabitants were bound to submit for the general good.”

Moreover he refused any parallel between Spain and Norway, saying that:

“The conduct of Norway during the war was not such as to entitle her to our forbearance: she had assisted Denmark, to the utmost of her power, in its co-operation with the Tyrant who then governed France. But even if the people of Norway were in some degree sacrificed, considering our engagements with the Crown of Sweden, and that this was the only sacrifice to the general liberty of Europe, while liberty was secured to the Norwegians by the Prince to whom they were ceded, and guaranteed by one of the most powerful nations of Europe (...)”.

#### 4.1.1.5 National Liberalism and The Anti-Bernadotte Sentiment

Another prominent characteristic of *The Examiner*, is the outspokenness against the Swedish Crown Prince, Charles John. The newspaper is cautious not to write anything negative about Sweden or the Swedes as such. The reason being not only that it was an allied country, but also because *The Examiner* sees the country's de facto leader and his ambitions as the problem. As promoters of the modern, national liberalist school of thought, the editors have many objections to the fact that a non-Swede is going to head the Swedish nation-state. He is seen as an imitator of Napoleon Bonaparte, threatening the peace of the North by invading a neighbouring country. That also explains the editors' resistance against English involvement in forcing the Norwegians to surrender to Sweden: "(...) we are really to assist one of Bonaparte's former Generals in starving and shooting into submission, for the will and pleasure of that consistent personage, a neighbour who never injured him." (August 7, no. 345).

Charles John is named Bernadotte – his original surname – throughout the 1814 edition of the newspaper, unlike other publications, where he is dubbed His Royal Highness or just the Crown Prince. In one article he is labelled an "adventurer and foreigner" (August 14, no. 346). This is done in order to show that he is a Frenchman, not a Swede, and is a clear political statement: "he is an alien to the whole North, and an imitator of the former master whose tyranny he has just been helping to overthrow, have not even the bad excuse of national prejudice, and are alike bare-faced, preposterous, and unjust." The comparison between Bernadotte and Bonaparte is drawn on many occasions, such as when *The Examiner* says he "is playing exactly the same part on a smaller scale in the North, as his old leader did in the South." However, the editors apparently do not want to honour Charles John by saying he is a leader of the same calibre as Bonaparte: "the former is not to be compared with him in strength and talents." The editors hope that the comparison will hold good to the conclusion, and that "the misfortune with which the Norwegians are threatened will then be converted every way into a blessing and a glory":

"They will have achieved their independence afresh; they will be enabled to keep the new Constitution which they have had knowledge and spirit enough to contemplate in their present emergency; and they will leap out at once into a rank, worthy their national character, by the side of nations, who have done like them."

Charles John is spoken of as a revolutionary who has turned against his previous convictions, as a man without principles. His honour as well as his legitimacy is therefore questioned, such as in the following example (September 11, no. 350):

“Between the words ‘Royal Highness’ and ‘the Crown Prince’, insert then – Felix Baptiste Bernadotte, alias Citizen Bernadotte, who took an oath to the French Republic – alias General Bernadotte, who went overturning other republics – alias Prince Pontecorvo, who took an oath to the French Emperor – alias Marshal Prince Pontecorvo, who went overturning royalties for the said Emperor, alias Charles John, who changed his religion in order to be made royal – alias General of the Allied Armies, who went overturning his old master for overturning aforesaid governments – alias the Restorer of Peace and Order, who compels his neighbours into a union – alias the Crown Prince, who talks about Jacobins.”

The essay says further that, “It is with the principles, and not with the parentage of such a man, that we quarrel,” and labels Bernadotte as a *turncoat* and an *apostate*: “a *turncoat*, for having deserted the cause of freedom to be the instrument of a despot – and an *apostate*, for having changed his religion in order to sit upon a throne.” A lot of space is used to lash out against “Bonaparte – we beg pardon – Bernadotte, we should say” – “the republican turned usurper”.

The editors of the Examiner are almost sensationally straightforward when it comes to expressing their antipathy towards the Crown Prince of Sweden (such as on August 28, no. 348): “We hope most cordially that he who thus imitates the vices, meet with the fate of his original. (...) If ‘the Napoleon of the North,’ as the Norwegians call him, is to make good his title to that appellation, his career will be much shorter than the other’s. His Spain and Russia will both be in Norway.” Another article (August 7, no. 345) attacks some of the proclamations issued by Charles John before the war on Norway, where he argued that the Norwegians were “destined by nature” to a union with Sweden and that their “fate was decided when the King of Denmark ceded to Sweden, by the Peace of Kiel, his rights over Norway.” The editors write that “Destined by nature to a union with the Swedish nation - This is the very plea that Napoleon has so often set out with in his desirous upon his neighbours.” The article asks what the Swedes would say, supposing that a King of Norway should one day would make the same claim with regard to Sweden. “(...) ‘Destined by nature’ is a dangerous phrase in the mouth of princes, especially if their own claims at home be of no very native cast,” the editor continues. “The Norwegians, at any rate, were not ‘destined by nature’ to be ruled by a Frenchman: and if master Bernadotte does not take care, the Swedes

may discover as much for themselves,” they warn him. “He (Bonaparte) was always talking about divisions, and ruin, and the peace of Europe, all of which meant his own will and aggrandizement. If you are so alarmed at divisions in the North, why do you begin them?” the editors ask.

They also remind Charles John that his predecessors Charles X and Charles XII lost their lives in attempts to invade Norway: “A lucky shot, that should tumble him from his horse and give him a disagreeable taste of the soil he has got such an appetite for, would end in a moment his own pretensions, abroad and at home, and do away all alarm for Norwegian independence” (August 14, no. 346).

The mocking of Charles John continues during the autumn of 1814 (September 25, no. 352). He is compared with Charles XII, Louis XIV, Frederick II the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte and Ferdinand of Spain, concluding that “of all the pretenders to glory, this Swedish Frenchman seems to be the dullest and most ungain.” The article also comments on the physical looks of the Crown Prince, which is an attack on his honour that lacks any comparison:

“There is no relief in his portrait, even of a glaring kind, not a point about him, even erroneously ornamental. A sort of mimicking and tall-boy ambition, an open abandonment of principle, with a face if he were not conscious of it – a dry hard-featured pertinacity, mixed with a ridiculous look of imbecility and irresolution, as if he were resolved upon the end, but could take the longest and most shuffling means to come to it – these appear to be his distinguishing features: and make him look at the head of his adopted subjects like a gawky lad, who has come from a greater academy to a less, and leads out the little boys to conquer the next day-school in order to show them his manhood.”

To emphasize that Charles John is just a bad copy of Napoleon Bonaparte, the article concludes that, “the latter indeed resembles the former about as much as stage lightning does that of the sky”. (September 25, no. 352)

#### **4.1.1.6 Prince Christian Frederick: from Hero to Disappointment**

The Examiner writes in very positive terms about Prince Christian Frederick, the new Norwegian king who is going to lead the Norwegians in the struggle against the foreign invaders. It seems, however, that it is not until mid-August that the editors are aware of – or at least mention – the fact that Christian Frederick is actually a Danish prince: “we cannot take leave of these documents without noticing the light in which they put the new King, and

which, we confess, is not altogether such as we could have wished” (August 21, no. 347). Having defended Christian Frederick for several months, the editors now write that “the peculiar situation of this Prince” could give rise to “unpleasant doubts in the conduct of the Norwegian Authorities.” In other words, they also suspect that Christian Frederick might have taken the lead in order to secure further Danish rule over Norway. It is noted that Sweden has already made this objection, and the editor recommends that Prince Christian Frederick should return his Crown into the hands of the representatives and leave the nation to itself. He is therefore satisfied that the Prince has complied to do so, according to reports. However, the editor is critical about the fact that Christian Frederick, in compliance with the suggestion of the Commissioners, intends “not merely to lay before the Norwegians the dangers attending a resistance (...) but to show them what are termed ‘the advantages of a union with Sweden’, and even ‘to employ all his influence in persuading the people to agree to it’.”

The editor claims that it is “a very poor compliment in return for the Crown which the people gave him.” He asks whether danger alone has opened the Prince’s eyes to this exit strategy, noting that, “all that Christian Frederick had hitherto done appeared calculated to raise our esteem; but really, judging from his last conduct of his, and knowing what we do of his character from nothing but what he has done in Norway, we should not conclude he was a very strong-minded person. If he thought that nations were to elect their own kings and achieve their own liberties without danger and toil, he was egregiously mistaken.” At the same time, the editor notes that regardless of the “solitary suspicion arising from the part originally taken by this Prince, we consider it as having nothing to do with the right of the Norwegian people to choose their own masters and live in their own way.”

The article argues that, “even if their old Court had deceived them, and was really playing a double game for it’s own future interest, even this makes no difference with regard to *them*; *they* had still the full right to renounce the imposition of Swedish authority; the knavish conduct of one Court, however obnoxious and perplexing to another, would have given the latter no fresh claim over millions of men, who chose to decline its connection.”

Later on (August 28, no. 348), it is written that “there is no more comparison between him and Bernadotte, than between something doubtful and something notoriously unprincipled.” In a footnote, it is emphasized that the newspaper only had one objection to Christian Frederick: that he promised to use his influence “in producing the submission of the



people". But, "for the rest, he was as much their heir to the crown of Norway as of Denmark". The editors can not at all see "why he should be treated as a rebel to the King of the latter country, who had no right to give up the former."

The disappointment in Christian Frederick is made clear once again in a piece titled "Convention between Prince Christian and Bernadotte" (September 4, no. 349), where it is written that, "We have more than once expressed our uneasiness at the apparent alarm of Prince Christian, and his strange conduct in talking of 'all Europe' being against the Norwegians, and in promising to use his 'influence' with them in favour of submission." The article says that the young man was entrusted "the honourable task of leading it (the country) in the path to freedom, has only put himself at the head of the people to concentrate their interest in his hands, and then give it up." Why did he not resign at an earlier period, The Examiner asks. "The Norwegians would have been then left to themselves, to their own spirit and resources; and the most time-serving of their enemies would have had not a shadow of pretence for misrepresenting their efforts at independence."

The editor sees that the Convention between Sweden and Norway may have positive consequences for Norway: "it is clear that the national resistance has already gained something; for by article third of the civil part of the Convention, the King of Sweden promises to accept the Constitution that was framed by the Deputies of the Diet of Eidsvold." It is later reported that Prince Christian Frederick has been attacked by a "nervous illness", which seems to be "an additional proof that disapprobation of his late measures must have been very strong." In the end, the The Examiner is quite apologetic towards the Prince, saying that, "his conduct was far from answering to what the Norwegians had a right to expect of him; but he is young, and perhaps was deceived by traitorous advisors; and it is impossible not to sympathize with a distress which seems a proof of his sensibility." (September 25, no. 352)

#### **4.1.1.7 Romanticising the Norwegian Peasantry**

The Examiner paints a romantic picture of the Norwegians, and the Norwegian peasantry in particular. On more than one occasion, the editors claim to know how the common Norwegians are thinking, and to be acting as the self-appointed guardians of the Norwegians rights and interests. One example of The Examiner speaking on behalf of the Norwegians is this: "If Denmark, the Norwegians might say, promised that we should tamely be transferred

like cattle, we are sorry that she did not know us better” (August 7, no. 345). The most striking example, however, is also an example of how experimental and far ahead The Examiner was in terms of literary techniques in their journalism – at least when compared to other newspapers in this study. In the issue of September 25 (no. 352), the newspaper published a fictional conversation between the Crown Prince of Sweden and the Norwegian peasantry.

The Norwegians are depicted as simple people, but “luckily, the peasantry are not to be misled like the Prince and his Counsellors,” the article says. “They have no interests foreign to those of their own soil; they have nothing about them, to which the same appeals can be made as to men of the world; they are liable to no sophistications; their arguments stand about them in the shape of present comforts, of domestic and patriotic associations, of homes, wives, children, parents, and the hitherto unconquered Norwegian name” (September 25, no. 352). The article encourages the reader for a moment to think of “the feelings with which this artless but high-spirited people must receive Bernadotte and his arguments.” The Norwegian nation is depicted almost like an indigenous people, living “out of the great world”, knowing and caring very little about foreign princes generals and high contracting parties.

“Their sole idea of Bernadotte is perhaps that of a stout sort of enemy, mixed with a contemptuous notion of his understanding in thinking to conquer them, and a kind of rambling wonderment between what they hear of his present designs, of his former history, and of his being a Frenchman at the head of the Swedes.” (September 25, no. 352)

#### CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE PEASANTRY AND BERNADOTTE

PEASANTRY. Stand off; - we do not know what you mean by our King giving us up; we are sorry for him, if he is in your clutches; but though he may give you his crown, he cannot give you our affections and obedience, and we choose to keep them for a government of our own.

BERNADOTTE. But I will make you happy.

P. But we are happy enough already.

B. Yes, but I will make you more free than you were under your former sovereign, and you are too gallant a people not to be found of freedom.

P. We are so, and that is the reason why we choose to have nothing to do with you. We tell you, that we shall transfer our obedience to a government of our own, which shall be altogether Norwegian, and which we can make as free as we please. If you are so fond of bestowing freedom, why did you force on your own future subjects that villainous thing of which we hear, called the Conscription?

B. Oh – the Conscription! Evil-minded people misinform you about it – besides, it is only a temporary measure, and I promise you, you shall have none of it.

P. Oh yes; - truly you are very likely to treat us better than your own people.

B. You misunderstand me. When this unnatural war –

P. Who began it?

B. Hear me out. When this unnatural war is over, there will be no necessity for any thing further of an unpleasant nature. All the Scandinavians will live like brothers; that is my great object; “I could die for the happiness of the Scandinavians.”

P. Ah, ha! A Frenchman, and die for the happiness of the Scandinavians; - Come, come, - we are not a very learned people, but we have common sense and the love of truth; and we plainly tell you, that we look upon you as an impostor.

B. (Reddening.) An impostor! – If any body but a Norwegian had said so, this sword should have been through him. Why, I am Crown Prince of Sweden, the Kings and Emperors, my allies, have sanctioned my proceedings, and I have the King my adopted father with me to sanction them also.

P. We know nothing of your adopted father, except that he has a rogue for his son; and as for the other persons of whom you spoke, we do not care for all the Kings and Emperors in the world in comparison with our freedom.

B. You do not? Why, this is pure Jacobinism. – Well, we shall see. I do not come here to talk, but to claim my right and property.

P. You must have mistaken your way.

B. Nonsense! I say, I come here to claim the country that has been made over to me and my family by your former possessor.

P. Possessor! We possessed him, as much as he possessed us. He was of a Norwegian stock, and if he choose to forget his family, it is no reason why we should forget ours. You say what we do not understand, when you talk of having had the country made over to you. Has our poor King removed these mountains? Has he transferred our cottages, our wives, and our children into Swedes? Has he whistled the graves of our fathers and mothers underneath your own burial-grounds? Then, and not till then, can we become members of another country, and reconcile the love of our own soil with the service of yours.

B. There is no talking with these dolts! – Fools, are you aware that the new King you have chosen has given you up also, and that he has made a Convention with me?

P. Poor young man! Woe betide those who advised him to it!

B. Yet I have sent your very countrymen who fought against me, home again, with money in their purses.

P. You have, because you thought to cajole us. You come to knock us down, and then give us money not to return the blow. You are out in your reckoning, and we shall chalk up the mistake on your back before you have done with us. We care neither for your Convention, nor for the Diet which you say is to give us up also. Every body, it seems, is giving us up; but for our parts, we find our homes as stationary, and our hearts as unyielding as ever; and you will find that a town or two in the south is not all Norway, nor a fiftieth part of it.

B. Well, I shall waste my time no longer. You are insensible to reason, and it only remains for me, when I have settled a little business, -

P. (with a smile) Ay, ay; we thought you would not be quite so quick as you promised.

B. I say, it only remains for me, when I come back from meeting my royal and imperial friends at the Congress, to bring up the remainder of my troops, if you continue refractory, and settle the matter at once. Those are the best arguments, I find; and they are irresistible.

P. Irrisistible! Poor creature, not to know that trees which are rotten at heart are fit only for cutting down. You see our families about us, - our homes, our native mountains, - our wives and children, - all the dear hearts (count not upon these tears, -'tis men that shed them;)- all the dear hearts, against which you are bringing up your detestable bayonets: - *These* are our arguments, and they can resist any thing.

Source: The Examiner, September 25, no. 352

The fictional conversation brings up the main arguments of those who support the new legitimacy principle of the sovereignty of the people and those who support the old absolutist regime.

#### 4.1.1.8 Looking towards the Congress

Peace, and the wish for a lasting one, is an important and recurring theme among all parties to the debates of the post-Napoleonic settlements. As written in *The Examiner* on May 22 (no. 334), "If the Definitive Treaty thus surrenders up Italy, and Saxony, and Poland, to dependence and foreign away, the seeds of future and speedy wars will be scattered all over Europe. Peace can only permanently dwell with Justice." In England there is a fear that France will regain its strength and offer to become a "liberator" once again: "who will wonder if insulted Italy, and divided Saxony, and outraged Poland, should listen to the delusion? There is Finland too, and Norway, and Spain, which its 'legitimate' Monarch seems anxious to plunge into a civil war." The article concludes that "The Princes of Europe have, in a great measure, its destiny now in their hands; as they act, so shall we see good or evil times."

In July there is much speculation about what will be the issues at the forthcoming Congress of Vienna. One commentator thinks that a number of questions will necessarily be considered at the Congress:

"Particularly the partition of Poland – that touchstone of the real magomuity of Kings – the spallation of Sardinia – the integrity of Genoa, for which the faith of Great Britain was pledged – the article for the subjugation of Norway – and the cession of Guadaloupe to France, that island and the permission to carry on the Slave Trade

being granted to France, in order to procure her concurrence and assistance in the subjugation of Norway, while Russia seemed to have given her assistance in the same measure, as a consideration for her right to retain Finland.” (July 3, no. 340)

On other occasions as well, it seems like the question of Norway was not perceived as finally settled with the Treaty of Kiel. For example, in a summary of another parliamentary debate, Mr. Whitbread is cited saying that he hoped “the interests of Norway and Poland would not be lost sight of at the ensuing Congress” (July 24, no. 343).

Under the title “*Apprehensions arising from the intriguing spirit of Bonaparte, and means of putting an end to them*” the editors of *The Examiner* advise the allies to give two or three “conclusive blows to the stirring snake of Elba,” and recommends, if they would prevent “bitter and dangerous sentiments on the part of the French nation, and a still more dangerous feeling (...) on the part of Europe in general” by the recognition of the independence of *Norway*, the restoration of Poland, and the abandonment of all uncharitable intentions upon Saxony. If the allied powers failed to do this, and Bonaparte repeated any attempts against them, he would be regarded “as an assisting friend” in Norway, Poland and Saxony, the article suggest (July 31, no. 344)

Another lead article, entitled, “The Norwegians and Bernadotte” (August 14, no. 346), expresses hopes that the talks between the King of Norway and the allied Commissionaires will lead to a good solution for Norway, with special reference to Czar Alexander I: “The more we hear of this Sovereign the more hopes we entertain of his conduct both with regard to Norway and Poland. (...) he must be aware, that the continuation of Poland as it is, and the taking any violent part in the proposed subjugation of Norway, would make great flaws in the solid and clear reputation, which otherwise he bids fair to erect.” The *Examiner*’s editors give reminders on several occasions that there are more interests in Europe than those of the five allied great powers:

“Granting even that all the Princes in question spoke the language of their respective nations, are there no nations in Europe but Great Britain, Sweden, Russia, Austria, and Prussia? What becomes of France, Spain, Turkey, the German free towns, Holland, Italy, *Poland*? We trust that this will be remembered at the approaching Congress, or it will be no Congress, no European Senate, but a meeting of Dictators. The affection of considering all Europe as comprised in the few moving Powers, who may have the immediate upper hand, and some of whom may be infinitely inferior to the uncomputed ones in the genius of their people and the natural resources of their country, is a very ridiculous one; and the great popular feeling, which has just been doing so much for Europe, will do well not to lose sight of it. It is a bad imitation of

the late dictatorial power of France, than which nothing was more galling to these very powers.” (August 21, no. 347)

As late as the end of September (no. 352), *The Examiner* believes that there is a possibility that the Norwegian question will be brought up at the Congress of Vienna and being finally settled there (see the last line of Bernadotte in the fictional conversation above).

#### **4.1.1.9 Conclusion**

*The Examiner* is the newspaper which was operating under the most liberal conditions in Europe in 1814. It supported the view that the King of Denmark had no right to transfer the Norwegian people to the King of Sweden. This was compared to the trade of cattle, and even the slave trade. The newspaper projected a national-liberal popular sovereignty representation of the events in Norway, claiming that a united mass of Norwegians were longing for their national liberty, highly motivated to engage in war against Sweden and its allies. As recent scholarship has shown, this was not the case (see chapter 3.7.6). *The Examiner* embezzled available information about the fact that Norwegians were divided on the issue, as reported in other newspapers, and that the national movement was driven first and foremost by the elite. This, however, did not fit into *The Examiner's* idea of popular sovereignty, that the authority of government is created, sustained and legitimized by the consent of the people, the nation. Furthermore, the newspaper is opposed to foreigners being the head of another nation's state. The propaganda campaign against Sweden's French Crown Prince is one example. Another example is the newspaper's dissatisfaction about that Christian Frederick is a Danish prince. However, the newspaper argues, this is not totally unheard of as long as it is the will of the people. *The Examiner* also defends the cause of other “suppressed nations”, and is writing several times, perhaps for their government to see it, that if these issues are not handled at the upcoming congress, there is a risk that all these nations will turn against the Allies together with France.

