

1

INTRODUCTION

Scandinavianism and Nordism in a Europe of pan-national movements

Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius

The significance of pan-nationalism both as a cultural and as a political mobilising force has long been neglected by a nation-state-oriented historiography.¹ The general success of the nation-state principle during the nineteenth century has led not only to a general disinterest in alternate national and spatial projects – be it of a regional, pan-national or multi-national kind – but also to a lack of understanding of pan-national, transnational and regional ideas, practices and influences.² This volume examines the promise and pitfalls of pan-nationalism to consider how these experiences have influenced nation- and region-building more generally, in both a Scandinavian and European context. The aim is to shed new light on the role of pan-national ideas and movements by a comparative and transnational approach, as well as to bridge the research gap between studies on pan-nationalism and nationalism. We argue that pan-nationalisms must be seen as interconnected phenomena, informing and influencing national developments in different ways.

Pan-nationalisms have in general been perceived as pipe dreams or historical experiments in political expansionism that have usually been aggressive, justifying warfare – and ending up as historical failures. The propaganda potential of hostile pan-national rhetoric is still current, as recent developments in Europe have violently demonstrated. The history of pan-nationalisms is, however, a complex one, calling for more comprehensive studies. Culturally and linguistically inspired pan-ideas have also encouraged peaceful and cooperative relations and promoted solidarity and reconciliation among perceived “brothers” or “sibling nations” across state boundaries, including co-nationals in foreign countries. This cultural, or low-political, dimension of pan-nationalisms seems to have a longer and relatively more successful history than the aggressive quest for statehood – not least in the Nordic region. By creating mechanisms of cooperation and a sense of mutual interests and trust, pan-national movements have

played a part in Nordic and European politics and beyond. We believe that the trigger mechanisms and underlying thought patterns for European pan-national thinking are still relevant objects of study to understand pivotal developments in international politics today. This applies both to the legitimising of expansion and conflictive revindication of geopolitical interests and to creating blocs within larger super-structures such as the EU and NATO.

Scandinavianism, and its successor Nordism, was one of several pan-movements shaping – and shaped by – national projects, region-building and transnational encounters in Europe and beyond, mainly from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, but it has not figured much in generalist and comparative studies of pan-nationalism. On the other hand, research on Scandinavianism of the nineteenth century and Nordism/Nordic cooperation of the twentieth century has mostly been studied in a (pan-)national methodological framing, seemingly autonomous from the rest of the world. This volume aims to amend both these aspects in the historiography of pan-nationalisms and the Scandinavian/Nordic case. The broader European context is necessary to understand the development within the Nordic region. The Nordic experiences may, on the other hand, help to broaden the understanding of pan-nationalism as a varied phenomenon that needs to be studied in its concrete contexts within the broader framework.

The developments towards a well-established Nordic transnational region thus call for a broader and more nuanced understanding of pan-nationalisms as not only aggressive and virulent nationalisms,³ but also as culturally oriented low-political projects of regional and transnational identification and integration. Even if, as traditionally perceived, the political project of a unified Scandinavian state perished in the trenches of Dybbøl in 1864 when Denmark received no official assistance from Sweden and Norway against the German enemy, still 150 years official later official and civil society Nordic cooperation has a remarkable track record. We suggest alternative approaches for assessing the relevance of pan-national thought and practices by highlighting the Nordic case, which has produced long-lasting institutional cooperation mechanisms and a sense of cohesion as reflected in the self-identifications as “Scandinavians” or “the Nordics,” notwithstanding political setbacks and recurrent national tensions within the region.

One of the specific features of the Nordic case is that it eventually develops from a typical nineteenth-century pan-national project to a formalised, institutionalised, practical and pragmatic political cooperation based on respect for each country’s sovereignty, evolving into an omnipresent latent factor in Nordic politics and societal action and orientation. Even what arguably may be termed ‘high-political’ gains have mainly been achieved during the 1950s and 1960s, the idea of practical Nordic official and civil cooperation as an option has prevailed. As we also wish to look upon the Scandinavian/Nordic pan-nationalism from a comparative perspective, these findings will contribute to the development of a pan-nationalism study taxonomy. As previous scholarship on Nordic cooperation and its successes and failures has mostly been analysed with

an internal chronological perspective, the focus has mostly been on the meagre results of the high-political ambitions. In contrast, looking at simultaneous developments in neighbouring pan-nationalisms will provide for a more comprehensive understanding of the taxonomy of pan-nationalisms. One important interpretation we wish to communicate is the need to understand pan-nationalisms from its more cultural and practical features and to promote this aspect as an intrinsic and equally important part of pan-nationalisms alongside the traditional realist and nation-state normative classifications of success and failure.⁴

Nordic and similar co-existent pan-ideas are thus examined through a transnational and comparative approach, by means of empirical studies of pan-national activists, transnational (*émigré*) networks, organisational endeavours, public and literary discourses and political and diplomatic reactions by neighbouring powers. The “windows of opportunity” regarding political pan-Scandinavian ambitions between 1848 and 1864 are further investigated based on international and thus far unexploited sources, thereby challenging existing research literature on this topic. Here also this volume wishes to contest methodological nationalism in history research that has too often disregarded some tangible proofs of how at times the pan-Scandinavian idea of political unity was close to being realised during the mid-nineteenth century.⁵ The emphasis on the scarcely studied connection and elements of continuity between Scandinavianism and Nordism may also open new avenues of research.