## 4.1.2 Rheinischer Merkur

### 4.1.2.1 Introduction

Napoleon and the French army's retreat from the German territories after being defeated in the battle of Leipzig meant that many old newspapers that had been prohibited or forcibly taken over could start publishing again. The liberation led not only to the revival of old newspapers, but also to the establishment of new ones. The most important of these was the *Rheinischer Merkur*, which appeared for the first time on January 23, 1814 in Koblenz, three weeks after the liberation. This date represents "the beginning of the development of a political press in Germany" (Koszyk 1966, cited in; Wilke 2008: 172). Its creator, Joseph Görres, had been a supporter of the French revolution and the democratic movement. He had already published a newspaper, *The Red Journal* in the late 1700s, at the age of 22. Now, what distinguished RM from other newspapers was the journalistic understanding that Görres was following (ibid.).

According to Görres, newspapers should "externally free and unfettered, lead the word about the public opinion: Tribunes should represent the vast majority, they should be the mouth of the people and the ear of the prince". They had recognized that "they are there for a greater purpose than just being the empty reverberation, telling what has happened in dry words". Görres was breaking with the journalistic tradition that had been the norm in Germany until then. Instead of limiting himself to just publishing news in a series of disconnected, individual reports (as we can see in chapter 4.2.1), he began to edit the reports into more coherent articles. Furthermore, he did not constrain himself to telling his own opinion and according to Wilke (2008) we can here see the origin of the editorial as an opinion-forming journalistic style.

Görres criticized the peace negotiations in Paris and the Congress of Vienna. In the beginning, RM had the political goodwill of the Prussian administration, because it sought to gain influence in Rhineland. However, Görres' agitation against France (and not only Napoleon) and repeated critique of the court in Berlin led its enforced closure in 1816. The newspaper at that time had then a print run of 3000 editions (Wilke 2008). Nevertheless, before RM was closed, it propagated the unification of Germany. In connection with this, Norway's struggle for independence became a core example for Görres.

#### 4.1.2.2 “Norway would never bloom more beautiful”

The first article on Scandinavian affairs appears in issue number 20, published on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 1814. It is based on the same logic of exchanging and compensating territories that was being asserted in HUC. The article presents a calculation that concludes that Sweden would be sufficiently compensated for the loss of Finland. “Moreover, Norway offers larger benefits through its commerce, its mines and its other features than Finland ever could”.

In number 26, published on 13<sup>th</sup> March, under the heading “Overview of the newest events”, we find the first report concerning Norway seeking independence. Unlike other newspapers, RM *explains* the logic of the events in a simple manner: when the King of Denmark renounced his status as Norway’s head of state, it gave him no right to make decisions on behalf of the independent kingdom of Norway. An assembly would decide the terms of an eventual union with Sweden.

In number 33, from 27<sup>th</sup> March, we find extracts of an article copied from Lütticher Zeitung, a newspaper published at Crown Prince Charles John’s military camp in Lüttich. In the article, a Swedish tradesman gives his account of the situation in Norway after returning from a journey. He explains that the wealthy people in particular want independence, while the farmers demand unification with Sweden. He also tells of the food shortage, which makes the situation difficult. Unlike other contemporary newspapers, RM offers an evaluation of the source, and it states that we should not believe in every part of this report: “The farmers of Norway might as well say something different”. Furthermore, the political views of Görres concerning the affairs of Scandinavia are now made clear:

“The loss of this country [Norway] has always seemed to us a very mild penalty to Denmark for its betrayal against the cause of all peoples. (...) We do not know if the common benefit and the politics of the powers absolutely demand for the unification of Sweden with this country; if it is able to protect its independence against the stronger neighbour: but we are sure that Norway would never bloom more beautiful, more glorious and stronger than when it still has its own king, and a free nation lives within its borders”.

In number 37 from 4<sup>th</sup> April, we can read a comprehensive article that, according to Görres, is based on private letters and the accounts of travellers. Görres’ enthusiasm and belief in the sovereignty of the people shines through. The Norwegian people is depicted as extremely patriotic and ready to fight for their country’s “ancient” independence. The Norwegian militia’s ability to fight is illustrated by the Battle of Kringen, where a Scottish mercenary



force was defeated. The question of whether the Norwegians want to sacrifice their blood and lives for “the holy cause of the homeland” is answered with a “hurra from thousands of voices”. Funeral music was played when the Danish flag was lowered, but was followed by exultation when the Norwegian flag was hoisted. Unconfirmed rumours about hostilities between Norwegian and Swedish forces are reported, as well as speculations that Prince Christian would marry an English princess – something that probably would have meant an alliance between Norway and England and a guarantee for Norway’s independence.

#### **4.1.2.3 National enthusiasm**

In number 46 from 23<sup>rd</sup> April, Görres gives an account of some of the military and geographical strategic features of Norway. The blockade is now noticeable in that only some Swedish reports have arrived from Norway. These claim, “the Norwegian people is almost unfamiliar with what has happened in the rest of Europe”. This probably refers to the moral truism as seen by the Swedish government – that Norway should accept to be ceded to Sweden as a deserved award for their military engagement against Napoleon on the European continent. The Norwegian army is described as famished, badly armed and without war experience; the Norwegians are outraged over the Swedish strategy of starving them out. The article describes Norway and Sweden as separated along the border by a granite mountain ridge, with only a few passes connecting the two countries. “On all other places, the country is totally inaccessible”. A web of forests, streams, lakes and moors covers the interior of the country, making it almost impossible to overpower. “Some fortresses guard the dangerous entrance points, and keep the enemy out until the short summer has passed and the cold would force him to a quick withdrawal.” Görres claims that Norway could mobilize 200,000 men, and writes, “the hatred is a powerful fighter”. He also emphasizes the advantage that Norway does not have a nobility, which could have “restrained the power of the nation” through differing interest. “It is all farmers and burghers”. This, Görres believes, makes “the suppression of this country very dubious, and without the active cooperation of England hardly possible”.

In number 52, from 5<sup>th</sup> May, Görres reports that the enthusiasm in Norway is still high, and that 66,000 men have flocked to the borders. It is even reported that Prince Christian had to order most of them to return, because he did not need so many. However, 15,000 Swedish soldiers are reported to have been sent to the border and their enthusiasm for

conquering Norway is said to be as strong. Görres is obviously aware “that the destiny of Norway depends on England”. Letters he has received state that the Norwegian representatives have been rejected at the English court, and that a blockade has been put into effect.

In number 57 from 15<sup>th</sup> May, Görres rejects a rumour that a Nordic king is going to abdicate. He argues that in some Nordic countries, this is not sufficient, “as we have seen in Norway”.

On 27<sup>th</sup> May, in number 63, the articles of the new Norwegian constitution are published. The report is rounded off with the comment: “In silent agreement only one voice goes through all Nations from the North to the deep South, where the King of Naples at least appears to be willing to give his people a similar constitution”.

#### 4.1.2.4 “Trading peoples as goods”

In number 78 from 27<sup>th</sup> June we find the poem “*Stimme der Zeit*”, or “Voice of the time”, which is very supportive of German unification and the sovereignty of the nation-state. It mentions both Spain and England, but also Norway. This shows that the political situation in Norway interested people very distant from Norway - and even inspired them to write poems.

Jetzt hört man Stimmen wehen  
Vom fernen Norden her,  
Wo Norwegs Felsen stehen  
Als heil'ge Freiheits-Wehr.  
Uralte Wälder rauschen,  
Es spricht der Nordsee Fluth:  
Man soll nicht Völker tauschen  
Wie schnödes Geld und Gut.

An English translation of this poem would be:

Now we hear voices blowing  
From the far north,  
Where Norway's mountains stand  
As holy defence for freedom  
Ancient forests rush,  
It speaks of the North Sea flood:  
One should not trade Peoples  
As simple cash and goods.

Just like in *The Examiner*, where the cession of Norway was compared with cattle trading between the more powerful states Denmark and Sweden, this poem acts as an answer to the dynastic-absolutist perception of the international system, where the nation-state had not yet become the main political entity.

In number 79, from 29<sup>th</sup> June, we again find normal news reports. This time, the source is the Norwegian newspaper *Tiden*, which can announce that Norway has a one-year supply of food and ammunition, that the Norwegian navy has taken many valuable prizes; and that 30,000-40,000 men now are under the command of the newly elected king. Görres seems to believe that the new state will survive.

On 16<sup>th</sup> August, in number 103, the Norwegian affair takes up the whole front page under the heading “Overview of the newest events”. Reports about the on-going war have marked the pages of the “mainstream” newspapers over the previous few days, and now the conflict is thoroughly discussed in RM. The introduction to the article shows that the latest developments come as no surprise and that there is a clear belief in the possibility of an independent Norwegian state:

“In Norway, the negotiations has, as predicted, collapsed because there is a strong will in the people to maintain its independence, and because Christian would not act on his own without the consent of the parliament. In the occasion of these negotiations one have from Norway’s side in the following way disputed Denmark’s authority to cede [Norway], and on the contrary put forward the People’s right to independence”.

The article presents the following line of argument, probably inspired or copied from a Norwegian text, placing the nation on equal terms with a human being: no human being is allowed to call himself the owner of another human being, not even the mother is the owner of her child. It has come into existence from her, but as a human being; a being that cannot become another’s property without willpower. It is a moral being, and through its own insights it has its own will. To take possession over human beings without their will must be considered kidnapping. It is thus argued that sovereignty arises out of the people, that the people of Denmark has given the King of Denmark a certain amount of authority, but the king has granted himself authority in Norway, it has not been granted by the Norwegian people. He therefore cannot take decisions concerning the people of Norway. Furthermore, it is argued that *Lex Regia*, the king’s law from 1665, which establishes the absolute powers of the King of Denmark, does allow for “trading people as goods”, although he (the king) does not wish to govern them (the people) may disclaim them.” Every people that is abandoned by

its sovereign is then free and can decide for itself under which terms it would give the regent's office to someone else, it is argued. "This is the judgment of the public opinion in that country", Görres continues. He states that because one has not been able to unite peacefully, the People is preparing to "assert this chapter of international law", and God will judge when the humans cannot conciliate.

#### **4.1.2.5 Christian Frederick "betraying the people"**

In number 111 (1<sup>st</sup> September), Görres has lost his belief that Norway will succeed in sustaining its independence. He writes that the Kingdom of Sicily has experienced a "constitutional farce", and that there is an "abominable spirit" in these times: "constitution, institution, basic rules, customs, religion, everything is painted in perspective on the coulisse. With only one sign given to the stagehand, the stage is quickly transformed; the theatre shows another scene and the same people, in different costumes, play a new role on the new stage, switching from one play to another." The same spirit has prevailed in Norway, and has led to the rapid renunciation of the prince. Görres expresses disappointment about Prince Christian giving up and argues that the people will feel betrayed. "When one is leading the cause so badly and wants to give it up so hastily, then one would rather abstain from doing it". At least, the people has gained an advantage in that it has won respect for its courage and decisiveness; that one negotiates with it on equal terms; and that the country is not united with another as a ceded province, Görres concludes.

#### **4.1.2.6 Conclusion**

Rheinischer Merkur was one of the most outspoken newspapers supporting the idea of the sovereignty of the people in the German states. The representation of the events in Norway clearly falls within the national-liberal popular sovereignty representation. Although Görres' thinking takes into account the geopolitical realities of the redistribution of territories as a sort of punishment for Denmark having taken side with Napoleon in the war, he questions whether it is necessary – and in the King of Denmark's power – to transfer Norway to Sweden. He rejects the claim that an absolute sovereign can have divine rights and that a ruler is authorised to give a part of his country, with the nation that belongs to it, to another king. In this respect he presents a version of the argument of the cattle metaphor: that a people cannot be traded as goods. He projects the idea of popular sovereignty, whereby the people

should decide, and when the Norwegian People resists the unification with Sweden, in his view, that should be respected. The internal divide in Norway is not mentioned, and Görres instead gives a representation of a nation that wants to fight for its “ancient independence”. He even uses arguments about Norway as a natural unit, saying that its geography indicates that it should be independent from Sweden. Just like *The Examiner*, Görres expresses his discontent with Christian Frederick for having given up the struggle for Norwegian independence, while recognizing that Norway is now in a better position as regards a possible union with Sweden.

## 4.1.3 Gazette de Lausanne

### 4.1.3.1 Introduction

The first edition of this French-language newspaper was issued in Lausanne in 1798 under the name *Peuple Vaudois*. The title *Gazette de Lausanne* (GDL) was adopted in 1803. This was one of the precursors of the liberal newspaper *Le Temps*, the most important French-language newspaper in Switzerland today. The founder and editor of the GDL was the Swiss lawyer and notary Gabriel-Antoine Miéville from Lausanne. As supporter of the ideas of the French revolution, he participated in the famous celebration *Banquet des Jordils* in 1791 to commemorate the two-year anniversary of the storming of the Bastille. Here he proposed a toast “à la grande nation!” - an act that led to his conviction by the government in Bern and five years of detention at the *Inselspital*, the city’s hospital (Verein der Schweizer Presse 1896: 404). In this way the government tried to label revolutionary ideas as mental illness. However, Miéville became a representative at the provisional assembly in 1798, following the French occupation and the introduction of the Helvetic Republic (Sardet 2008). In the same year he founded the newspaper, since Helvetia (1798-1803) was the first state to postulate freedom of the press guaranteed by the constitution. The Period of Mediation (1803-1814) brought a partial return to the customs of the Ancien Régime, especially in the area of press freedom and censorship (Höchli 2010: 68-69). Although pre- and post-censorship were both reintroduced, and critical publishing was nowhere to be seen, the GDL communicated every piece of information it could get its hands on regarding the affairs of Norway. Although the

newspaper did not express political views as clearly as for example the RM, for example, it repeatedly characterized what was taking place in Norway as a revolution.

#### 4.1.3.2 “Norway continues its revolution”

On 25<sup>th</sup> January (no. 7), the GDL publishes a brief report on the peace treaty of Kiel and states in one simple sentence: “Le Dannemarck cède la Norwège”. On 15<sup>th</sup> March (no. 21) there is an article saying: “from Norway we learn,” that the citizens are grateful to the King of Denmark “for the happiness they have enjoyed under his rule”, but that the situation in which the country finds itself does not give him the right to the freedom of the people. Therefore, a congress will be assembled where the terms of a union with Sweden will be decided upon. On 22<sup>nd</sup> March (no. 23) a report on Norway says that, “Prince Christian is still in the kingdom, and his presence served as a pretext for the unrest that erupted there”.

On 22<sup>nd</sup> April (no. 32) an article explains the events that have taken place in Norway over the last few months: “Norway continues its revolution. Prince Christian, who was to be proclaimed sovereign, has preferred for the nation to proclaim itself constitutionally at the general assembly which opens on 10<sup>th</sup> April. One has temporarily formed a council of state composed of 17 members. In Sweden, one is also convinced that the conduct of the prince is coordinated with the Danish government”. On 29<sup>th</sup> April (no. 34) the newspaper simply informs that: “It is said that the Crown Prince of Sweden will leave Paris shortly to go back to Sweden and settle the affairs of Norway”.

On 10<sup>th</sup> May (no. 37) another article on Norway is published, referring to letters and proclamations from Prince Christian Frederick: “While France and Germany are ensuring their political tranquility, the North is stirring again. Prince Christian of Denmark, who is accepting the regency of Norway, felt obliged to communicate to his court, with the document below, the reasons for his decision.” Then follows a passage that is ascribed to Prince Christian Frederick:

“You were forced to cede your right to the throne of Norway, in favour of the King of Sweden. You ordered me to surrender the fortresses of the country, to leave my post and return to Denmark. It was my duty not to obey these orders. You have freed the people of its oath; thus it is surrendered to itself, and is not required to bend, against its will, the head under the yoke.”

Furthermore, the article cites another passage, also ascribed to the Prince: “I have probed the spirit of the nation. The universal cry is: rather die than become Swedish. It is my high calling

to save a free people from oppression and, as regent of Norway I will defend their rights. Heaven bless my efforts, I will do what is right.” Finally it states: “Norway, united with Sweden, would sooner or later procure Denmark. Now, the Danish states are guaranteed on their side, and your majesty has a true friend in me.”

“While Prince Christian thus agitates Norway, Mr. Counselor Anker was sent to London to interest the British cabinet in his revolution; but his mission was without success.” The article says that the British has guaranteed the cession of Norway to Sweden, and would send envoys to him which would “prompt the execution of the Treaty of Kiel”, declare their determination to fulfil their duty towards their ally. It says that the prince would have to “judge his position and see the abyss into which he would lead the people astray”.

#### **4.1.3.3 “All eyes are now fixed on the diet of Christiania”**

On 13<sup>th</sup> May (no. 38) the newspaper includes a summary of a letter from Frankfurt. The introduction says: “One continues to occupy oneself with the new distribution of Europe”. In a dry manner it lists how a number of different territories all around Europe have been redistributed between princes. Interestingly, the cession of Norway from Denmark to Sweden is actually mentioned first. This interest in the Norwegian affair is also expressed in the following issue from 17<sup>th</sup> May (no. 39), which features an article explaining the factions of Norwegian politics, including those who want a democratic constitution and national sovereignty.

The GDL from 24<sup>th</sup> May (no. 41) cites a pamphlet which contains an article from Bremen, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May: “All the letters we have received about Norway teaches us that this country is continuing its efforts to gain its independence.” The article says that the Danish government is trying to change the Norwegian people’s aversion against Swedish domination through Admiral Steen Bille, but that one can tell in advance that this will not succeed. The Norwegians “will not sacrifice their independence” to save the German provinces. Moreover, it says that “the prince to whom they have entrusted their defence belongs to this house, fertile in heroes, who occupy the thrones of the north,” and, “it must be added that Prince Christian, aged only 28, is noted for his brilliant qualities” and that his virtues and his talents have earned him the affection of both Danes and Norwegians, and it is being complained about the separation of the two Kingdoms.

On 31<sup>st</sup> May (no. 43) the following article was published, based on a letter from Frankfurt:

“The Swedish party and the Republican Party have completely fallen in Norway, and their leaders have been arrested. A constitution has definitely been adopted, conferring the crown to Prince Christian of Norway. A legislative body has been appointed, and the independence of the people is solemnly proclaimed. The King of Denmark has spoken out against this revolution to remove all doubts by decree as of the 12th of this month, all communication with Norway, through any other route than through Sweden, is hereby prohibited.”

On 21<sup>st</sup> June (no. 49) it is reported that Prince Christian Frederick has become the elected King of Norway. On June 28th (no. 51), letters from Germany report that the commissioners of the allied powers have “unnecessarily” presented themselves on the border of Norway. “The new king wondered if they had letters of credence to him, and by their negative response their passports were denied,” the article says.

On 12<sup>th</sup> July (no. 55) it is reported that the commissioners to Norway have left Denmark and it is commented that: “We must hope that the mediation between the most powerful princes of Europe will determine the people and the prince himself to submit (...). In case they would refuse, they would expose themselves to being completely cut off from Europe”. On 19<sup>th</sup> July (no. 57) it is stated that “All eyes are now fixed on the diet of Christiania, which will decide the fate of the kingdom”.

#### **4.1.3.4 Speculations on alliances and redistribution of territory**

The relatively free conditions under which the GDL operated are best illustrated by its publication of rumours concerning the royals and nobility of the Nordic countries. Nothing similar is to be found in other newspapers – or at least not to this extent. On 2<sup>nd</sup> August (no. 61) an article claims that the marriage between Prince Christian of Norway and Princess Charlotte of Wales is completely settled. The Prince would retain Norway and be declared the heir to the Swedish crown. The children of this marriage would be entitled to the throne of England but not to those of Sweden and Norway, which would be reserved for the son from the marriage between the Prince and the princess of Mecklenburg. He, along with his brother Prince Ferdinand, would renounce the throne of Denmark. In exchange, the line of Prince Ferdinand would inherit Norway, if the elder line died out. Furthermore, the article speculates that the hereditary Prince of Oldenburg would marry Princess Caroline of



Denmark and succeed that throne, and elaborates on how other territories in Northern Germany would be redistributed between different princes. The most spectacular suggestion however, is that the Crown Prince of Sweden, Charles John, and his son would renounce their succession to the Swedish throne and receive compensation in form of the crown of Naples if the “current owner” were to receive sufficient remuneration. The son of the late King of Sweden would receive his in Germany, against the renouncement of his rights to the throne. The Congress of Vienna was to sanction these changes. The rumours were far from guaranteed, the article says, but they circulated in Germany. A footnote in the same article provides a piece of personal information that has not been brought up anywhere else: Prince Christian Frederick divorced princess Charlotte Fredericke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1810, and they had a six-year-old son.

Another interesting article appear on 5<sup>th</sup> August (no. 62). Under the heading “Norwège” this article says the commissionaires from the allied powers have met representatives of the Norwegian diet and told them that they would prefer to see that Norway unite with Sweden, and that in such a case, she (Sweden) will guarantee the constitution that Norway has given itself. The Danish commissioner urges the Norwegians to be loyal and follow the last order of their former sovereign. The article cites the president of the diet on a number of arguments concerning, for example, Norway’s “ancient right to chose its own sovereign” and its demand to be allowed to be represented by a plenipotentiary at the Congress of Vienna. Furthermore, it is reported that there have been a number of secret meetings between the representatives of the various countries, but neither the object nor the result is known. The article also reports a rumour that England will undertake Sweden with some colonial concessions, in order to renounce its claims on Norway. Prince Christian Frederick, “the acknowledged king of Norway and Denmark” would then marry Princess Charlotte, the heiress of Great Britain. This arrangement would give England a large preponderance in the North. Furthermore, the GDL communicates rumours from Norwegian newspapers, accusing the Crown Prince of Sweden of having had a secret correspondence with Napoleon in February.

#### **4.1.3.5 “Prince Christian sacrificed himself for the sake of Norway”**

When the news of the Swedish attack on Norway reaches the GDL on 23<sup>rd</sup> August (no. 67) the newspaper states that all the news about Norway is full of contradictions. “The only point

on which they agree is the conquest of the island of Kragerø”. The subsequent issues publish the proclamations from Crown Prince Charles John, in addition to the Bulletin from Westgard, which we know from other newspapers as well. On 2<sup>nd</sup> September (no. 70), after the updates on the latest developments of the military campaign in Norway, we find an extensive footnote, which is introduced thus: “When Norway is the theatre of a new war, some features of its inhabitants will not be devoid of interest.” The footnote, which is in fact an article in itself, originates from Journal de l’Empire: it is in fact the geographical article written by Conrad Malte-Brun. This is not stated anywhere in the newspaper, but this is yet another example that shows that this newspaper belongs among the liberal ones.

On 6<sup>th</sup> September (no. 71) it is reported that Prince Christian Frederick has abdicated. The following number (72, 9<sup>th</sup> September) provides more details about how the warfare in Norway developed, and says that “In this situation Prince Christian sacrificed himself for the sake of Norway, and to defend the rights of the people, renounced his rights to the crown of Denmark, and decided to offer the Crown Prince the following agreement, signed on August 14 at Moss. The first point was his resignation of the crown of Norway.” After citing 11 points of the treaty, the article says:

“It is likely that Sweden will accept the Norwegian constitution, except a small number of changes. This constitution, more democratic than that of Sweden, leaves the sovereign power precarious and defends the establishment of a hereditary monarchy (...). If it is maintained, Norway will be more or less united to Sweden, as Hungary is to Austria.”

Issue number 73 (13<sup>th</sup> September) contains the letters between Prince Christian and Crown Prince Charles John. “The following letters, which were written before the convention which established the fate of Norway, are barely known, and they are of great interest for the history of its revolutions”. On 28<sup>th</sup> September (no. 86) it is reported that the Russian general Suchtelen arrived at the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Sweden, to offer the congratulations from his sovereign on the successful outcome of the affairs of Norway. The article says that it is believed that the diet will issue a decree that will unite Norway with Sweden “and put an end to its revolutions”.

#### **4.1.3.6 Conclusion**

The representation of the Norwegian affairs in the GDL also forms a part of the popular sovereignty representation. The difference between the GDL and both from The Examiner

and the RM, however, is that the GDL held on to the more traditional enlightenment style by not expressing its own political views explicitly and by reporting and citing sources from different sides of the conflict. The coverage of the GDL demonstrates a perception of the international society that combines both modern and traditional features. The newspaper does not put a lot of effort into the discussion of whether the King of Denmark can cede Norway to Sweden. The GDL projects a view that a revolution has broken out because the Norwegians do not want to be united with Sweden. Although much emphasis is put on the importance of the sovereignty of the people, it does not set aside the importance of the (elected) king of Norway. The newspaper's analysis is that Norway will not succeed to become independent without the support of England, and speculates that an alliance would be made the old-fashioned way, through royal marriage. Furthermore, the question of Norwegian independence could be solved by further redistribution of territories, for example by giving Crown Prince Charles John the crown of Naples instead. Why Norway's independence and the Norwegian people's right to choose their own king should be given more emphasis than that of other peoples, the newspaper does not give any answer to.

## 4.1.4 Journal des débats and Journal de l'Empire

### 4.1.4.1 Introduction

*Journal des Débats* (JDB) is considered one of the most important politically and intellectually important press organs of the restoration period in France. Published for the first time shortly after the Estates-General of 1789, it contained the exact record of the debates of the national assembly. From 1799 onwards it became a political newspaper. It changed title several times, due to changing regimes. During the First Empire (1804-1814) the newspaper's editor Louis-François Bertin opposed Napoleon and he was therefore forced to quit, with a new title being imposed on the newspaper: *Journal de l'Empire* (JDE). From 1811 the newspaper was taken over by the government (Bertsch 2005; Jakoby 1988). By this time there were only four newspapers in Paris (Kovarik 2011: 37).

Understandably, coverage of the political situation in Norway was not the top priority of the French newspapers in early 1814, whether the publication was run privately or by the government. Napoleon was defeated and later forced to abdicate in April that year. However,

we do find some reports on what is occurring on in Scandinavia. On 27<sup>th</sup> January, London newspapers are cited in reports that negotiations between Denmark and Sweden had collapsed, and that the fighting continued. It then falls silent about Scandinavia for several weeks. News about Norway's independence was first published on 8<sup>th</sup> March. Below the heading "Nouvelles Etrangères" on the front page, a report from the London newspaper *The Courier* was cited together with another letter from London. "The Norwegians are determined to become independent; there are 22.000 men at the borders, and every peasant across the whole of Norway has armed himself". Additionally the report says, "le gouvernement norvégien" have declared that it will wage war against any nation that trespasses its border, but that "its only desire is to remain neutral and a friend of all nations."

#### **4.1.4.2 Norwegian independence for the greater good of Scandinavia**

The main person responsible for this column, "Nouvelles Etrangères", was the Danish-French geographer and journalist Malthe Conrad Brun - in the French publications only known as Malte-Brun (Bredal 2011: 404). He had come to Paris as a refugee, after having provoked the King of Denmark with his revolutionary ideas, and started writing for *JDE* in 1804. Malte-Brun was one of the forerunners of Scandinavism (Clausen 1900: 10), an ideological and political movement that would blossom in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Hemstad 2008). Malte-Brun's political project was to reunite Scandinavia. Denmark, Norway and Sweden should again become one kingdom, as they were during the Kalmar Union, and this realm should form an alliance with Napoleon's new empire. This was the main motivation for his joining Napoleon on his campaign during the winter of 1813-1814 as a journalist for the *JDE*. Malte-Brun wanted to convince Napoleon to go north, reunite the Scandinavian countries and thereby obtain the key to European dominion as a "roman-gothic emperor". By 1804 he had formed the *Association Coloniale Scandinave* together with a group of Scandinavians in Paris, whose main goal was to put a Danish king on the Swedish throne. As Denmark was already allied with Napoleon, the association did everything in their power to prevent Napoleon's former general, and now enemy, Jean-Baptiste Bernadotte from becoming the new Swedish prince. Malte-Brun and his association bombarded the Parisian press with propaganda bashing away at the French candidate to the Swedish throne. A Scandinavian battle was therefore lost for Malte-Brun, when Bernadotte was elected prince in 1810 (Bredal 2011: 332-336; Friis 1898: 272-273).

However, Malte-Brun continued to argue that a union formed from the Scandinavian nations would be “the best-constructed political society in Europe,” and that the three nations would complement each other: “Though the Danes may lack vigor, the Swedes constancy, and the Norwegians education, these deficiencies would compensate for one another if these nations were united.” With friends “on both shores”, i.e. on the Cimbrian and the Scandinavian peninsula, he claimed to have “completely and solemnly renounced all national prejudices.” Malte-Brun’s general political principle was, according to himself: “Think of the good of Scandinavia!” (Malte-Brun 1814c)

When it was decided, with the Treaty of Kiel, that Denmark would have to cede Norway to Sweden in 1814, Malte-Brun evidently lost another battle. A forced marriage between Norway and Sweden would not support his dream of a united Scandinavia. On the contrary, he saw that it would work out to be extremely counterproductive. He therefore changed his intellectual take on the situation: each of the three states of Scandinavia had to be independent and be on equal terms in order for the new Scandinavian union to be realized. He argues that “the Norwegian revolution” is neither the work of one single party, nor a plot hatched with Denmark, and defends that when the King of Denmark resigned, the people of Norway had the right to choose their own king, as a consequence of the sovereignty of the people: “Grotius believes that subjects are not duty bound to obey a king who wishes relinquish the throne, and who they may even wage war against him.” Malte-Brun even uses the cattle-trade argument: “Peoples cannot be traded as if they were national goods, because a monarchy is not a patrimony, it is a usufruct. No portion of a State can be lawfully ceded without the consent of its subjects, those in both the part to be ceded and the remaining part.” (Malte-Brun 1814c).

#### **4.1.4.3 Drawing a romantic picture of Norway and its people**

On 16<sup>th</sup> March, 1814, the JDE features the first part of a series of articles by Malte-Brun named *Sur la Norwège et les Norwégiens*, propagating for Norway’s independence. The introduction states that “Norway is a unique country in Europe” and that, “the nation that inhabits it has conserved an ancient civilization”. Furthermore, the article says “this nation has, by an impulse we expected and predicted, placed itself among the number of independent states”. This was the reason why it was now time to give an authentic notice drawn from the many topographies that had appeared in the same country, argues the author.

The first part describes the Norwegian landscape, fauna, the northern light and the climate through different seasons. It also mentions the country's geology and the deposits of metals and minerals. The second part considers other resources, such as forests, fruits, wild and household animals, the rich fisheries and trade in exotic goods. Towards the end a brief description of cultural and intellectual life in Norway is presented. Malte-Brun states that even though "the germs of corruption" have become visible in the cities, "the people of the countryside have preserved their energy and national loyalty." and that these people "deserve to be devoted a separate article".

The third and last article in the series talks about the people of Norway. It begins by stating that, "In all countries of the world, the inhabitants of the country are the mass of the nation, and yet the idea of a kind of political and moral nullity endeavours on behalf of all farmers. It is only in Switzerland, the Tyrol, in the north of Sweden and Norway, that the farmers have consistently maintained the exercise of all rights of a citizen, and as a natural consequence, the dignity of man." Malte-Brun emphasizes that the nobility were small, and that the traces of feudalism were becoming increasingly rare, "and in the end it would disappear". The further description of the Norwegian people, or more precisely the Norwegian farmer, is highly romanticised. He is described as a person with a lot of "wit and vivacity". He is "loyal and energetic", "he respects his superiors", and "he loves with enthusiasm his country and his sovereign". Furthermore he reports that "Many farmers, especially in the high valleys, claim - probably with good reason, - to be descended from the ancient kings". He also uses some space on explaining the ancient Norwegian system of *odelsrett*. and how it "attaches the farmers to the soil of birth". In the conclusion of the article, Malte-Brun states that Norway is smaller than Sicily in terms of population, with less than a million inhabitants, but that the value of its exports exceeds that of Sicily manifold. Therefore, "Norway's crown weighs more in the balance of Europe than that of Sicily". He concludes that, "A nation endowed with so many excellent qualities, placed in a situation favourable to independence, merits to interest all enlightened minds and all hearts in general."

## 4.1.5 Le Spectateur

### 4.1.5.1 Introduction

When Napoleon abdicated on 4<sup>th</sup> April, 1814, his empire ceased to exist – and so did the empire’s newspaper. Nonetheless, it re-emerged almost immediately under its old title *Journal des Débats*. Its former editor Louis-François Bertin regained possession of it, and continued to support the royalist cause. Malte-Brun did not take part in this transformation, although he had become a royalist. He had hailed emperor Napoleon and his victories so many times that he could not simply appear in the same columns as an adherent to the restored king Louis XVIII. That would damage both his and the newspaper’s credibility. He therefore established a new publication on his own, *Le Spectateur ou Variétés Historique, Littéraires, Critiques, Politiques et Morales* (Bredal 2011: 337-339).

During the momentous months of May to September, *Journal des Débats* mentioned or published reports about Norway in over 50 issues. However, similar to many other newspapers of the time, it sought to present an “impartial” or “objective” version of events. There were no more colourful, descriptive articles about the mythical country far up in the north, such as those Malte-Brun had written. The affairs of Norway were henceforth covered through the direct reproduction or summaries of letters and proclamations, with almost no attempt to analyse the situation. Because the JDB’s coverage was very similar to that of the HUC and the OEB, I do not find it necessary to make a more elaborate analysis of it here. I will, however, look closer at how Malte-Brun continued to argue for his Scandinavianist cause in his own weekly newspaper, *Le Spectateur*. It is not clear how large the print run of *Le Spectateur* was, but it was probably fairly small. Although the publication only survived for a year, it is interesting enough fact in itself that Malte-Brun was permitted to continue to publish his thoughts on a united Scandinavia even after the regime change in France.

### 4.1.5.2 “A counterweight to the English dominance of the sea”

Many noted Malte-Brun’s change of political course, from supporting Napoleon to supporting the king, and he was therefore ridiculed by a long article in the *Dictionnaire des Girouettes* – the “Encyclopedia of Weathercocks”. The concept is very basic: People are being cited on what they said before, during and after Napoleon, spiced up with some scornful

comments. The accusation of being a weathercock apparently also comes from Sweden. Below the heading, "*Statement by the Editor on his involvement in the affairs of the North*" (Malte-Brun 1814b), he writes that he has just received a pamphlet, which appears to have been printed in Sweden, and which has been distributed to all of the capitals of the North. Among other things, it tells Norwegians, "not to trust those who, under the pretext of defending Norway's liberty, wanted to bring in the troops of Napoleon, their idol and master; those Scandinavians who are now doing their utmost to stop the union of the Scandinavian peoples when it was they who instigated it."

The finger is pointed at Malte-Brun, and he finds it necessary to refute the accusations. He begins by stating that:

"having never received from Emperor Napoleon, nor his ministers, in any place, any special treatment, nor any form of payment, having always lived honourably from the product of my work, I have never supported the French government apart from as a result of the duty imposed upon me by a just, noble and sacred cause, which I defended legitimately, and which I am far from abandoning."

In other words: although he may change his opinion about his host country's supreme leader, he will not do so with regard to his ultimate goal of a united Scandinavia.

He draws up the background of how the "misfortunes of Europe" had inspired some Danes, Norwegians and Swedes – the *Colonial Association of New Scandinavia* – to found an independent colony. He also explains how he had suggested to Napoleon that this could provide an extra counterweight to the English dominance of the sea and an extra market for French trade. Napoleon, however, did not show much enthusiasm for this project. When they were about to give it up, the death of Prince Charles August of Sweden gave renewed hope; "they saw that at that moment, without any great upheaval, the Scandinavian nations could have completely joined together under a single monarch." Malte-Brun suggested that the King of Denmark and Norway, who "descended from the same bloodline as the last four kings of Sweden" would be a good candidate for the throne. This king "even seemed to have some claim to the affection of the Swedes, since during the Finnish war he had deliberately abstained from any genuine hostility towards Sweden", writes Malte-Brun.

At that time, "Napoleon's name struck fear into the hearts of all of Europe's diplomats." Malte-Brun therefore came up with "the audacious idea", as he puts it, "of using this to the North's advantage". He wrote an article that resembled a "semi-official statement from the Imperial government", which was published in JDE. The article's message to the



Swedes was that they should choose the King of Denmark: Malte-Brun claims that England always feared the union of the Scandinavian powers in a single political system, because the closure of the Baltic Sea, an active war in the North Sea, as well as constant concerns for the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, "would be the inevitable consequences of this union." Therefore, Malte-Brun writes in the article, in 1743, the English Ambassador stopped the Diet, which had already been established by the will of the people, from electing the Crown Prince of Denmark as successor to the Swedish throne. This was only possible because England was supported by France, he argues, concluding:

"We firmly believe that Sweden's patriots are suffering today from the disastrous consequences that the English scheme of 1743 had for the tranquillity and glory of Sweden. Across the whole of the North, now only one national sentiment predominates: that of the necessity to stay closely united and remain on guard against all ideas that come from the English".

#### **4.1.5.3 Norwegian independence "in the hearts of all Scandinavians"**

Malte-Brun emphasizes how important his article was in order to "boost spirits" in the Scandinavian countries, and that a number of pamphlets appeared, discussing the prospect of uniting the Scandinavian kingdoms, which they said had been "proposed by Napoleon's semi-official journals." Even the French Chargé d'Affaires in Stockholm was convinced that the article in the *Journal de l'Empire* expressed Napoleon's intentions. Napoleon, however, repudiated this and supported Bernadotte's candidacy to become the heir of the Swedish throne. Malte-Brun suggests that Napoleon believed "all too faithfully" that he was "disarming a former enemy" and that the Swedes would in any case have too much resentment against Russia, which had conquered Finland from them. However, "Europe knows how far wrong Napoleon was in his calculations" when the new Crown Prince of Sweden made a transaction with Russia; Sweden "closely allied itself with Russia and was promised, in return for its claims on Finland, the acquisition of Norway, a country which did not belong to the party which was treating it as though it owned it". This transaction was "was null and void before the people's court of law."

Malte-Brun continues to justify why he had to continue to support Napoleon: "I sympathised, by duty and feeling, with the Norwegian cause; Napoleon's policy seemed simply to oppose the plots to take over this country; moreover, if bravery and justice failed, the *Colonial Association* naturally had to take under its wing all those Norwegians who wished to break free from Sweden; and it was still Napoleon's policy alone that could support the

*Colonial Association*. Thus, everything obliged me to support the policy of the French government.”

He states that it was his duty to encourage the Norwegians to defend their honour when they were “threatened with invasion and subjugation by a foreign power”. He writes that “I will not flatter myself by saying that I inspired part of the project that Europe is now attentively watching unfold: this project was already in everyone’s minds, in the hearts of all Scandinavians.” The project of which Malte-Brun is talking is the independence of Norway. Only when all the three countries are independent, he believes, can they form a united Scandinavia. Nevertheless, Malte-Brun writes that he wanted to do more. In February 1814 he had followed Napoleon on his campaign: “I was hoping to approach him on a battlefield to ask him to provide me with the means to go to the North, to suggest to him the idea of using the Norwegians as a means to reinstate the Gustavs on the thrones of their ancestors. This was the sure-fire way to divert the storm that was looming over Norway and send it straight towards those who had provoked it.” As it would appear, the French statesmen did not fancy the Dane’s propositions.

With respect to the situation in Norway, he draws up four possible scenarios: the Congress of Vienna could choose “to uphold the principles of justice and natural equity in Scandinavia by stopping an attack on an innocent nation”; Norway could drive away its enemy and retain its independence; or Sweden could give up “the pretence of conquering a people with whom it would have wished, with good reason, to reconcile amicably”. The fourth scenario is that Norway will be conquered. In this case, Malte-Brun writes, all the Norwegians who would like to leave the country, as granted by the Treaty of Kiel, would do so. The Colonial Association would then gain “a million brave people”. He emphasize that he does not desire, or even expect this outcome.

A united Scandinavia was Malte-Brun’s ultimate political goal, and this was therefore his “excuse” for supporting Napoleon. This article would “completely prove my unwavering loyalty to the Scandinavian cause, even during difficult times and when in a delicate position.” He writes that his opinions regarding the affairs of Norway after Napoleon’s downfall are all recorded in *Le Spectateur*: “They can dissatisfy no one except those in favour of deception and injustice. They will stand up against any scrutiny.” Malte-Brun would not allow anyone to accuse him of being a *girouette* – a weathercock who turns wherever the wind blows. Scandinavia was the greater cause – greater than Napoleon.

#### 4.1.5.4 Christian Frederick as the “Constitutional Father”

It is noteworthy that Malte-Brun – unlike *The Examiner* – weighs his words when writing in negative terms against Crown Prince Charles John and when writing about his ally Russia. On the other hand, he seems not to hold back on his apparently boundless affection for Prince Christian Frederick, which he dubs Norway’s “magnanimous and heroic monarch” (Malte-Brun 1814b) and “one of the most beautiful characters who ever adorned the annals of humankind” (Malte-Brun 1814a). The latter characteristic appears under the heading *A Moral and Literary Chronicle*. The article is devoted to the excellence of the young Prince, whose “pure judgement” was not sullied by “a shred of personal ambition”. “He wants nothing but to be the instrument of national will, the servant of his new country,” to be an “agent of the people,” Malte-Brun states. Furthermore, Christian Frederick is credited for having personally encouraged the nation’s representatives to make a constitution more liberal than those of Sweden and England. This constitution “creates a genuine representative democracy, such as could only exist in a virtuous, austere nation,” he continues, and adds that the only advice that Prince Christian deemed necessary to give the legislators of Norway was: “Protect the rights of the people!” Nonetheless, the “grateful nation” gave the Prince a “worthy reward” by offering him the “ancient throne of Harald” and he was saluted with “one unanimous cry of love and devotion”.

The only mistake that Christian Frederick made, according to Malte-Brun, was to not take advantage and attack Sweden at the first sign of spring, since “a meagre body of troops would have succeeded in re-establishing the Gustav dynasty there.” Furthermore, he committed an error by “judging the hearts of other sovereigns according to his own.” Malte-Brun claims that the monarchs of the allied powers were “embarrassed” that the treaties obliged them to support “the most unjust of causes”, and that they sent delegates to Norway in an attempt to prevent bloodshed. Christian Frederick sacrificed “all self-interest and personal glory for the good of the country,” and asked “only for a three-month armistice to give his country time to deliberate on its interests”. Nothing could be more fair in the eyes of the allies, he claims, but Bernadotte refused because “he felt that Europe’s will would be imposed, as long he gave it time.” Malte-Brun suggests that the Christian Frederick could have retreated deeper into the forests and valleys in the interior of the country and that, “a protracted war would have evened out the imbalance of weapons.” However, “this would have dragged the happy, peaceful huts of the countryside into the horrors and chaos of war.”

Malte-Brun finishes the article by attributing Christian Frederick Scandinavianist values: “Convinced that Europe's more enlightened policy would lead it to cease its oppression of Scandinavia, King Christian Frederick repeated his offers of resignation.” Furthermore, he states that Christian Frederick will be “blessed by generations to come as the founder of their liberty.” Even Sweden “will have him to thank for the addition of the liberal principles that its current constitution does not sufficiently guarantee.”

#### 4.1.5.5 The balance of Power

Under the heading *Table of the political interests of Europe*, Malte-Brun (1814d) draws a map of what he considers the political interests of the different parts of Europe to be. Below the subheading “Scandinavia” he states that, “it is in the interests of Prussia, the German Federation, Holland and England for the colossal Russian empire to encounter a barrier in the form of Scandinavia, an independent power”. This Scandinavian power would necessarily become France’s ally, and it is therefore in this country’s interest as well, he argues. The Scandinavian monarchy that Malte-Brun envisions must be “a close-knit federation of *three* Northern kingdoms and a few small neighboring territories, under various branches of their ancient, national and legitimate dynasties.” Furthermore, he ambitiously suggests that “a national congress seated in Gothenburg, the federal city, would maintain the union of these nations who (...) have no ambition but to mutually love and support one another.”

But “instead of this happy union,” he continues, “what we have is a foreign prince, a partial breakup, the beginnings of a long-running dispute, perhaps a civil war.” He argues that the policy of Crown Prince Charles John “has only made Sweden just great enough so that it can be weakened once more.” Furthermore, the loss of Finland and Pomerania has made Sweden unable to sustain itself, and much less able to provide supplies to Norway. The possession of these lands is an essential prerequisite for Scandinavian independence. Now, Norway and Sweden have become dependent on England, and in the event of a more ambitious Russian emperor, the Scandinavian monarchy would be subjugated. Finally, Malte-Brun argues, “Self-interested politics are upsetting the balance of Europe” while “Justice and the will of nations, on the other hand, are the guarantee of genuine stability, a sustainable state of affairs.”

Malte-Brun is not only an early Scandinavianist, he is also an early representative of an anti-Russian sentiment – the perception of “the Russian threat” – that would develop in

Norway and Sweden in the decades following 1814 (Berg 2001). As Nielsen (2001) suggested, Russia was perceived as the bulwark of reaction with its autocratic system of government, and with a tsar all set to move in and suppress progressive movements in the West. In his text about the Russian-Norwegian relationship, Nielsen asks whether Russia could have played a part in Norwegian nation-building as “the constituting other”, as Neumann (1993) would have put it. Nielsen’s conclusion is that it could not. However the “othering” continued as long as Norwegians engaged in forms of nationalism that required a larger community, such as Scandinavism. Malte-Brun was clearly also under the influence of the Swedish fear of Russia, after Finland was conquered in 1809.

#### **4.1.5.6 Conclusion**

Malte-Brun stands for the popular sovereignty representation in his writings in *Journal des débats*, *Journal de l’Empire* and *Le Spectateur*. He embraced the arguments that people could not be traded as goods, and that a nation should decide its own destiny. Malte-Brun is perhaps one of the most interesting individuals who treated the question of Norwegian independence in 1814 because he regarded this independence as necessary in order to reach the ultimate goal of a united Scandinavia. This entity would then, in Malte-Brun’s imagination, become an ally with France and work as a counterweight to England and Russia. He draws a romantic picture of the Norwegian farmer and projects a view of the Norwegian independence struggle as something that is rooted in the Norwegian people. Christian Frederick is presented as a “servant” of the country and an “instrument” of the people’s will. Although he stepped down, both Norwegians and Swedes will be grateful for generations for the liberal constitution he gave them, according to Malte-Brun.

## 4.2 The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation

### 4.2.1 Deutsche Blätter

#### 4.2.1.1 Introduction

Like the *Rheinischer Merkur*, *Deutsche Blätter* was a political newspaper that emerged during the short phase of press freedom that followed the defeat of Napoleon. Blessed with a privilege from the Austrian field marshal and supreme commander of the allied forces, the Prince of Schwarzenberg, the first issue of DB was published only a couple of days before the battle of Leipzig on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 1813. The newspaper was a strong agitator against the Napoleonic occupation forces, not only because of its privilege and the censorship, but also because the population had suffered under the occupation and the anti-French sentiment. The print run was about 4000 issues at the beginning, in 1813, but decreased to about 1500 issues in 1816 (Ufer 2000: 182).

The founding editor of DB, Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, belonged to the “reform-liberal elite” of Leipzig, and the political ideas that he communicated through DB clearly show the contradictory stance of this group. As Peter Ufer (2000, 184) writes, they must have had an impression of a crisis in the political institutions, of which the outcome was unclear. “The crisis provoked numerous, often diffuse, often contradictory expectations concerning the implementation of necessary reforms, of modernization of German political relations” (Vierhaus 1987: 251; cited in Ufer 2000: 184).

These contradictions are expressed in several ways. Firstly, Brockhaus promoted a unitary Germany, but refused the formation of a nation-state. Secondly, he made bourgeois demands (such as the freedom of trade and industries, consistent laws, the abolition of the prerogatives of the aristocracy, and freedom of the press), but at the same time he entrusted the leadership of the state to the nobility. Thirdly, he criticized the princes in detail, but rejected any alteration of the state with the help of the people (Ufer 2000, 184). In his treatment of the Norwegian question, this is apparent, as he refuses the sovereignty of the people and propagates that the people should follow orders from the kings and the princes.

#### 4.2.1.2 Norway must “submit to the Rights of the Victor”

The cession of Norway from Denmark to Sweden is not doubted at any point, in contrast to in the RM, and the cession is perceived as a natural consequence of the events leading up to the Treaty of Kiel. Brockhaus is clearly grateful for Sweden and Crown Prince Charles John’s efforts against Napoleon and his allies: In issue number 109, published on April 2, he comes with a statement that indicates that he was content about Denmark’s loss of Norway, that this would fortify the Swedish state and that it meant the end of Sweden’s immediate ambitions on the European continent.

In issue number 142, under the heading “Napoleon’s resignation”, Brockhaus clearly shows that he is aware of what is going on in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America, and in the “American free states”. Furthermore he states that, “Norway shows the same spirit that Europe admired by Spain and Portugal: it will only have the government it has given itself.” However, he points out, few European governments would find this acceptable as Denmark has sent its troops against Napoleon, as Sweden has already done.

Brockhaus’ major confrontation with the ideas of Norwegian independence appears in an extensive essay, titled *Die neue Staatenordnung von Europa nach dem Pariser Frieden*, published as a series throughout several editions of DB. Through more than ten pages of issue number 166, published on 4<sup>th</sup> August, the idea of an independent Norway is thoroughly discussed. He starts by stating that “the Norwegian people has brought up a big issue in international law”. He explains how Norway only recognizes one article of the Treaty of Kiel, i.e. that the country is free from Denmark, but not the other article, that the country has been ceded to Sweden. Three questions are then asked, and quickly answered:

“Is Norway an individual state, so that Denmark cannot decide over its political affairs without its consent? Furthermore, have Denmark or Sweden violated Norway’s primordial rights, which are raised above all principles of the state? Finally, does the nature entitle the land of Norway political independence? We believe that we have to negate all of these questions.”

Brockhaus argue that Norway and Denmark were first united in the Calmar Union, then through another alliance in 1450. In 1536 King Christian III and the Sovereign Council decided that Norway should no longer have status as an individual kingdom, but as a province subordinate to Denmark. Norway lost its Sovereign Council, and was henceforth governed by a Danish governor. Nevertheless, the king retained the title, King of Norway, and described it as a separate kingdom in treaties with other powers. Norway was also mentioned as a separate,

inheritable kingdom to Denmark in *Lex Regia* of 1661. Through the adaptation of this law, all sovereign powers were transferred to the king and the realm was turned into an absolutist hereditary monarchy. “During the last year,” Brockhaus writes, “as the cession of Norway to Sweden publicly came up as a suggestion several times, there came no objections from the Norwegian side, but Norway was calmed down by the statements of its king, whose voice was regarded as decisive”. Furthermore, Brockhaus argues that Norway aided Denmark in its alliance with France in the war against England, Russia and Sweden – and consequently participated in the fight for suppression against the independence of all people, without being willing to save itself from blockade and famine through an act of independence. If the king of Denmark and Norway, with his unlimited powers, could declare war, could he also make peace. Thus, Norway must recognize the Treaty of Kiel’s point of being ceded to Sweden, just as the point about being free from Denmark. Accordingly, Norway must “submit to the Rights of the Victor”, Brockhaus says to conclude this part of the essay, before posing another question.

“Has the King of Denmark ceded more rights over Norway to Sweden than he possessed, or has the King of Sweden on his own expanded the rights that he received?” Here Brockhaus is referring to the fifth article of the Treaty of Kiel, and to two declarations from the King of Sweden, which promise the Norwegians that they will have their own constitution, representation and management of their own finances, and that the debt and income of Sweden and Norway shall be kept separate. In this way, Norway acquires more rights than it possessed under the Danish government. It would transform from a subordinate province, which only had the name of a kingdom, to a free kingdom unified with Sweden under one king. “In this manner, Sweden has emphatically recognized the primordial rights of the Norwegian people and done more than it was obliged to do according to the established positive constitutional and international laws of Europe.” Thus, Brockhaus can envision an (almost) independent Norwegian state, but he would prefer that the people stay away from the altering of the state and leave it to the statesmen. With the French experience fresh in mind, he is, as many of his time, clearly sceptical about what a popular uprising can cause.

#### **4.2.1.3 A Natural bond tying Norway and Sweden together**

“Does nature give the Norwegians promises of independence? So little as any in a fortress that is in an eternal state of siege”, according to Brockhaus, who claims that nature has denied



Norway three substances that no civilized people could be without: bread, wine and salt. His point of course is that Norway is not self-sufficient and is dependent on the sea imports. Therefore, his argument is that Norway cannot become independent without the support of England, which “lays the laws of the trading world”. However, England could not recognize Norway’s independence because of respect for the agreements that were already settled. In that case, what is the powerful obstacle to unification with a kingdom that is governed by free laws, together with which it builds a naturally secured peninsula, an independent force between the powers of Russia and Great Britain? Nothing but blind national hatred, Brockhaus answers his own question. Furthermore he argues that the bond of nature that ties the two kingdoms together should also become a political bond: the sea builds a natural border were the two nations, who originate from one *Urstamm* (a primordial tribe), who have related languages and share the same spirit of freedom, should live united together.

Brockhaus writes that one cannot understand why exactly the presumable successor of the King of Denmark, “an alien”, has been elected king of the Norwegians. Additionally he questions why people who are Danes by birth, or Danish officials, are present in the parliament, influencing the voice of the people. Furthermore, he argues that Norway’s independence did not originate from the people, but from the Danish stattholder, Christian Frederick.

#### **4.2.1.4 The fear of continued war in Europe**

In an extensive footnote, which constitutes in itself constituting a sort of editorial article covering over two half-pages, he expresses what is best described as frustration over how the Norwegians are acting: he simply cannot understand why the Norwegians do not want to join a union with Sweden, or how they cannot see that this is the best solution for themselves. “The King of Sweden offers Norway the pleasure of greater political rights than it has possessed under Denmark since 1661. Norway rejects this with bitterness, to become an independent state with 800,000 inhabitants that will live in eternal war with Europe!”

Brockhaus is warning that claiming national independence could lead to more wars. It is not particularly strange for him to do this, having experienced continuous warfare for several years himself, which culminated in the “battle of nations in Leipzig”. With nearly half a million soldiers of the most diverse nationalities participating, this was the largest battle in history before World War I. Although his own account of the battle, published on October

22, 1813, was very official in style by stressing individual, heroic skirmishes and providing factual information on gains and losses, he could not have been spared to witnessing the “unimaginable horror and misery” of the war (Hagemann 2009). Furthermore, Brockhaus argues that independence does not mean the absence of association with another power; it does not mean that one stands alone. Independence is to maintain one’s language, laws, and the honour as a nation. This is secured through a federation, but it is imperilled by turning to stand alone. “If all peoples, like the Norwegians, were to seek honour in having their own king and their own court, then most of Europe’s states would split up into a great number of smaller kingdoms, and the war would never have an end.” In other words, separatism is conceivable, but not perceived as viable.

He argues that King Frederick VI has the right to cede Norway in order to keep Holstein, Schleswig and Jutland. At the same time, he argues, the king has secured Norway’s rights: the country will be ceded to Sweden in the same judicial state, as it was when it was connected with Denmark. Brockhaus seems to be outraged that the Norwegians are now disobedient towards their king’s agreement, and that the Danish officials in Norway regards themselves as independent from the King of Denmark: “What is Sweden suppressing? Has Sweden suppressed Finland?” he asks rhetorically and continues by saying that “blind national hatred” has lead the people astray and “an adventurous enterprise” has lead Prince Christian astray. “Unified with Sweden, Norway is irrepressible. Without Sweden there will be war, or an uncertain peace”.

#### **4.2.1.5 Conclusion**

Although he belonged to a reform-liberal elite, Brockhaus apparently feared republican revolutions and the continuation of war in Europe. The people should stay out of state affairs, and he totally rejected popular sovereignty. Furthermore, he did not see any problem with the King of Denmark ceding Norway to Sweden, after having been an allied with Napoleon Bonaparte and lost the war. In his writings, he called on the Norwegians to obey their former king, and let the country be transferred to the King of Sweden, without resistance. As Brockhaus sees it, the Norwegians will get better rights under the Swedish king. And after all, he argues, it is nature’s will that Norway and Sweden should be united – as the Scandinavian peninsula constitutes a natural territorial entity.

## 4.2.2 Erlanger Real-Zeitung

### 4.2.2.1 Introduction

The Erlanger Real-Zeitung (ERZ) was written and edited by Johann Georg Christian Fick, a school teacher. Norway is mentioned for the first time in the ERZ as early as 4<sup>th</sup> January, 1814, when the newspaper reports that Denmark will cede the Norwegian county of Trondheim to Sweden. This is clearly a rumour, given that it comes before the Treaty of Kiel is even signed – and that it is wrong. In number 4, issued on January 14, the ERZ quotes a bulletin from the Swedish Crown Prince “in which some minor affairs with the Danes are covered”. The cession of Norway is one of these “minor affairs”, and this description clearly shows that the political affairs of Scandinavia are yet not high on the agenda. On February 1, in number 9, it is reported that the northern part of Germany will soon be liberated from the “hostage of war” and that the peace between Sweden and Denmark is confirmed. Denmark will cede the whole of Norway and is “letting 15000 soldiers march for the sake of God”. Denmark will therefore “retain their German provinces that were conquered by the Swedes” it is reported later on. Clearly, territories can change royal hands, just as in a board game.

Lütticher Zeitung, a newspaper then controlled by the Swedish Crown Prince, is cited in ERZ number 28, issued on 8<sup>th</sup> April. Under the title “The bell tolls for many”, the claim is put forward that the governor in Norway, Prince Christian Frederick, has withheld the news about the peace treaty between Sweden and Denmark. Further reports concerning Norway does not appear until in issue number 45, 7<sup>th</sup> June. A small analytical piece concludes that Denmark appears to be under pressure, as Sweden will occupy the Danish territories Holstein and Schleswig until Norway is handed over to Sweden or Prince Christian is convicted to death as a rebel. “It seems to fulfil the just penalty for Hamburg” it is stated.

### 4.2.2.2 “After long years of war and suffering, peace must finally return”

The fact that Norway is a country in the periphery is clearly stated in number 49, issued on 21<sup>st</sup> June. Below the title “In the far north” it is reported that the outbreak of war seems near, and that Sweden will keep “their Pomerania” as compensation for the effort for the conquest of Norway. Furthermore it is suggested that Swedish Pomerania could perhaps be united with Prussia, as compensation. This perception of territories as pawns in the princes’ game is made

even clearer in number 59 of the ERZ, published on 26<sup>th</sup> July. Below the heading “The Norwegian Affairs”, it is reported that if the envoys to Norway cannot make Norway’s new king resign, it is certain that “large amounts of blood will be spilled in a stubborn fight”. The ERZ concludes that, “one should have offered Prince Christian a nice independent possession in another part of Europe and ensured him the right of inheritance to the Danish crown”.

The atmosphere of war-fatigue that characterizes the population in the German states is obviously mirrored clearly in an article published on 16<sup>th</sup> August, in the ERZ number 65. Below the heading “No rose without thorns”, Norway is used as an example of how the misery of war is still spreading around Europe: “As the better half of the European humanity (...) sincerely enjoy the fact that after long years of war and suffering, peace must finally return, and with it prosperity and general improvement, reports that cannot give us any pleasure at all have arrived from two countries very distant from each other – from Spain and Norway”. What follows are excerpts from a text from the Swedish Crown Prince that has also been cited in other German newspapers: “The orders of the day”. The report ends with the following encouragement: “But reader, comfort yourself with respect to this war, which in all probability will be of a very short duration”.

The next issue, number 66, published on 19<sup>th</sup> August, contains a report citing the declaration from the allied envoys to Norway, where Prince Christian is encouraged to step down, or else be removed from the throne by force. Furthermore, the report contains the Swedish Crown Prince’s call on his soldiers, where he states that the soldiers will not rest until the unification and independence of the Scandinavian Peninsula is accomplished. It is obvious that the ERZ does not perceive Norway as an entity that could survive as a state on its own, but one that should be a subordinate territory belonging to another power.

#### **4.2.2.3 “The Scandinavian Peninsula now belongs to one master”**

A couple of weeks later, in issue 70 published on 2<sup>nd</sup> September, the news of the capitulation of Prince Christian and the peace settlement between Norway and Sweden has reached Erlangen. Under the heading “A general peace in Europe”, on the first page, the editor states: “the reports of human slaughter, of tyranny and persecution will soon be repressed, and we will only be able entertain our readers with fortunate incidents and changes. Even the war between Sweden and Norway has, to the horror of those who rather read and write about blood, reached a happy end”. The same anti-war sentiment is expressed in issue number 75,

published on 20<sup>th</sup> September. Here it is stated that “it does good to the friend of human beings when he sees that here too the inflamed war is finished so soon, without much human blood.” Prince Christian Frederick is named the “one-month-king of Norway”, and the peace treaty is characterized as “the famous convention of Moss”. The ERZ dryly remarks that the Norwegian “spirit of freedom” expressed itself as riots in Christiania, but that it has been “put aside”. “Norway is now totally calm, and its representatives is gathering in a national assembly in order to decide on the terms that will unite Norway with the Swedish realm for all eternity”. The next issue (76) published on 23<sup>rd</sup> September includes a short report, stating that the affairs of Norway “can now be regarded as finished, since nothing is standing in the way for the unification of this country with Sweden”. The article also comes with the overwhelmingly enthusiastic statement that “Norway will get a perfect constitution and the Scandinavian Peninsula will be happy”. Furthermore, it is reported that the Swedes are content with their crown prince, as he has secured “a significant enlargement of their kingdom” without spilling a lot of blood. Apparently, Norway is now perceived as an incorporated part of the kingdom of Sweden.

The affairs concerning Scandinavia are not mentioned until 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> November, in issue number 87 and 88, which report on rumours about how Denmark will be compensated for the loss of Norway and how this will turn out in relation to other continental European states. On November 22, in issue number 93, the ERZ declares, “Norway’s destiny is sealed” as the Norwegian national assembly has voted for the unification with Sweden with a great majority. This is followed with an article entitled “Norway is unified with Sweden, how?” in issue number 96, published on 2<sup>nd</sup> December. Here the ERZ explains that the King of Sweden has been declared King of Norway, and that the unification of the two countries now is “happily finished”. Furthermore, “time will make the union for ever more tight and indissoluble”. The article explains how the two kingdoms will keep separate administrative and financial systems, its own judiciary and military – and that only Norwegian-born men can become officers. It is also explained that the Norwegian military will participate in the defence of Sweden, although the Norwegian national assembly has to decide whether the military should join in an eventual Swedish offensive war. “In another word, they will remain to separate kingdoms through their laws and their interests, although they are allied and united as the same head wears both their crowns”. “The Scandinavian Peninsula now belongs to one master”, it is reassured in issue number 98, published on December 9, 1814.

#### 4.2.2.4 Conclusion

Also in Erlanger Real-Zeitung, the war-fatigue is apparent, and again peace is present as a topic in the columns. The editor expresses hopes that the hostilities in Scandinavia will be soon over, and does not seem convinced that it is the people itself who wish for Norway's independence. The newspaper's focus is first and foremost directed against Prince Christian Frederick, and it suggests that he should be offered another territory in order to satisfy his wish for his own land. Although it is not expressed explicitly, the undertones indicate that the editor thinks Norway should obey its former king and not resist the cession to Sweden.

### 4.2.3 Le Conservateur Impartial

#### 4.2.3.1 Introduction

Like Austria and many of the German states, the Russian Imperial government also had a far-reaching system of censorship (cf. Ruud 2009). There was nothing in his past that would have inclined Alexander I to support more press freedom when he came into power in 1801: he was not a champion of the printed word and was not familiar with classic literature, although he knew French better than Russian. He had even been a member of his predecessors principal censorship committee and had participated in banning hundreds of books. However, he began his period of rule by approving censorship reforms, which allowed for private presses and toleration of public debate. The most liberal reform of the imperial period was introduced in 1804 and viewed journalistic rights with respect for what Kant distinguished as the spheres of "public" and "private" reason. This made absolutism and relative freedom to discuss public issues more or less compatible. However, the semi-liberal reforms were reversed towards the second half of Alexander's reign (ibid, 25-30).

According to a contemporary encyclopaedia, as many as 33 newspapers were published in the years following Napoleon's failed campaign in 1812 (Wilkes 1820: 26-27). As a multinational empire, the newspapers of Russia were published in a variety of different languages (e.g. French, German, Swedish) in addition to Russian. Besides Saint Petersburg and Moscow, newspapers were also published in Riga, Vilnius, Tartu, Åbo, Astrachan and Kazan. I have only managed to get my hands on one of these Russian newspapers, *Le Conservateur Impartial* (LCI), which was published by the Russian Ministry of Foreign

Affairs. It belongs to a category of official and semi-official newspapers that were published in Saint Petersburg and Moscow. For example, *Poste du Nord* (The Northern Post) was published by the Ministry of Interior, *The Son of the Country* was published by the secretary to the Committee of Censorship, while *The Russian Invalid* was a newspaper published by the collegiate councillor and member of the college of justice. It is therefore reasonable to examine how LCI presented the Norwegian affairs, how it perceived Norway and whether the country's independence was conceptually possible.

*Le Conservateur Impartial* was a bi-weekly, French language newspaper published in Saint Petersburg by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As the name of the newspaper implies, it sought to be "impartial" while at the same time being conservative. The first issue appeared in January 1813, and its editor was the Baltic German author and later diplomat, Gotthilf Theodor von Faber.

Like many of his contemporary newspaper colleagues, von Faber had a peculiar career before becoming an editor, which may have influenced his later work on the newspaper. When the French revolution began in 1789, he went to Paris and joined the *Garde nationale* under the Marquis de Lafayette. Later he fought with the Revolutionary Army in Champagne and Belgium under General Dumouriez, before the Austrians imprisoned him between 1793 and 1795. Thereafter he served the French administration in the occupied German territories, worked as editor for the *Beobachter im Roerdepartement* (The Observer in the Ruhr Department), and as a professor of French language and literature at the University of Cologne, before going into Russian service in 1813 after having been recommended by the Prussian Baron vom Stein. He first worked at the newly-established Ministry of Police, which was responsible for the implementation of censorship in the empire, and had a central role in the establishment of LCI. He edited the newspaper until 1816, when he returned to Germany as a Russian attaché to the Bundestag in Frankfurt am Main (Amburger et al. 1998: 205; Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald 1969: 96; Robel & Robel 1999: 3; Ruud 2009: 33).

#### **4.2.3.2 Pro-independence arguments censored**

During the year 1814, reports about Norway appear in some 40 issues of LCI. This is not a big difference compared to newspapers from other countries. What is different though, is the content of the reports: Throughout 1814 the newspaper almost completely abstained from

publishing texts from the pro-independence side, such as those by Prince Christian Frederick and some British parliamentarians. This is somewhat remarkable, because the other newspapers I have examined earlier have all presented the pro-independence arguments, while shortly afterwards contradicting and debunking these arguments. In LCI on the other hand, give us the impression that it just wants to ignore the whole discussion of independence for Norway.

We cannot be sure about the reason for these omissions, but I would conclude almost definitely, that it is done with a purpose, and not because of any lack of sources and information. There were Russian envoys located close to the events, in Copenhagen Gothenburg and Stockholm, who all frequently reported to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Saint Petersburg (Roginskij 2001). The editors of LCI obviously had access to several London newspapers, the HUC and other German newspapers, *Journal des Débats* in addition to Swedish newspapers. The texts that argue for Norwegian independence and propagate Norwegian nationalism have been removed by the censors or simply left out and actively ignored by the editor. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that LCI does not provide any comment or opinion on the Norwegian question, except for on one occasion. In the following I will provide a quick overview of the main coverage of Norway in LCI.

In early 1814 the newspaper publishes reports about the territorial reorganisations in Europe, including the cession of Norway from Denmark to Sweden (no. 12, 10<sup>th</sup> February). One and a half month later, it reports on the letter from the King of Denmark to Prince Christian Frederick, where he is asked to hand over the fortresses to the Swedes and leave Norway (no. 26, 31<sup>st</sup> March). LCI disseminates the proclamation from Crown Prince Charles John to the people of Norway (no. 27, 3<sup>rd</sup> April) and the letter from Charles John to Prince Christian Frederick, encouraging him to keep the treaty and hand over Norway (no. 32, 21<sup>st</sup> April). The declaration by Charles John to the inhabitants of Norway (notice that it is not the *people* of Norway) is published in late May (no. 42, 26<sup>th</sup> May) and the proclamation by the Crown Prince to his brothers in arms is published on the front page of number 43 (29<sup>th</sup> May). All of these texts and the arguments used have been treated earlier.

In number 45 (5<sup>th</sup> June) LCI publishes a rather peculiar summary of the parliamentary debate about Norway that took place 9<sup>th</sup> May in London. Representatives who were in favour of Norwegian independence has been cut out, while the arguments of those that opposed an independent Norway are included. Among others, the summary includes Lord Liverpool's



statement that Prince Christian Frederick is planning to reunite Norway with Denmark when he inherits the Danish crown later. He is also quoted saying that “it is not a national act,” and that, “a large number of Norwegians” want a union with Sweden. The subsequent issue (9<sup>th</sup> June) reports that “it is reassured” that Prince Christian Frederick will give up his project and return to Denmark, and that an independent Norwegian state is unviable. Furthermore, it is reported that the envoys from the allied powers to Norway have not succeeded in getting the “desired results”, that is to say the unification of Norway and Sweden (no. 60, 23<sup>rd</sup> July).

The Swedish diary of military operations issued at Westgard on August 5 is published in number 64 (23<sup>rd</sup> August). This is everything LCI reports on the actual war between Norway and Sweden, before the newspaper quotes *Poste du Nord* (also a state newspaper) on the “particular but very positive news” that Prince Christian Frederick has resigned and that “the peace and quiet in Norway has been restored” (no. 67, 2<sup>nd</sup> September). The Treaty of Moss is published in full (no. 71, 16<sup>th</sup> September). First in number 73 (23<sup>rd</sup> September) LCI publishes the earlier correspondence between Prince Christian Frederick and Crown Prince Charles John, where Prince Christian Frederick argues that the public opinion of the Norwegian people is that they do not want to unite with Sweden, that the Crown Prince should respect this, and that they will defend their sovereignty and go to war if necessary. Of course, Charles John “wins” the argument.

#### **4.2.3.3 Conclusion**

Why is LCI so reticent from disseminating the arguments of Prince Christian Frederick and the side which favours Norwegian independence? A likely reason could be that the Russian government did not want to give anyone any “secessionist ideas”. A few years earlier, Russia had taken Finland from Sweden. The Finnish people, as well as the Polish people, wanted independence, and the Russian imperial authorities probably feared that they could get inspiration from other national secessionist movements. Additionally, the Russian empire was home to numerous other national minorities, who may have also desired independence. Although it may seem naïve to think that ignoring certain issues may keep the problem away, this is still a much used communication strategy nowadays as well. However, to draw a general conclusion only from the examination of one newspaper is unsatisfactory. Of course, more research is needed and more newspapers and publications need to be examined.

Nevertheless, this is an interesting indication of how the official Russian newspapers handled the question of Norwegian independence by ignoring it.

## 4.2.4 Wiener Zeitung and Oesterreichischer Beobachter

### 4.2.4.1 Introduction

At the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, only one political newspaper existed in Vienna: Wiener Zeitung. Its character was official, and it played a leading role for Austrian press organs outside the capital. A press reform was introduced in 1809 and the father, Friedrich von Gentz, wanted to establish a second political newspaper, which would be supported, controlled and managed by the government, without having to profess the opinions of the government. Such a newspaper was established in 1810, with the German romanticist Friedrich Schlegel as its editor. It was called Oesterreichischer Beobachter (OEB). However, already after one year Metternich's personal secretary Josef Pilat – also a German, succeeded him (Wilke 2008: 170).

During the campaign of 1813/1814, Pilat stayed at the Austrian headquarters and directed the field print works, accompanying Prince Metternich to the Congress of Prague in 1813, to Paris in 1814 and to London after the signing of the Treaty of Paris. As Metternich's most important press worker, Pilat propagated his conservative policies and remained editor of the OEB until the liberal revolution of 1848 forced Metternich to resign (Reinalter 2001).

Metternich was not a fan of press freedom, to put it mildly, and saw the control of the press as one the first principles of government (Sandeman 1911: 268). In a letter to the Austrian minister of foreign affairs in 1808, Metternich complained about all the lies and rumours that were spread about them, especially in the Frankfurt and Augsburg newspapers, and about the fact that these were reprinted in the French journals. He also criticized his own government for having committed a great fault since the French Revolution in its failure “to speak truth to the public, and to speak it incessantly”. Metternich's closing words have later become a famous quote: “To Napoleon, the newspapers are worth an army of three hundred thousand men, for such a force would not watch over the interior any better, or frighten foreign powers more, than half a dozen of his paid pamphleteers” (Metternich 1880: 225-

227). His censorship regime was tight and, according to some, even the East German Stasi could have taken lessons from him. His network of spies covered the entire Austrian empire, “touching the farmer's hut, the citizen's home, the landlord's pub and the nobleman's castle” (Bjorklund & Corey 1998: 33).

It is interesting to notice that Metternich not only perfectly understood the impact that the media could have, but also the mechanisms of the proliferation of news. He knew how to take advantage of the extensiveness, the good name and the reputation of the most influential European newspaper in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century: *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. As the AAZ was dependent on a network of correspondents in other cities and countries to get its exclusive reports and maintain its leading position, Metternich let his own propagandists, Gentz and Pilat, work as correspondents for the German newspaper (von Rintelen 1994: 389–390). Metternich knew that his own publication could not compete with the credibility of the AAZ, but with his own men reporting on Austrian affairs in the AAZ, he secured a presentation that would be advantageous to the empire. In return, the OEB could publish entire articles taken from the AAZ (Wilke 2008: 196). This demonstrates that the newspapers of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century not only read each other's material, as we have already seen, but they also wrote each other's material.

#### **4.2.4.2 A tight censorship regime**

Following the Carlsbad conference of 1819, where the German Confederation agreed on a set of reactionary restrictions, Metternich introduced an even tighter censorship regime with the establishment of 12 censors in Vienna. As the late charge d'affaires of the United States at the court of Vienna noted in 1852, it was not permitted “even to elucidate the actually-established political system, the dreaded discovery of whose weakness is carefully guarded against by purging the language of common usage from all such dangerous words and expressions as ‘popular rights’, ‘popular opinion’, ‘public spirit’, and ‘nationality’.” (Stiles 1852: 85).

The censors tried their best to prevent even the most indirect encouragement of national feeling – even by censoring reports that came from abroad. One example is that the phrase “a band of youthful heroes who flocked around the glorious standard of their country” was changed by the censor to, “a considerable number of young men who voluntarily enlisted themselves for the public service”. In 1834 Metternich delivered a tirade on the “evils of Liberalism, speaking to a conference of German ministers about “the misguided attempts of

factions to supersede the monarchical principle with the modern idea of the sovereignty of the people” (Russell 1934: 59). His perceptions of the world became no less reactionary right until he had to resign in 1848.

In 1814, however, Metternich’s censorship regime was not yet as strict as it would later become, at least when we look at how the political affairs of Norway were covered. The Austrian press organ did not have its own correspondents in Scandinavia, and the OEB generally had to rely heavily on the AAZ and other German newspapers in its coverage of several foreign issues, including that of Norway Norway. In contrast to several other newspapers in this study however, the OEB and the WZ were generally careful with giving reference to which newspaper was the source of the information that they published. Both newspapers published proclamations and bulletins both from Prince Christian Frederick and members of the Norwegian national assembly, the King of Denmark, the King of Sweden and Crown Prince Charles John.

#### **4.2.4.3 Norway – a sensitive subject**

Metternich was not particularly positive towards neither Crown Prince Charles John, nor the cession of Norway from Denmark to Sweden (Barton 1929: 134; Hårdstedt 2010: 368; Wilson & Randolph 1861: 216). It is suggested that Metternich did not want to allow the robbery of a “king of divine mercy” by a “revolutionary hero” (Paul 1927: 648) and that he hoped to thwart the Swedish Crown Prince on the question of Norway (McGuigan 1975: 168). These attitudes may partly explain why Metternich did not order his censors to be more strict when evaluating which reports regarding Norway that should be let through, and which words should be allowed to be used. Both the OEB and the WZ report on the Norwegian national assembly, the liberal “republican” constitution, nation and patriotism. These modern features were probably not yet perceived as a great threat to the current monarchical system. Obviously it was also important that the head of the Norwegian revolt was a Danish Prince, not an ordinary *parvenu*, and that he thought that the monarchical principle maybe was not as threatened by the sovereignty of the people in the case of Norway. But as we know, Norway was only one of several places where the pressure for constitution and national unity and sovereignty was emerging around 1814. Therefore, it is logical that a reaction in the form of tighter censorship measures should come in 1819, as mentioned above.

The coverage is characterised by the aim of being “impartial” and “objective”, and as Metternich would put it: to tell “the truth”. An additional feature is that the Austrian newspapers do not express their view on the Norwegian affair through comments in the short introduction to the letters and articles, such as for example the German newspapers, which also claimed to be “impartial”. The reason for the lack of expressed opinion on the Norwegian affair is probably that the issue was regarded as too little important compared to the risk of offending any parties or their sympathisers. Because the coverage of Norway is very similar in both the WZ and the OEB, I will mainly give examples from the latter in the following.

#### **4.2.4.4 “This affair is currently too delicate to be commented upon”**

The OEB number 30, published on 30<sup>th</sup> January, 1814, features an article describing the geography of Norway. The Norwegians and Swedes are described as being enemies, although they share religion and many cultural and lingual features. Number 33, published on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, publishes reports on the Treaty of Kiel, and on Denmark’s has cessation of Norway to Sweden. It is emphasized that it is not official news. Number 44, published on 13<sup>th</sup> February, includes a report containing details about the terms and conditions of the Treaty of Kiel. The complete text of the treaty is not published before in issue number 53, published on 22<sup>nd</sup> February.

Number 92, from 2<sup>nd</sup> April, brings a proclamation from the King of Denmark, where he orders his officers in Norway to hand over all royal possessions to the Swedes. Events in Norway have not yet been mentioned in the newspaper: Prince Christian has proclaimed himself the new king of an independent Norway, and that all men between the ages 16 and 60 are taking to arms. This is however reported in the following issue, number 93, published on 3<sup>rd</sup> April. Prince Christian’s proclamation to Europe is also reproduced here, and the OEB has not censored the information that Norway is working on its own constitution and that the Norwegian nation is seeking independence.

Number 94, published on 4<sup>th</sup> April, has copied a whole page from the AAZ, which again is copied from a Danish newspaper. In number 111, published on 21<sup>st</sup> April, we find yet another article copied from AAZ. Number 135, published on 15<sup>th</sup> May, contains a whole article that is copied from the AAZ. This article talks about three parties in Norway, giving the impression that the country is deeply divided. It also passes on a rumour saying that all Danish officers in Norway have been arrested, and that a Danish naval captain has been shot

at and forced by his own crew to return his ship to Norway. Correctly observed, the article states that Norway's destiny is dependent on England and its recognition of Norway. The article quotes a London newspaper, reporting that Carsten Anker has arrived in London as an official delegate from Norway. However, "this affair is currently too delicate to be commented upon". The article also projects a potential conflict as, "Prince Christian proclaimed himself sovereign of Norway before the party that wants to introduce a republican constitution had appeared in public." A Swedish newspaper, claiming that the Danish court has a secret agreement with Prince Christian, is also quoted. The claim is however dismissed as "unfounded".

This issue of the OEB also quotes a report from the *Deutsche Beobachter* in Lübeck from 27<sup>th</sup> April. It claims that a strong party in Norway is turning against Prince Christian and the Anker brothers, and that Prince Christian will resign and return to Copenhagen. The article claims that this party will have a unification with Sweden where the rights of the Norwegian people are secured, and that they have realized that it is not possible to form an independent state from such a sparsely populated country. "This is how peace will also be reinstated in the north".

Yet another article from the AAZ is copied in issue 138 of the OEB, published on 18<sup>th</sup> May. The article quotes an anonymous naval officer, who claims that the situation in Norway is "harmonious" and that one knows from "trustworthy sources" that the Swedish party has won a clear majority of the votes. It is now expected that Prince Christian will leave the country, according to the article. The reason for this twist in the situation in Norway is that England has declared that it will support Sweden's rights, according to the Treaty of Kiel.

An article from the AAZ also appears in OEB number 148, published on 28<sup>th</sup> May. It reports that the Swedish party is inferior, that the national assembly supports Prince Christian Frederick and that a "very republican constitution" has been adopted. Furthermore, the article contains reports about Carsten Anker's journey to England, the arrest of Andreas Gyldenpalm and the Swedish preparations for war against Norway.

The official Austrian newspaper OEB was obviously not unwilling to show that there was a controversy surrounding Norwegian matters abroad. In issue number 149/150 and 151 for example, the newspaper brings a five-page long excerpt from the speech given by Lord Grey to the House of Lords in which he speaks up for an independent Norway. The excerpt resembles the one published in *The Examiner* (see previous subchapter).

The OEB again brings news from Scandinavia copied from the AAZ in issue number 158, from 7<sup>th</sup> June. The article reports “belligerent rumours” that will claim the duchies as a mortgage for Norway if Prince Christian Frederick is not declared a traitor. It is also reported that the Danish Prime Minister Moltke must resign as a consequence of secret letters to Norway found on the diplomat Gyldenpalm, who was arrested in Sweden. Number 160/161 also brings text that is copied from the AAZ featuring the whole speech given by Prince Christian Frederick at the opening of the assembly at Eidsvoll on 10<sup>th</sup> April, while number 163 cites the 11 first articles of the new constitution. These are not censored, and the OEB reports on the articles saying that “Norway shall be independent for eternity”, that “Prince Christian becomes the inheriting monarch” and that “press freedom is unlimited”. Furthermore, the article says that diplomats from Russia, Austria, Prussia, England and Sweden are on their way to Norway in order to persuade Prince Christian to resign. The whole article is copied from the AAZ, as is the whole article about Norway in number 173, which reports that the Norwegians are ready to fight for their independence.

In number 179, published on 28<sup>th</sup> June, the OEB has copied another article from the AAZ. It says that more obstacles now stand in the way of a unification of the two countries, because Prince Christian took the crown on 17<sup>th</sup> May, was received by a cheering population of Christiania two days later. The article also cites the Norwegian newspaper *Tiden*, saying that the country has food and ammunition enough for a year. Also interesting to note is the fact that the article is mentioning that *the Norwegian navy* has taken valuable prizes, without problematizing this any further. This means that Norway is perceived as a legitimate sea-power, and not as pirates, something which is a step towards recognizing the independent Norwegian state. Furthermore, the article mentions that there are disagreements among the representatives at Eidsvoll on whether or not all the estates should be represented, but that the majority supports the representation of all estates.

#### **4.2.4.5 “Norway’s destiny has been decided upon”**

Issue number 193 contains the speech by Jacob Aall to the national assembly, copied from the AAZ. A speech given by the Swedish Crown Prince Charles John is cited in number 194, where he emphasizes that he wants unification with Norway not to increase his own power, but to secure peace on the Scandinavian Peninsula. Number 227, published on 15<sup>th</sup> August, brings a proclamation from Prince Christian Frederick, stating that he will follow the will of

the Norwegian people, and fight against any outside powers in order to secure the country's sovereignty. In the same issue, a Frankfurt newspaper is cited on a comment that "some believe the destiny of Norway will be decided upon at the congress in Vienna".

Throughout August, there are several reports about the allied envoys to Norway, which try to convince Prince Christian Frederick to respect the "holiness of the treaty" (e.g. number 232 and 243). Towards the end of August, in number 236, the first reports about the Swedish-Norwegian war are published. On 7<sup>th</sup> September (number 250) a report from a Berlin newspaper saying that travellers from Sweden confirms that the war with Norway is finished. On 11<sup>th</sup> September, (number 254) the OEB publishes headline news about a confirmed report on the ceasefire agreement between Norway and Sweden.

However, it was not easy to separate rumours from facts, and this was made even more difficult because of slow communications. On 17<sup>th</sup> September (number 260), the OEB cites a news report first published in the *Bremer Zeitung* on 5<sup>th</sup> September. The newspaper again cites a letter from Helsingør dated 1<sup>st</sup> September, saying that communications with Norway is again unrestricted. However, an English vessel brings the news of a *revolution* that has broken out in Norway, of which the goal is to gain independence for Norway. The report also contains rumours of a battle between Norwegian and Swedish forces, where each side has lost 1500 men. As a result, it is said that the blockade will be reestablished. This is the first and only instance where the situation in Norway is described as a revolution in the OEB. This is most likely a mistake by an inattentive censor, since the conflict in Norway was supposed to be treated as a conflict between two competing monarchs, not as an issue of popular rebellion and popular sovereignty.

On 18<sup>th</sup> September, the OEB publishes an article copied from the HUC about the inhabitants of Christiania who have rebelled against their leaders. Some days later, on 24<sup>th</sup> September, an order comes from Crown Prince Charles John as a reaction to the rebellion in Christiania He demands peace and tells people to remain calm, characterizing those who have rebelled as "individuals who confess to the Jacobin principles" and who just want to ignite another rebellion in Christiania. He condemns the attack on General Haxthausen's house, and threatens to disrespect the demarcation zone so as to root out anyone who wants to introduce anarchy to the Nordic countries.

Throughout the autumn of 1814, the OEB brings the bulletin from Trøgstad, presenting the Swedish account of the war with Norway (number 268) and the Convention of



Moss (number 306). On 14<sup>th</sup> November, the OEB states that “Norway’s destiny has been decided upon”, in other words that the country did not decide for itself: this meant that it was decided upon by the princes.

#### **4.2.4.6 Conclusion**

Although Metternich was not fond of the press, he clearly understood how to use it. The OEB was apparently edited according to the idea of enlightenment and impartiality as other large newspapers in the Germanophone area. Even if he feared revolution and that the people should make claim to sovereignty, he allowed texts from Christian Frederick – and even the parliamentary debates from London – to be published in “his own” newspaper. Nevertheless, the newspaper leans towards the dynastic sovereignty representation, as there is a paternalistic tone shining through, for example when the newspaper says that certain topics are “too delicate” to write about, and when the issue of Norway has been “decided upon” – not by the people, but by the princes of the great powers.

## 4.3 The “Impartial” Enlightenment Newspapers

### 4.3.1 Hamburgischen Unparteyischen Correspondenten

#### 4.3.1.1 Introduction

A newspaper that was untypical for the German press of the 18th century in terms of size and influence, and also a prototype for later developments, was the *Staats- und Gelehrte Zeitung des Hamburgischen Unparteyischen Correspondenten* (Stöber 2005: 82). It was commonly known as *Hamburgischen Unparteyischen Correspondenten* (HUC) and was one of the most important European newspapers of the 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century, overshadowing even *The Times* of London. Read across the whole of Europe, it had a circulation of 30,000-50,000 (including 4000 issues for the departing ships) in its peak period in the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until 1806, when it became an official organ for the Napoleonic occupation forces (Böning 2012). Except for the time of French occupation, which lasted until 1814, the HUC could enjoy relatively liberal regulations on the press, which several would argue was the major reason for its success.

It was not only the largest, but also the qualitatively probably the best newspaper of the time, in terms of disseminating news in an “impartial” way. For most newspapers it was too expensive to hire a qualified editor. The HUC was the first newspaper to build up a newsroom consisting of professional journalists, and its reporting was supported by a network of its own, competent correspondents (Tolkemitt 1995: 11). At most other newspapers, journalists worked only part-time alongside their main job, which was often in government offices, universities or in trade, until way into the 19th century (Stöber 2005: 77).

It has been documented that the newspaper was used as an instrument of the enlightenment movement (Tolkemitt 1995). Being *unparteyisch*, i.e. impartial, was the ideal for the newspapers of the enlightenment, and HUC lived up to this ideal by publishing posts from all parties in a conflict. For example, in the case I have researched, the HUC published proclamations (or what we today would call press releases) from prince Christian Frederick, king Frederick VI of Denmark and Crown Prince Charles John of Sweden. Although the newspaper did not go far in problematizing these texts, as would have happened in current

media, it is remarkable that all parties are allowed to present their cases, so that the reader can make up his or her own mind.

Reasoning and policy advice, otherwise known as the classic editorial, only appears in the form of discrete introductions to the various letters and reports in the news section of the paper. The small introductions are significant, as they are the only pieces of the text that we can know for sure originates directly from the editors. They can therefore serve as an expression of the editors' perceptions of the world – or at least of what they could allow themselves to express about their perceptions of the world. Editing a newspaper in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century was a task that demanded a high degree of caution and the ability to achieve a balance between the readers' demands for news and insight and the authorities' fear for the proliferation of “dangerous ideas”. Another important and influential newspaper of the time, *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, is very similar to the HUC. I have examined its coverage of the Norwegian affairs, but concluded that it is too similar to the HUC and have therefore decided not to include it here.

The Napoleonic era, which began with the occupation of Hamburg in 1806, represented the end of the golden period for the HUC. A dual-language edition of the newspaper was published under a strict censorship regime until 1814, when Napoleon lost his power. In mid-May 1814 the HUC re-emerged, but its name and reputation was damaged. From 1815 the newspaper started its real decline, although it continued to exist until 1934 (Stöber 2005: 83). It is, however, interesting to see how HUC covered the political events in Scandinavia of 1814 from mid-May and throughout the year.

First, I would like to spend a few words on the visual appearance of HUC, before I continue with its structure, and then look at the texts in more depth. In the period I have researched, from May to December 1814, the HUC appears with four issues each week. In terms of layout, there are no major differences between important and less important articles. Almost all articles are printed in the same gothic font, mostly in the same font size. However, an indication of how important a piece of news is considered to be is given by its location within the newspaper. The most current, sensational and dramatic news, typically military and political events, are normally placed on the first pages. Less important news, including background texts such as bills, treaties, parliamentary speeches and debates, is normally communicated on the pages behind the “hard” news, either in full or in part. After this

section, and before the advertisements that come last in every issue, we find comments and discussion pieces, although none of them addresses the political affairs of Scandinavia.

This way of prioritizing news could be seen as an early expression of the modern journalistic principle of the inverted pyramid, although in HUC this principle is not applied within the different articles, the referred letters or news pieces as such, but only on the level of weighing the different pieces against each other. News concerning the dramatic events in Scandinavia appeared on the first page of HUC several times, for example when the news about the Convention of Moss reached Hamburg and the newspaper printed the whole document in both French and German language following this introductory sentence: “In the following are in the original and in translation the newest conspicuous files from Norway”.

#### **4.3.1.2 War-fatigued and wishing for peace?**

The HUC’s coverage shows that there is a territory known as Norway. However, it seems not to be obvious that this nation should be independent - neither from The Danish Empire nor Sweden. The way Norway and Norwegians are featured in the HUC’s coverage of the events of 1814 bear witness to the fact that the concepts of *nation-state* and *Norwegians* are far from mature in the modern sense. The first place Norway is mentioned is in a report from London in the second edition of HUC, published on 20<sup>th</sup> May, 1814. The news about the national assembly at Eidsvoll, which has proclaimed Norway independent, has not yet reached Hamburg. However it is said: “Sweden has given Norway a more liberal offer than any ceded land has ever gotten before”. The meaning of the German concept *Land* is that of a territory subordinated a prince or a king, typical of the system of conglomerate states in the early modern era (Robisheaux 2002). The parliamentary declaration to Sweden, which is rendered in the HUC, talks about “the peoples of Norway” (“den Völkern von Norwegen”). At the same time it mentions “der Nation” and “dem Volke” – the nation. An interpretation of this indecisiveness could be an indication of uncertainty whether the people living in Norway could indeed be perceived as a homogenous group, as one nation. The rendered declaration also talks about “the both crowns” (“der beyden Kronen”) of Sweden and Norway, and says that “the king [of Sweden] will in his way interfere directly in the new constitutional act of Norway, but its acceptance must be subordinated to the king”. Evidently, Norway is perceived as a kingdom, a political-territorial entity, whose crown could be worn by any king. The

national origin of the king is of little importance, and popular sovereignty is subordinate the sovereignty of the king.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC, a proclamation from Crown Prince Charles John to his soldiers is published, word-by-word, in French language only. The “sacred and inviolable” status of the Treaty of Kiel is underlined. In addition, it is emphasized that the Swedish government’s only desire is to establish a union between Sweden and Norway in order to secure the peace in the North, and make the Norwegians free and independent.

A letter from the Norwegian border, dated 10<sup>th</sup> May, appears in the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC. It reports that the parliamentary meetings at Eidsvold had hitherto been very lively, and that opinion on whether Norway could maintain itself as an independent state had been very divided. It is reported that the assembly concluded that this would be possible if England declared itself in favour the new constitution. This contemporary analysis of the situation is fully in line with any analysis that has followed: England’s stand on the Norwegian issue was a determining factor in whether Norway could become an independent state in 1814. Perhaps the editor of the HUC reveals his own opinion on the Norwegian issue when he permits the correspondent’s evaluation of the news to be published: “Unfortunately is England’s declaration in fact in strong terms arrived in Christiania together with the news that nine battleships were about to set sail, in order to give emphasis to the strictest blockade of the cabinet-order, through which many minds have become depressed, although Prince Christian courageously pursues the goal he has set. Meanwhile, the quiet majority believes that the commissioners of the Allied powers will succeed in putting in place an amicable arrangement”. At first, one might get the impression that the author favours Norwegian independence. However, it is probably preferable to interpret this as a wish for peace that appears several times when the editor and/or his correspondents take the opportunity to present their opinion on these issues. What is “unfortunate” is not that England opposes an independent Norway, but the fact that more war is the likely outcome of it. Those who write the newspaper belong to an educated middle class, who have witnessed several years of warfare in Europe and are familiar with the horrors of war. The Norwegian independence struggle is not seen as something heroic, but as a possible reason for more bloodshed. Therefore the conservative-bourgeoisie sees the maintaining of the status quo and finding “amicable solutions”, as the the biggest priority.

In the 7<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC, we find the minutes from a parliamentary meeting in London on 5<sup>th</sup> May. One of the Lords had handed over a bill that was signed by 8000 inhabitants of Newcastle, in which they protested against any changes in the regulations on the import of grain, and expressed regret that some individuals were working to keep the grain prices high. In this regard, it was asked if England had sent any commissioners to settle the disputes in Norway, and whether the cession of Norway to Sweden was a strictly necessary precondition for a peaceful settlement there. In other words, an independent Norway seemed to be a preferable outcome for merchants who wanted to be able to again export their grain to Norway.

In a letter from Copenhagen dated 31<sup>st</sup> May and published in the 11<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC, it is reported that any traffic with Norway is prohibited and will be punished with the death penalty. This is probably a contributing factor to the fact that the HUC does not publish any news about the Norwegian affairs until 28<sup>th</sup> June, in its 24<sup>th</sup> edition. Once again, there is a letter from the undefinable location “the Norwegian border”, dated 12<sup>th</sup> June: “Should war-operations against Norway become necessary, the attack would not be carried out from the landside, it is said, but through a landing from the seaside. By now, all hopes are there for a peaceful solution concerning the issue of Norway”. This is again an example of the editorial hope that the issue will be resolved without becoming a violent conflict.

#### **4.3.1.3 The diet and the constitution**

In the 24<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC we also find the rendering of a speech by councillor of government Jacob Aall, which he gave to the parliamentary assembly before Prince Christian was proclaimed king. The speech is very interesting because it serves as a sort of expert analysis as it treats three different possible ways for the development of the Norwegian struggle for independence: 1) A free Norway, undisturbed by the rest of Europe; 2) In a war with Sweden; 3) In a war with England and Sweden. “The third point does not deserve any further examination, because the independence would be totally unattainable in this case”. Once more we see how aware both actors and spectators are that England’s support is necessary in order for an independent Norway to survive. Further on, the speech states that, “Norway’s independence, even in a state of peace, will lay heavier burdens on the nation than before,” and, “it will hardly be possible to defend the homeland in a war with Sweden without damaging it; ”in a war with Sweden and England it will be impossible”. Aall emphasizes that

if Norway does not get any support from abroad, the best solution would be a union with Sweden under an advantageous constitution. After a colourful description of the distressing conditions under which many people are living in Norway, he concludes by confessing his weakness: “my love for the work of independence”. By now, the readers of the HUC who had been following the developments in Norway must have been aware of the idea of the creation of a new state in Northern Europe. However, the survival of this state was totally dependent upon the support and recognition of a foreign power: England. The publication and dissemination of the ideas that appear in Aall’s speech must certainly have bothered rulers in the more totalitarian German states of 1814, as national unity was not in their interest. Hamburg however enjoyed relative press freedom, and its newspapers were distributed widely across the German-speaking territories.

The report on Aall’s speech was followed by nearly a month of news drought regarding the developments in Norway. Once again this illustrates how slow the distribution of news could be at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the 37<sup>th</sup> edition of the HUC, we find a letter from Helsingør dated 13<sup>th</sup> July, which tells us that the leaflets they have received from Norway contain the transcripts of the new Norwegian constitution. On the same page, a letter from the newspaper’s Danish correspondent dated 16<sup>th</sup> July is rendered. He reports that no news has arrived from the commissioners, “according to what we hear”. The correspondent reports, however, that “it is assured, that Prince Christian has assembled the notables of Norway, not the estates of the realm, in order to learn of the will of the people, and he has declared that he would with every personal sacrifice concur with the public opinion”. This is nevertheless not an entirely correct observation, because the Norwegian national assembly consisted of representatives from the different estates of the realm, such as farmers, priests, academics and merchants, not only notables in the sense of people belonging to the nobility. Perhaps the correspondent was wrongly informed by its sources, with or without deliberation? It would maybe be too radical to report that an assembly similar to the French Estates-General of 1789 was taking place in the new would-be independent nation-state in the North?

#### **4.3.1.4 Swedish propaganda**

In the 38<sup>th</sup> edition from 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 1814, we find a letter from Stockholm dated 12<sup>th</sup> July. It presents excerpts from *what is presented as* an account from a representative at the Norwegian

national assembly, which has been published by Elmén & Granberg, a Swedish publishing house. Interestingly, this text is a reproduction of an essay that originally emerged in *Allmänna Journalen*, a journal written and published by the Swedish editor Peter Adam Wallmark (1814). He was also the royal librarian, and taught the French-born Crown Prince Charles John the Swedish language between 1810 and 1813. During the fall of 1814 he even joined his master on a journey to Norway, where he made acquaintances within the Norwegian political and literary elite (Almén 1893: 62).

The title of the essay states that the text is a translation. Given that many of the Norwegian representatives at the national assembly at Eidsvold favoured a union with Sweden, it is therefore not unlikely that such a speech could have been held, and that it is an actual translation from Norwegian. However, it is conspicuous that the author is kept anonymous, especially in Sweden, where such a view would be saluted. It is therefore natural to assume that the author of the text is Wallmark himself. In any case, it is an expression of the union-friendly way of thinking about Norway's sovereignty.

The text begins with a statement concerning whether or not the Norwegians have the right to evade the stipulations of the Kiel treaty. It states that the Norwegians have lost their right to do this *de facto* through the treaties and guarantees of the great powers that are now deciding the destiny of Europe. This right is also lost *de jure*, the author claims, because Norway was a recognized province of Denmark for centuries, and the Norwegians neglected the last favourable opportunity to regain at least some of their political rights: "This is something that any other province across the seas, of our importance and alleged love for freedom, would not fail to seize". In other words, to strive for sovereignty and independence at this point is far too late. One moral argument presented is that the Norwegians were loyal subjects of Denmark when the country surrendered itself to Napoleons policy, and therefore the Norwegians must now also obey, "surrender the judgment of the Oracle" and sacrifice themselves for the previous (i.e. the Danish) government. It could also seem as if the author rejects the idea of one Norwegian nationalism, as he presents the argument that "if a country's history, i.e. its previous conditions, decided its coming destiny, and not its current welfare, conditions and needs, then every valley, as you know, would have the same reasons as we to demand their independence and have their own kings". The Treaty of Kiel is binding and the sovereign's last order, it is argued.

"Every protest against his sovereignty come 300 years too late (...) Our resistance does not honour our courage or our patriotism. It was not like when Switzerland, Holland



and America gained their independence (...) They would not have betrayed a new sovereign's legitimate waiting, who has come and by his own will offered them all the political rights they could wish for; even less would they have armed themselves against him, without listening to him first. No, their courage was not the courage of a slave, abstained from his old master, running armed against his new master, whose hand is stretched out to him in a fatherly way; it was the courage of an enlightened man, who is calm and convinced that one could always persuade a nation which really loves its freedom, to take up arms, but abstain from doing so before all other means have been tried, even the new sovereign”.

On the same page as this essay, we find a short news notice saying, “According to what we hear from Sweden, Prince Christian has offered (the Swedish) General von Essen a truce”. At this point the war between Norway and Sweden had yet not broken out.

#### **4.3.1.5 Massive coverage in an unclear situation**

In the 39<sup>th</sup> issue from 23<sup>rd</sup> July, the HUC's correspondent in Denmark cites letters from Christiania about the negotiations between Prince Christian and the Swedes. Contrary to the earlier reports, the correspondent in Denmark now writes about an assembly of the estates, saying that Prince Christian would like to have “the will of the nation” behind him before any handing-over of fortresses.

In another letter from the correspondent in Denmark, oddly printed chronologically after the least newsworthy first letter, we get to know that the negotiations between Prince Christian and the commissioners have been taking place since the beginning of the month, but that they have not come to a successful conclusion. The parties have agreed to suspend any hostilities, and the district on the border has been declared a neutral zone, according to the report. It is also reported that several warships have passed through the

In a third letter from Copenhagen, it is reported that later correspondence that has arrived from Sweden says that the commissioners are expected to leave soon empty-handed, because they cannot wait for the estates-general to come together. Finally, it is again pointed out that in the case of a war it would be natural to expect that Norway would be attacked through landings at several points along the coast.

It is now apparent that the Norwegian issue is perceived as acute by continental Europe and by the editor of the HUC. In issue number 40, i.e. the third issue in a row, the affairs concerning Norway are being given priority, and a letter from the correspondent in Denmark dated 20<sup>th</sup> July appears on the first page. The letter deals with a communication

from the King of Denmark to Prince Christian, in which the king allegedly says that he is withdrawing all of Prince Christian's powers and orders. Furthermore, according to the above-mentioned communication, the king commands Prince Christian to cede the title of sovereign, to hand over the Norwegian fortresses to Sweden, to issue a manifest to the people of Norway where they are urged to fulfil their duty (to accept Norway's transfer to Sweden) and to return to Denmark immediately. Finally, the king makes Prince Christian responsible for the execution of these orders. Should he refuse to follow orders, he would be called to account according to the king's law.

The correspondent also reports on rumours concerning the terms of a proposed ceasefire: 1) The Prince is responsible for putting his power in the hands of the representatives of the assembly; 2) Two fortresses should be granted to Sweden; 3) The district between the border and the river Glomma should be declared neutral.

In the 41<sup>st</sup> edition from 27<sup>th</sup> July, Norwegian affairs are again headline news. The correspondent reports that according to letters from Uddevalla, the negotiations have been re-established, and according to his analysis it is likely that we they will result in "a favorable success and the maintenance of peace in the North."

Later on in the same newspaper an order from the Prussian king appears, where he declares that trade between Prussia and Norway is prohibited because of the "differences between Sweden and Denmark over Norway", and that all Prussian subjects should obey this order until further notice.

On 30<sup>th</sup> July, in the 30<sup>th</sup> edition, the correspondent in Denmark reports that there is still reason to hope that the dispute in the North between Sweden and Norway will be settled amicably", that the crown prince of Sweden has received the conditions for a peace agreement, and that his acceptance or dismissal of this will decide whether there will be war or peace. "The decision must come within a few days", he comments impatiently.

In the same edition we also find a letter from Gothenburg dated 13<sup>th</sup> July. The real author is unknown, but he is supposed to be a naval officer who has encountered some Norwegian fishermen at sea, near the mouth of the Oslofjord:

"I saw the Norwegian fishermen coming towards us, to beg for some bread. They told us that quite a lot of flour and grain had arrived in Norway, but that everything had been kept aside for the army, and that an extensive food-shortage was causing great discontent with the government. The poor people got bread and went home. As a consequence of the blockade, 17 ships have been taken along the Norwegian coast and brought in".

It is impossible, however, to find out whether or not this is a real and truthful account, but probably it is a work of propaganda. That said, the report is still interesting as it appears to provide first-hand knowledge of the conditions for the average Norwegian living in unstable times. The text also aims to emphasize that nationality, whether it is Norwegian, Danish or Swedish, does not matter. What matters is whether a man has bread to feed his family and himself and whether the state under which he is a subject leads a policy that allows him to do so. It is very likely not by coincidence that this report was reproduced in the HUC – the text can be interpreted as the editors' wishful thinking of peace and harmony after decades of war.

The same issue of the HUC reports a letter from London dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July, saying that Baron Anker and four other prominent people from Norway had arrived, but that they were only allowed to enter the country as private individuals, not as representatives of Norway. This is a clear statement that Norway is not recognized by England as a sovereign power and is further confirmed as one reads further: "As we hear", their intention to close an alliance and a treaty of commerce with England was totally dismissed by the ministers.

Another letter from Copenhagen dated 30<sup>th</sup> July reports that the negotiations between the Crown Prince (Charles John) and Prince Christian have not yet been interrupted, and "according to what is said" the two are supposed to have met in private.

In issue 47 of the HUC, from 6<sup>th</sup> August, we find a very interesting letter from Strømstad, dated 28<sup>th</sup> July. It contains a detailed description of the first hostilities between Sweden and Norway on 26<sup>th</sup> July. This is obviously regarded as highly newsworthy, and the editor devotes almost half a page to a detailed description of the naval operation that ends with the escape of the Norwegian gunboats outside the Hvaler archipelago. This eyewitness account is followed by another text entitled "The order of the day", allegedly issued by Crown Prince Charles John to the Swedish troops. It is most likely not a real order to the troops, but a propaganda letter issued in order to depict the Swedish cause as noble and just. It says that the Swedes are not waging war against Norwegians as such and that requisitions from Norwegians should be paid with cash as long as the inhabitants obey orders and follow their duties. Thereafter, the newspaper cites a royal proclamation, encouraging the Norwegians to surrender and declaring the Norwegian national assembly as unlawful. Another letter from the Norwegian border reports that Norwegian warships have taken several Swedish ships as prizes, and vice versa.

#### 4.3.1.6 “Peace and security for the Scandinavian peninsula”

The front page of the 48<sup>th</sup> issue of HUC, issued on 9<sup>th</sup> August, bear witness to how important the political affairs in Norway and the country's struggle for sovereignty were perceived. A proclamation on the Norwegian people from the King of Sweden stretches right through the whole first and second page, even onto the third page. This priority is a clear statement of how preoccupied the editor must have been with the developments on the Scandinavian Peninsula, especially when we consider that the whole publication consists of only eight pages. Although the proclamation is from the king, it is signed by Carl von Brinkman, a former diplomat to Prussia who functioned as the deputy state secretary for the minister of foreign affairs in 1814. It is therefore likely that it could have been written by him, targeted especially towards the German readership. The text has a recurring paternalistic tone, and starts off by stating, “Our dear son, the Swedish Crown Prince now is managing the acquisition of the Kingdom of Norway”. Furthermore, it mentions “subjects who have got lost”, before stating that the political existence of the inhabitants of Norway has been decided by the the developments of the war (where Denmark was on the losing side) and confirmed by the unbreakable and most holy alliance. It encourages the obedient people in Norway not to be lead astray by some agitators who want to put obstacles in the way for the establishment of a new order in the North, because this is secured unanimously by Europe's powerful governments.

The following passage justifies why Sweden can claim sovereignty over Norway: Sweden's uncontested right to the union with Norway is bought too expensively by the blood and patriotic efforts of our subjects, so that we could not be undecided for a single moment, through all means which the foresight has placed in our hands, to support and most strongly assert this right. It continues by stating that, for all the sacrifices Sweden has given voluntarily during the bloody and glorious campaign to the general rescuing of Europe, “we have never wished for a reward other than the future peace and security for the Scandinavian peninsula.”

Furthermore, the King of Denmark is encouraged to relinquish Norway. To reach this objective, it says, Sweden has complied with “altruistic peace terms” and offered compensation in the form of “even more precious and for our hearts more painful sacrifices” for the peaceful cession of Norway. This is of course a reference to Swedish Pommerania, which was ceded to Denmark in the Treaty of Kiel. The international system could easily be associated with a

board game, as territories are expected to change hands just as one would change cards with an opponent.

Again, the people of Norway is warned against being led astray: “Unfortunately, until now one single person, together with a few followers, has counteracted our own and our allies’ common efforts,” it says, and accuses the King of Denmark’s former governor in Norway, Prince Christian, of allowing himself to “abuse your trust and lead you astray towards a criminal opposition against the powers who have determined the Scandinavian union and the righteousness of our aim and the reasonable of our form of action”. “Such an unauthorized sovereignty is not only contrary your own benefit”, it is argued, “but also [contrary to] the principle of the true constitutional law”.

“With fatherly goodwill to consider the Norwegians non other than the brothers of our Swedish subjects, we have taken measures for a long time, convinced that the nation itself would sooner or later disapprove of the criminal imprudence of a foreign official”.

“The former governor formed a Peoples’ Representation according to his own intentions, but not with the ancient customs of the Nordic. Foreign officials, who had shared interests with him, participated in this assembly, where the armed power had more influence than the voice of the fellow countrymen”. The proclamation states that Prince Christian is effectively leading the Norwegians to war against England, Russia, Austria and Prussia, unless he gives up his ambition of being the sovereign of Norway. Crown Prince Charles John will carry out the annexation of Norway, and “as soon as he has reached our new state he will, in our name and our royal authority, call together the estates of the Norwegian people”. Once they have authorized their fellow citizens through a free election, they can discuss a constitution for the foundation of the future welfare of the country and present it for our royal approval. At the same time, the national assembly formed under Prince Christian is declared unlawful. All foreigners in Norway should “remove themselves from the country” or swear allegiance to our representatives if they do not want to be regarded and convicted as troublemakers and as spies. At the same time, all Norwegians who have been “lead astray” are offered amnesty if they at once swear allegiance to the King of Sweden and promise to follow his laws as good subjects.

#### 4.3.1.7 “Do you want to oppose the general desire on your own?”

Norwegian affairs also top the front page of the next, 49<sup>th</sup> issue from 10<sup>th</sup> August as well. In a letter from Copenhagen, it is reported that the English commissioners have returned from Norway and that the negotiations between Prince Christian and Crown Prince Charles John has broken down. The war is no longer avoidable and the hostilities have begun, the letter asserts. It also contains a very crucial piece of information: the commissioners of the allied powers are convinced that Denmark does not have any influence over the Norwegians' course of action. Another proclamation from Charles John, dated 17<sup>th</sup> July, follows. This time it is addressed to his brothers-in-arms. The sanctity of the Treaty of Kiel is once more repeated, and he encourages his soldiers to do everything they can in order to return their diverted brothers' [the Norwegians'] feeling of their true welfare and duties. “I repeat, there will be no calm for us until the union and sovereignty of the Scandinavian Peninsula is accomplished.”

The front page of the 50<sup>th</sup> issue has also been devoted Norwegian affairs. A letter from the Crown Prince of Sweden to the Norwegian people, which appeared in Stockholm on 2<sup>nd</sup> August, covers a page and a half. It repeats that the King of Denmark has ceded Norway to Sweden, in return for the release of the duchies Schleswig and Holstein, the town Glückstadt, a monetary contribution and the transfer of Swedish Pomerania to Denmark when Swedish forces have been allowed to take charge of a number of fortresses in Norway. Not a small amount of indignation that shows through in the following statement: “Norwegians! When, in our time, this treaty of civilized nation could be wiped out, then would loyalty and trust no longer exist on the earth.” It is of course irritating that a small territorial unit refuses to play the game following the rules of the big boys: “Norwegians! Small states are a game in the hands of the more powerful. You cannot endure under your own, isolated government.” According to the proclamation, Charles John has seen through Prince Christian Frederick's plan: To reunite the two crowns of Norway and Denmark in the end. “The nature wants, in connection with a reasonable policy, that the Norwegians and the Swedes should be friends and brothers.” The reader is encouraged to look towards England: “Did not this so famous island found its power and welfare on a similar union?”

Furthermore, the Norwegians are asked to think about the battle of Leipzig, and if they have learned that the union with Sweden will make the foundation of their security. “The great powers wish for this union (...) Do you want to oppose the general desire on your own? Do you want to fight alone against Sweden and the sovereigns who have guaranteed

your unification with us? Your reputation, your interests and the sanctity of the treaty demands for this union”. Norway is acting against the common will of Europe, according to the bold claim.

#### **4.3.1.8 The outbreak of war in the North**

Issue 51 of the HUC, published on 13<sup>th</sup> August, brings a letter from Copenhagen and one from Uddevalla in Sweden. The first one reports, once more, that the English diplomats are returning to England convinced that the King of Denmark has no influence over Prince Christian Frederick or what is going on in Norway. The Swedish letter is more or less an excerpt from a war diary, probably garnished to serve as propaganda. It tells of the Swedish military advancements in Norway, saying that they have taken some Norwegian prisoners of war, and that many Norwegians have pledged allegiance to the Swedish king.

HUC issue 52 published on 16<sup>th</sup> August brings a report from the Norwegian border. It is a statement (said to have been) given by the English envoy John Philip Morier. The main point is that England will not recognize Norway’s sovereignty, and that he hopes that Norway will observe the Treaty of Kiel, given that any outcome other than the transfer of Norway to Sweden is impossible and a war will only lead to hatred between the peoples.

A letter from Copenhagen dated 13<sup>th</sup> August and cited in the 53<sup>rd</sup> edition of the HUC on 17<sup>th</sup> August, reports that the peace treaty between England and Denmark has been ratified, and that Denmark’s colonies “in both Indies” will be returned immediately.

In the same issue we find a report about counsellor of justice M. R. Westermann, who has been sentenced to exile for writing a letter to Carsten Anker in Norway, in which he had criticised the King of Denmark’s acceptance to surrender Norway.

An war bulletin from the Royal Swedish Field Headquarters in Westgård, almost two-pages long, has also been published in this issue. Of course, it contains some reports about the heroic Swedish struggle to its legitimate territorial claim, that Swedish troops only suffer small losses, that the Norwegian resistance is insignificant, but at the same time that the Norwegian losses are bigger and that many Norwegian soldiers have been taken prisoners of war. The siege of Fredriksten fortress is also described here. The author is clearly trying to give the impression that the Swedish troops are doing what they can to conduct just and considerate warfare. For example, when the commander of the fortress declined to surrender, the Swedish commander had to bomb the fortress, “taking every possible precaution in order

to spare the town. However, because of the strong currents, it was not possible to fire the bombs with precision, and some landed in the town, luckily without causing any damage". Furthermore, the capitulation of Fredrikstad is utilised for propaganda purposes: the 1500-2000 men, of which the garrison was made up of, were not taken as prisoners of war; "they were subjects led astray, who had returned from their delusion and decided to hand themselves over to their legitimate king". Additionally, not only the Swedish flag, but also the Norwegian flag is waving from the walls of the fortress, as a symbol of the union of the two nations. "In the districts that our troops have secured, the inhabitants clearly express their joy at the arrival of Sweden, and hope that the union with Sweden will put an end to their long-lasting sufferings". The Swedish army is colourfully depicted as a liberation force, and the resistance against Sweden is presented as a marginal phenomenon: "Those few people who have tried to embitter the nation and rebel against Sweden are criminals" and "shame and regret will be the faith of those who try to undermine the indisputable rights and the most holy duties [of Sweden]."

In issue number 55, published on 20<sup>th</sup> August, we find letters issued both in Gothenburg, Uddevalla and on the Norwegian border. All of them contain information concerning the development of the war. A letter from Copenhagen, however, contains a transcript of the minutes from a meeting between the English diplomat Augustus John Foster and the King of Denmark, first published in the Danish State Journal. Again, we are told that the English diplomats have travelled to Norway to support the peaceful cession of Norway to Sweden, and that they have returned to Denmark convinced that the King of Denmark is not putting obstacles in the way of this cession. It is also emphasized that there is a good relationship between Denmark and the allied powers who have sent their delegates to Copenhagen.

Issue 57, from 24<sup>th</sup> August, contains many letters concerning the war in Norway. An almost three-page long bulletin from the Royal Swedish Headquarters in Fredrikstad gives a summary of the most important developments of the Swedish warfare. It also contains a section which repeats the typical Swedish arguments that Sweden does not want to go to war against Norwegians and that they believe only some few people have been led astray, encouraging the Norwegian people to turn to their "rightful king". The author seeks to point out Denmark as the scapegoat, writing that, "Except a bishop, Danish by birth, and two or three priests, led astray by the first-mentioned, all of the members of this respectful estate,



through the sincerity with which they have spoken to their congregations, have proven that they are dignified servants of the divinity, the peace and the truth.” In other words, the Danes are depicted as the troublemakers in Norway, going even against God’s will.

At the end of the same newspaper, we find three interesting letters: all of them report that the war in Norway is over. The reason why they are printed towards the end of the newspaper is probably that they arrived close to the deadline. The first letter from Gothenburg, dated 18<sup>th</sup> August, says, “the war in Norway, which has lasted for about 14 days, is finished earlier than expected. Prince Christian will abolish his government and the hostilities are discontinued.” A second letter from Gothenburg, also dated 18<sup>th</sup> August, additionally reports that “negotiations between our government and the estates of Norway during a 14-day long armistice will no longer put obstacles in the way for the union and the subordination of this province under Sweden.” A third letter, from Copenhagen dated 20<sup>th</sup> August, reports that Prince Christian will sign a treaty with Sweden and abdicate.

#### **4.3.1.9 Armistice and union**

A proclamation from Crown Prince Charles John to the Norwegian people appears on the front page of the 59<sup>th</sup> issue of the HUC, dated 27<sup>th</sup> August. The message from earlier propaganda writings is repeated and it is even written that, “the Swedish soldier has not come as an enemy. He loves, he adores the Norwegians”, and the only thing he desires is to unite ancient Norway with ancient Sweden. Luckily for the Swedish forces, “the inhabitants of the occupied territories are pleased to have His Royal Highness Crown Prince Charles John as their new governor”.

A few days later, in issue 61 published on 31<sup>st</sup> August, the readers of the HUC are brought the whole Convention of Moss and the Armistice agreement, both in French and in German. In issue 65, published on 7<sup>th</sup> September, letters from Copenhagen and Scania reports that the King of Denmark and the Crown Prince of Sweden respectively will travel to Vienna to attend a congress – “a glistening assembly of monarchs and princes”. “It is expected that the affairs concerning Norway will be a topic at the congress”, the newspaper reports. Another letter from Gothenburg cites reports from Norway saying that a large part of Prince Christian’s royal guard has switched to the Swedish side. It also cites reports about turbulent relations in Northern Norway, and that several citizens have requested His Royal Highness for protection.

A proclamation from Prince Christian Frederick to the Norwegian people dated 16<sup>th</sup> August, is the first official writing from Norway, which has been published in HUC since before the war with Sweden. The proclamation is signed and probably written by state secretary Carl Henrik von Holten. It reached Hamburg through Gothenburg, so there is a risk that it could have been manipulated in Sweden, although I would conclude that it is not.

The proclamation begins with giving the reason for Prince Christian to seize the leadership when Norway was ceded from Denmark: he wanted to prevent a civil war, and additionally the Norwegian people wanted him on the throne. He presents himself as a supporter of the sovereignty of the people as he states that “we could impossibly have imagined that the powerful states of Europe would unite themselves to suppress a noble and innocent nation who wished for freedom, and its only endeavour was sovereignty”. The war is characterised as a legitimate attempt to defend Norway’s sovereignty, because the terms of the suggested peace treaty were unconstitutional.

A letter from Stockholm, dated 28<sup>th</sup> August, mentions the persecution of two officers of the Norwegian army, General Haxthausen and General Staffeldt. Another letter from Zealand deals with the increasing dissatisfaction in Norway and reports that several military officers have been arrested, with three of them being convicted to death. A third letter from Copenhagen says that “the news we have received from Norway is of a serious character”. People who were dissatisfied with different leaders in Norway “have rebelled, and several people have been massacred”. A fourth letter from Copenhagen says that “in Norway the general opinion is that the shortage of food and other necessities has made it necessary to give in to the terms of the treaty, and the affair must be regarded as totally finished because no further resistance is conceivable.”

It is in issue 67, published 10<sup>th</sup> September, that parts of what appear to be the pre-war correspondence between Prince Christian and Crown Prince Charles John are first published. One explanation could be that the editor withheld it; something that is not very likely. Another explanation could be that the war made effective communication even more difficult, as it is also reported in this issue that the mail delivery from Norway has not yet been opened. However, this is the last text that HUC brings from Prince Christian and his supporters.

During the autumn the newspaper only published letters and proclamations from the Swedish side, which further sought to justify and legitimize the union with Norway. In issue 69 published on 14<sup>th</sup> September, a bulletin states that, “In no land in Europe has the peasant

been so mistreated as in Norway. A number of small tyrants have suppressed him, and taken possession over his forests and fields unpunished. This mistreatment shall now come to an end. Justice shall be for all; the peasant shall in peace and under protection, harvest the fruits of his struggles". In other words, Charles John is coming to liberate Norway – and will protect its common people from oppressors. It is tempting to draw the line further: although it is not explicit, here Charles John is here painting a picture of Norway almost becoming a protectorate. Furthermore, any attempt to question the legitimacy of the cession of Norway from the King of Denmark is strongly discouraged, and it is emphasized that, "this legitimacy, which is founded in international law, is universally recognized".

A letter from Zealand published in HUC number 75, 24<sup>th</sup> September, reports that the blockade of Norway has been lifted, that hundreds of Norwegian soldiers have either put down their weapon or joined the Swedish forces and that general Haxthausen will be put on trial. It is reported that the general order and discipline has been maintained – something that seems to be the most important aspect for the person who has authored the letter.

In HUC number 81 from 5<sup>th</sup> October, a proclamation from Crown Prince Charles John to the Norwegian people appears. It says "The Kingdom of Norway shall not be considered a conquered country, subject to Sweden, but it will constitute a free and independent state together with Sweden". Additionally, the Norwegian constitution shall, after "going through unavoidable modifications and improvements", gain lawful protection.

In HUC number 91, we find an interesting report under the title "Letter from Fredrikstad from October 8" by an anonymous author. It says that order prevails over the whole country, that the upcoming national assembly is awaited and that this will result in the final execution of the union with Sweden. Furthermore it is reported that more and more people are realizing the advantages of the union and that the aversion against the union is declining. "It is said, that the question of the union is already settled", and further resistance is inconceivable. Finally, it is said in the letter: "The Norwegians have now understood that Prince Christian is nothing else than a friend of the miseries of war and bloodshed".

Finally, in number 99 of HUC, published 5<sup>th</sup> November news has arrived in Hamburg that the Norwegian national assembly has decided to join the union with Sweden. Although a proclamation from the representatives to the Norwegian people states that the assembly will continue to work for national independence for Norway, it is now clear that Norway will not gain its independence.

#### **4.3.1.10 Conclusion**

The HUC was a typical newspaper of the enlightenment tradition, and it does not make any sense to categorize it within any two main representations. It barely expressed its own views, but rather disseminated the views of other actors, leaving the readers to make up their own minds. Unlike newspapers with a more clearly expressed political agenda, the HUC seldom explicitly evaluated the sources of information that it published. If the newspaper expressed any of its own views at all, it must have been the war-fatigued editor's careful expression of a wish for peace.

## 5. Conclusion

In the beginning of this thesis I stated that 1814 was a momentous year in the history of Norway. That was made possible, however, because 1814 first of all was a momentous year in Europe's history. The defeat and eventual surrender of Napoleonic France in May 1814 brought an end to 25 years of almost continuous war on the continent. Being on the losing side, the King of Denmark was forced to cede Norway, but as we know, the treaty that stipulated the cession was met with Norwegian resistance. As peace was about to be restored in Europe, the escalating conflict in the North attracted attention of newspaper editors and readers all over Europe. Through the exploration and examination of a number of European newspapers from 1814, this study has sought to answer how Norway and the question of Norwegian sovereignty were perceived in 1814, whether Norwegian independence was conceptually possible in the eyes of people outside Scandinavia, and what the thinking about the possibility of a new state in 1814 looked like.

### 5.1 Findings

As well as on the battlefield, the struggle between revolutionary and reactionary forces throughout Europe also materialized itself through the printing press. Newspapers were important facilitators for a bourgeois public sphere. The two main schools of thought presented different representations of the reality. I have labeled them *The Popular Sovereignty Representation* and *The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation*. The common features of the first representation is that the people's right of self-determination – the sovereignty of the people – is put forward as the legitimating principle of government. There is also a clear apprehension of the Norwegians as a distinct people or nation, and that every nation should have their own independent state. The People of Norway was highly romanticized and ascribed qualities such as a strong thirst for liberty, a firm understanding of their right to decide their own destinies, internal unity and a strong hatred against the Swedish arch-enemy. In this representation it is vitally important that a people cannot be transferred from one king to another, “like a herd of cattle”. An important claim is that a nation has a primordial, natural right to self-determination. Thus, Norwegian independence was clearly conceptually possible – however

the possibility of actually gaining independence in an environment of absolutist great powers was harder to imagine for some of the editors.

Within The Popular Sovereignty Representation, I have shown that there existed varieties. Malte-Brun, for example, is promoting the sovereignty of the people and the independence of Norway in order to facilitate a union incorporating all the three Scandinavian countries. Unlike other newspapers, *Le Spectateur* is suggesting Scandinavia as a weight in order to establish a better balance of power of France against Russia and the United Kingdom. There are also differing representations concerning the issue of having a foreigner as the head of state. This was disliked both in *The Examiner* and *Le Spectateur*, while *Rheinischer Merkur* did not bother. *Gazette de Lausanne* was thinking within the logic of territorial redistributions between princes, something that rather belongs within The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation. However, the newspaper emphasize that the Norwegian people are entitled to elect their own government and therefore belongs within The Popular Sovereignty Representation. In *The Examiner* the events are characterized as a just claim to the sovereignty of the people, not as a rebel or revolution. In *Rheinischer Merkur* and *Gazette de Lausanne* the events in Norway are consistently talked about as a revolution.

The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation refuses the claims of The Popular Sovereignty Representation. It is conservative, arguing against the undermining of the old regime's foundation of dynastic legitimacy and the divine rights of kings. *Deutsche Blätter* especially is putting forward contractual law, calling on the Norwegians to submit to the Treaty of Kiel. Norwegian independence is unthinkable. The newspaper refuses any claims of ancient freedom, and fears chaos if every little nation in Europe should go and declare themselves independent. Peace is a recurring topic. All the newspapers that fall within this representation express their contentedness when news arrives about that Norway has surrendered and peace is restored. The representation is not only about what is being written, but also about what is left out. *Le Conservateur Impartial*, for instance, chose to censor most of the letters containing pro-independence arguments.

In both representations, Norway is presented as a wider security issue for Europe: The Popular Sovereignty Representation warns that if Norway do not get its independence, the country will possibly turn against the allies together with France and other disgruntled nations who have not gained their independence. The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation, on the other hand, claims that if the Norwegians do not obey their former king's resolution of

cession, and make peace with their neighbour, the country will face a protracted war or an uncertain peace – and that there is a fear that this will affect the security situation in the rest of Europe. In *The Popular Sovereignty Representation*, Norway is presented as a natural unit, and this is a reason for why the country should get its independence. But this argument is also turned the other way around in *The Dynastic Sovereignty Representation*: that Norway and Sweden constitutes a natural unit as both countries are situated on the Scandinavian Peninsula, and should therefore be united.

There is a certain type of newspapers that falls outside the two main representations, which I have named *The “Impartial” Enlightenment Newspapers*. These are “mainstream” – or pretending to be “mainstream” – newspapers that we find in several European countries. I would argue that they function as an important supplier of terms in the debate on the political developments concerning Norway. Texts that appear in these newspapers are often used in publications with a more outspoken political view. This type of newspapers publish texts from all parties: both Prince Christian Frederick and Crown Prince Charles John, the commissioners and the King of Denmark – just to mention a few. In this way they are impartial. The individual texts from the different parties can be categorized within the two first representations, but the newspapers themselves speak up for neither Popular Sovereignty nor Dynastic Sovereignty. However, in the few instances where the editors comment on the issue themselves, it seems that they would prefer the maintaining of status quo. The absence of outspokenness could also indicate that a newspaper is leaning towards reaction, such as the HUC.

Norway is one of several examples of national liberation movements in the so-called Revolutionary Era between the 1770s and 1815. Thus, the question of Norwegian independence was conceptually possible in the eyes of many people outside Scandinavia – this was something similar to what had happened before, other places. There was taking place a gradual shift from the absolute states’ constitutional structures to those of the modern state. The Norwegian declaration of independence, the liberal constitution and the war against Sweden got a great deal of attention, taken into consideration that Norway at that time was known as a peripheral province of Denmark. This demonstrates that the importance of ideas in systems change must not be underrated – ideas were certainly not underrated in 1814.

## 5.2 Suggestions for further research

Foreign historical newspapers as such are a very little used source in shedding light upon the events regarding Norway in the pivotal year of 1814. Hopefully, this study has contributed to fill part of the gap in the literature concerning the coverage of Norway's independence in 1814 in foreign newspapers, and how people were thinking around the possibility for a new state. However, this study is only scratching the surface of a vast body of historical material that says something about how the events were perceived and reflected upon by people outside Scandinavia in 1814. Concrete examples of such unused material are Dutch and Spanish newspapers that are easily available in the digital archives of the National Libraries of the respective countries. The Dutch experienced several constitutional situations during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era (as a republic, a puppet kingdom, and as a part of the French Empire) and Spain got a liberal constitution already in 1812, two years before Norway. Therefore it would be a very interesting project to explore what these publications were expressing about the events in the North.



# List of references

## Newspapers

*Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://books.google.no/books?id=PONDAAAAcAAJ>

*Deutsche Blätter*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://books.google.no/books?id=GvIFAAAAcAAJ>

*Erlanger Real-Zeitung*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://books.google.no/books?id=MBpEAAAAcAAJ>

*The Examiner*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/>

*Gazette de Lausanne*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://www.letempsarchives.ch/>

*Hamburgischen Unparteyischen Correspondenten*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://www.bibliothek.uni-regensburg.de/ezeit/?2260914>

*Journal des débats*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb39294634r/date1814.langFR>

*Le Conservateur Impartial*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://books.google.no/books?id=s-caAAAAYAAJ>

*Le Spectateur*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://books.google.de/books?id=9k5HAAAAcAAJ&dq>

*Rheinischer Merkur*. The 1814 Volume.  
<http://digital.ub.uni-duesseldorf.de/ihd/periodical/structure/1724496>

# Literature

- Allgemeine Zeitung. (1814, September 1). Schweden. *Allgemeine Zeitung* (224), p. 4.
- Almén, J. (1893). *Ätten Bernadotte: biografiska anteckningar*. C.E. Fritze's k. hofbokhandel i distribution.
- Amburger, E., von Krusenstjern, G. & Lenz, W. (1998). *Deutschbaltische Biographische Lexikon*: Verlag von Hirschheydt.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin And Spread of Nationalism*: Verso.
- Barker, H. & Burrows, S. (2002). *Press, Politics and the Public Sphere in Europe and North America, 1760-1820*: Cambridge University Press.
- Barton, D. P. (1929). *The Amazing Career of Bernadotte 1763-1844*: Murray.
- Beaulac, S. (2004). *The Power of Language in the Making of International Law: The Word Sovereignty in Bodin and Vattel and the Myth of Westphalia*: Nijhoff.
- Berg, R. (2001). Den russiske "trussel" i Norge 1814-1855. In Roll-Hansen, D. & Büchten, D. (eds) *Norge-Russland 2004/2005 : Norsk-russiske forbindelser i perioden 1814-1917: Rapport fra tverrfaglig konferanse ved Norsk Folkemuseum 10.-12. mars 2001*. Oslo: Utenriksdepartementet.
- Bertsch, D. (2005). *Anton Prokesch von Osten (1795-1876): ein Diplomat Österreichs in Athen und an der Hohen Pforte*: Oldenbourg Wissensch.Vlg.
- Bjorklund, B. & Corey, M. E. (1998). *Politics in German Literature*: Camden House.
- Blom, G. P. (1869). *Norges statsforandring i aaret 1814*: P. T. Malling.
- Bredal, B. (2011). *Manden der ville vise verden: Malthe Conrad Bruun & Malte-Brun*: Gyldendal.
- Bregnsbo, M. & Jensen, K. V. (2004). *Det danske imperium: storhed og fald*: Aschehoug.
- Brown, W., Bromley, S. & Athreye, S. (2004). *Ordering the International: History, Change and Transformation*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*: Oxford University Press.
- Bukovansky, M. (1999). The Altered State and the State of Nature: The French Revolution and International Politics. *Review of International Studies*, 25 (2): 197-216.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society : A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Böhn, A. & Seidler, A. (2008). *Mediengeschichte. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Böning, H. (2012, June 6). "Hamburgischer Correspondent". *Journal der Epoche. Die Zeit*.
- Carey, J. W. (1989). *Communication as Culture: essays on media and society*. Boston: Hyman Publishers.
- Clausen, J. (1900). *Skandinavismen : historisk fremstillet*. København: Det Nordiske Forlag.
- Conboy, M. (2012). How journalism uses history. In Conboy, M. (ed.) *Journalism Studies: Theory and Practice, How journalism uses history*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Darnton, R. & Roce, D. (1989). *Revolution in print: The press in France 1775-1800*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- de Carvalho, B., Leira, H. & Hobson, J. M. (2011). The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 39 (3): 735-758.
- Dooley, B. (2010). *The Dissemination of News and the Emergence of Contemporaneity in Early Modern Europe*: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Dunne, T. (2010). The English School. In Dunne, T., Kurki, M. & Smith, S. (eds) *International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity*: Oxford University Press.
- Ellingsrud, M. (2011). *"Et helt stykke Norge" : britisk Norgespoltikk 1812-1814 (master thesis)*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History.
- Erlanger Real-Zeitung. (1814, September 2). Eine allgemeine Ruhe in Europa. *Erlanger Real-Zeitung* (70), p. 1.
- Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald. (1969). *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift: Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, vol. 18. Greifswald: Der Rektor der Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Universität.
- Federal Republican. (1814, November 25). *Federal Republican*.
- Forskning.no. (2004). *Hva om 2005 var et helt vanlig år?* Available at: <http://www.forskning.no/artikler/2004/desember/1103714335.73> (accessed: 27.09.2012).
- Friis, A. (1898). Frederik den Sjette og det andet svenske Tronfølgervalg 1810. *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 7 (1).
- Giessing, H. P. (1852). *Kong Christian den Ottendes Regjeringshistorie*: Bing.
- Glenthøj, R. (2010). *Fælles kultur - forskellige nationaliteter*: Syddansk Universitet, Institut for Historie, Kultur og Samfundsbeskrivelse.

- Glenthøj, R. (2012). *Skilsmissen. Dansk og norsk identitet før og efter 1814*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Green, A. (2001). Intervening in the public sphere: German Governments and the Press 1815-1860. *The Historical Journal*, 44 (1): 155-175.
- Gross, L. (1948). The Peace of Westphalia, 1648-1948. *The American Journal of International Law*, 42 (1): 20-41.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*: Polity Press.
- Hagemann, K. (2009). 'Unimaginable Horror and Misery': The Battle of Leipzig in October 1813 in Civilian Experience and Perception. In Forrest, A., Hagemann, K. & Rendall, J. (eds) *Soldiers, Citizens and Civilians. Experiences and Perceptions of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1790-1820*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hemstad, R. (2008). *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter : Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publiserings.
- Hemstad, R. (2012). Carl Johan og propagandakrigen om Norge 1812-1814. *Finsk tidsskrift* (7): 19-30.
- Hopkin, D. (2009). The World Turned Upside Down: Female Soldiers in the French Armies of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. In Forrest, A., Hagemann, K. & Rendall, J. (eds) *Soldiers, Citizens and Civilians. Experiences and Perceptions of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars 1790-1820*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hroch, M. (1985). *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*: Cambridge University Press.
- Höchli, M. (2010). *The Invisible Scissors: Media Freedom and Censorship in Switzerland*: Peter Lang.
- Høyer, S. (1995). *Pressen mellom teknologi og samfunn. Norske og internasjonale perspektiver på pressehistorien fra Gutenberg til vår tid*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Høyer, S. (2010). Newspapers without journalists. *Journalism Studies*, 4 (4): 451-463.
- Hårdstedt, M. (2010). *Omvälvningarnas tid : Norden och Europa under revolutions- och Napoleonkrigen*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Jakoby, R. (1988). *Das Feuilleton des Journal des Débats von 1814 bis 1830: ein Beitrag zur Literaturdiskussion der Restauration*: Narr.
- Koszyk, K. (1966). *Deutsche Presse im 19. Jahrhundert: Geschichte der deutschen Presse*: Colloquium Verlag.

- Kovarik, B. (2011). *Revolutions in Communications : Media History from Gutenberg to the Digital Age*. New York: Continuum.
- Krasner, S. (1995). Compromising Westphalia. *International Security*, 20 (3): 115-151.
- Krasner, S. (2001). Rethinking the sovereign state model. In Cox, M., Dunne, T. & Booth, K. (eds) *Empires, Systems and States : Great Transformations in International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Leiren, T. I. (1975). Norwegian Independence and British Opinion : January to August 1814. *Scandinavian Studies*, 47 (3): 364-382.
- Lundell, P. (2011). From Enlightened Participation to Liberal Professionalism: On the Historiography of the Press as a Resource for Legitimacy. In Ekström, A., Jülich, S., Lundgren, F. & Wisselgren, P. (eds) *Routledge Studies in Cultural History, History of Participatory Media. Politics and Publics, 1750-2000*, pp. 10-19. London and New York: Routledge.
- Malte-Brun. (1814a). Chronique morale et littéraire : Le prince Christian-Frédéric. *Le Spectateur ou Variétés Historiques, Littéraires, Critiques, Politiques et Morales* (XXV): 232-234.
- Malte-Brun. (1814b). Déclaration du Rédacteur sur la part qu'il a prise aux affaires du Nord. *Le Spectateur ou Variétés Historiques, Littéraires, Critiques, Politiques et Morales* (XVI): 255-263.
- Malte-Brun. (1814c). Pièces authentiques, relatives aux derniers événemens de la Norwège. Premier cahier, Juin, 1814. (En allemand : Aktenstücke, etc.). *Le Spectateur ou Variétés Historiques, Littéraires, Critiques, Politiques et Morales* (XII): 49-59.
- Malte-Brun. (1814d). Tableau des intérêts politiques de l'Europe : §. IV. Scandinavie. *Le Spectateur ou Variétés Historiques, Littéraires, Critiques, Politiques et Morales* (XXII): 61-64.
- McGuigan, D. G. (1975). *Metternich and the duchess*: Doubleday.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. London: Routledge.
- Meadwell, H. (2001). The long nineteenth century in Europe. In Cox, M., Dunne, T. & Booth, K. (eds) *Empires, Systems and States : Great Transformations in International Politics*: Cambridge University Press.
- Metternich, K. (1880). Metternich on the Censorship of the Press. In Prince Richard Metternich (ed.) vol. 5 *Memoirs of Prince Metternich, 1830-1835*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

- Milliken, J. (1999). The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods. *European Journal of International Relations*, 5 (2): 225-254.
- Motion, A. (1999). *Keats*: University of Chicago Press.
- Neumann, I. (1993). Russia as Central Europe's Constituting Other. *East European Politics & Societies* (7): 349-369.
- Neumann, I. B. (2001). *Mening, materialitet, makt: En innføring i diskursanalyse*. Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.
- Nexon, D. H. (2009). *The struggle for power in early modern Europe. Religious conflict, dynastic empires & international change*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Nielsen, J. P. (2001). Den russiske faktoren i norsk historie 1814-1917. In Roll-Hansen, D. & Büchten, D. (eds) *Norge-Russland 2004/2005 : Norsk-russiske forbindelser i perioden 1814-1917: Rapport fra tverrfaglig konferanse ved Norsk Folkemuseum 10.-12. mars 2001*. Oslo: Utenriksdepartementet.
- Nilsen, R. A. (1997). *Hva fikk nordmennene å lese i 1814? En bibliografi med beskrivelse av skrifter og trykk utgitt i Norge i grunnlovsåret*. Oslo: Universitetsbiblioteket.
- Opregte Haarlemsche Courant. (1814, September 2). Noorwegen. Christiania, den 10 Augustus. *Opregte Haarlemsche Courant* (205), p. 2.
- Osiander, A. (1994). *The States System of Europe, 1640-1990 : Peacemaking and the Conditions of International Stability*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Osiander, A. (2001). Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth. *International Organization*, 55 (2): 251-287.
- Ottosen, M. N. (2012). *Popular Responses to Unpopular Wars: Resistance, Collaboration and Experiences in Norwegian Borderlands, 1807-1814*. Oslo.
- Paul, J. (1927). Arbeiten zur deutschen Geschichte in nordischen Sprachen. In Brackmann, A. & Hartung, F. (eds) vol. 3 *Jahresberichte für deutsche Geschichte*. Leipzig: Koehler.
- Reinalter, H. (2001). "Pilat, Josef Anton Edler von". Neue Deutsche Biographie. Available at: <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd119432617.html> (accessed: 14.01.2013).
- Reus-Smit, C. (1999). *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations*: Princeton University Press.
- Robel, G. & Robel, H. (1999). *Alieni de Russia. Russlandberichte von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1855*. Mitteilungen, vol. 3. Munich: Osteuropa-Institut München.
- Robisheaux, T. (2002). *Rural Society and the Search for Order in Early Modern Germany*: Cambridge University Press.
- Roginskij, V. (2001). Р о л ь Р о с с и и в 1814 г (Russlands rolle i 1814). In Roll-Hansen, D. & Büchten, D. (eds) *Norge-Russland 2004/2005 : Norsk-russiske*

- forbindelser i perioden 1814-1917: Rapport fra tverrfaglig konferanse ved Norsk Folkemuseum 10.-12. mars 2001.* Oslo: Utenriksdepartementet.
- Rosenberg, J. (1994). *The Empire of Civil Society: A Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relations.* London: Verso.
- Russell, B. (1934). *Freedom and Organization, 1814-1914:* Routledge.
- Ruud, C. A. (2009). *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906:* University of Toronto Press.
- Sahlin, M. (1976). *Culture and Practical Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sandeman, G. A. C. (1911). *Metternich.* London: Methuen.
- Sardet, F. (2008). *Miéville, Gabrielle-Antoine.* Bern: Historischen Lexikon der Schweiz. Available at: <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/d/D20408.php> (accessed: 07.02.2013).
- Schnitler, C. W. (1911). *Slegten fra 1814: studier over norsk embedsmanskultur i klassicismens tidsalder 1814-1840.* Kulturformene: H. Aschehough & Company (W. Nygaard).
- Scott, F. D. (1968). Propaganda activities of Bernadotte, 1813-1814. In McKay, D. C. (ed.) *Essays in the history of modern Europe.* Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History:* John Wiley & Sons.
- Spruyt, H. (1996). *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors: An Analysis of Systems Change:* Princeton University Press.
- Starr, P. (2004). *The Creation of the Media. Political Origins of Modern Communications.* New York: Basic Books, A Member of the Perseus Books Group.
- Stephen, L. (1885). Hunt, James Henry Leigh. In Lee, S. (ed.) vol. 28 *Dictionary of national biography.* New York: Macmillan.
- Stiles, W. H. (1852). *Austria in 1848-49: being a history of the late political movements in Vienna, Milan, Venice, and Prague; with details of the campaigns of Lombardy and Novara; a full account of the revolution in Hungary; and historical sketches of the Austrian government and the provinces of the empire:* Harper & brothers.
- Storsveen, O. A. (1997). "Fornuftig Kierlighed til Fædrelandet". En analyse av norsk patriotisme mellom 1784 og 1801. In Storsveen et al. (ed.) *Norsk patriotisme før 1814, Kult skriftserie nr. 88.* Oslo.
- Storsveen, O. A. (2000). *Litteraturen om 1814 - en historiografi.* Oslo: Nasjonalbiblioteket. Available at: <http://www.nb.no/baser/1814/histori.html> (accessed: 30.09.2012).
- Stöber, R. (2005). *Deutsche Pressegeschichte: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart.* Konstanz: UVK-Verl.-Ges.

- Sørensen, Ø. (2004). *Historien om det som ikke skjedde. Kontrafaktisk historie*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Taylor, P. M. (2003). *Munitions of the mind. A history of propaganda from the ancient world to the present day*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Teschke, B. (2003). *The Myth of 1648: Class Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations*. London: Verso.
- Thomson, J. E. (1994). *Mercenaries, pirates, and sovereigns: state-building and extraterritorial violence in early modern Europe*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. X, 219 pp.
- Tilly, C. (1992). *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tolkemitt, B. (1995). *Der Hamburgische Correspondent*: Niemeyer.
- Ufer, P. (2000). *Leipziger Presse 1789 bis 1815: eine Studie zu Entwicklungstendenzen und Kommunikationsbedingungen des Zeitungs- und Zeitschriftenwesens zwischen Französischer Revolution und den Befreiungskriegen*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- United States Declaration of Independence. (1990). In Laquer, W. & Rubin, B. (eds) *The Human Rights Reader*, pp. 106-9. New York: Meridian.
- Verein der Schweizer Presse. (1896). *Die Schweizer Presse: La presse suisse*: Keller.
- Vierhaus, R. (1987). *Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert. Politische Verfassung, Soziales Gefüge, Geistige Bewegung*. Göttingen.
- von Rintelen, M. (1994). *Zwischen Revolution und Restauration. Die Allgemeine Zeitung 1798-1823*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Geschichte und Ihre Hilfswissenschaften, vol. 597. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Wallmark, P. A. (1814). *Memorial, uppläst på riksdagen i Eiswolde, i Norrige, rörande föreningen med Sverige. Öfversättning, aftryckt utur Allmänna journalen n:o 154 och 155*. Stockholm: Elméns och Granbergs Tryckeri.
- Wilke, J. (1987). Foreign news coverage and international news flow over three centuries. *Gazette*, 39: 147-180.
- Wilke, J. (2008). *Grundzüge der Medien- und Kommunikationsgeschichte*: Böhlau.
- Wilkes, J. (1820). *Encyclopaedia Londinensis*, vol. 17.
- Wilson, R. T. & Randolph, H. (1861). *Private diary of travels, personal services, and public events: during mission and employment with the European armies in the campaigns of 1812, 1813, 1814. From the invasion of Russia to the capture of Paris*: J. Murray.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Zelizer, B. (2008). *Explorations in Communications and History. Shaping Inquiry in Culture, Communication and Media Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.



Østergård, U. (2002). The State of Denmark – Territory and Nation. In *Comparare. European History Review* 2, pp. 200-220. Paris.