The geographical scope of this book is mainly restricted to pan-national movements in Europe, and primarily Northern Europe. It brings together well-known international scholars and a new generation of researchers, from the UK, the Netherlands, Italy, Russia and the Nordic countries in a common effort to discuss encounters, transfers, similarities and differences among pan-movements in Europe and beyond, in addition to Scandinavianism/Nordism such as pan-Slavism, pan-Turanism, pan-Germanism and Greater Netherlandism, and the position of Britishness as an overarching but also contested pan-identity in Great Britain. The contributions add an important and so far understudied international and transnational dimension to Nordic region- and nation-building. Another aspect of this is to look at competing pan-nationalisms that at times were directed towards parts of the geographical area we generally consider as Nordic.

In the following, we will first outline definitions of pan-nationalism and related concepts, before turning to Nordic pan-ideas and practices. The third part explores the intersection between pan-nationalism and civil society, while the final section will serve as a roadmap and presentation of the chapters in this book.

Pan-nationalisms: A reappraisal

The long nineteenth century has been described as the age of nationalism in Europe,⁶ and a nation-state ideology has dominated the history of Europe for at

least 150 years. Our understanding of nationalism has, however, been “shaped by its later developments rather than by its original possibilities,” Dominique Reill argues.⁷ The predominance of the one nation, one state model, was “not the result of blind faith or a narrowness of original options. It resulted from the failures of other projects and aspirations.”⁸ Nineteenth-century Europe consisted mostly not of “nation-states” but rather of different state constructions ranging from composite states and empires to confederations and multi-ethnic union states.⁹ Connected to this political landscape, and not always easily separated from the more successful “main” nationalism (as it was not necessarily a clear-cut difference), is the rise of pan-nationalisms.¹⁰ While pan-nationalisms in the early nineteenth century, such as Mazzini’s Young Europe-movement,¹¹ may be seen as less aggressive, pan-national ideas later in the century were more often coupled with the global conquest of colonies and western expansionism.

In one of the few full-length studies of pan-movements, published almost 40 years ago, Louis L. Snyder defines what he terms “macro-nationalisms” as “politico-cultural movements promoting the solidarity of peoples united by common or kindred languages, group identification, traditions, or some other characteristic such as geographical proximity.”¹² In Snyder’s approach, this supra-national version of the expanded nation-state, the “nation writ large,” always includes an element of domination. This narrow and limited scope may arise from the inclinations of some leading scholars on the subject, such as Snyder, not to see beyond the logics of major powers as actors. Consequently, the smaller state’s cooperation imperatives and logics have not fitted into a model of expansive action. In a more cultural-oriented approach, Joep Leerssen describes pan-movements as an interrelated aspect of unification nationalisms and as “projects to unite not just the fellow-members of one particular culture or language but indeed whole clusters or families of languages: the nationalism of language families.”¹³

Recently there has been a growing interdisciplinary scholarly interest in pan-nationalisms in general and specific pan-national movements in particular¹⁴ (on Scandinavianism/Nordism see below) – to focus here on the European-based pan-movements mainly connected to regional rather than continental groupings of people (such as pan-Americanism, pan-Africanism, pan-Arabism and Eurasianism). New scholarship contends that it is high time for a re-evaluation of pan-nationalism’s ideological and cultural role in European and global history, including the complex and close entanglement between pan-national movements and nation-building processes.¹⁵ Pan-nationalism may thus be analysed as a particular phenomenon, or predominantly as nationalism “written large” or potential nationalisms, not yet recognised.¹⁶ John Breuilly, by using a similar retroactive criterion, defines unification nationalism as “successful pan-nationalism” that has achieved the establishment of a national state: “until the moment of success there is no difference between the two.”¹⁷

In a recent work on pan-nationalisms, however, Alexander Maxwell recommends a broader understanding of pan-national movements, not limited to or

measured by their success or failure in forming nation-states. Although pan-nationalism implies a focus on “geographical division, and specifically the desire to promote unity between co-nationals in different states,” unity can mean different things, he underlines, and rightfully claims: “pan-nationalists do not always seek a common state.”¹⁸ Maxwell identifies two criteria in established definitions of pan-nationalism: a “multiple statehood” criterion as a necessary but not sufficient precondition, and a “success/failure” criterion dependent on achievement of “high-political” unification goals – as that of a state.¹⁹ He further refers to two related kinds of common normative usages – contemporary as well as historiographic – of the pan prefix: a “pejorative” and a “revanchist” usage, used to stigmatise the aspirations of rivals and opponents, or to underline the aggressive or unrealistic dimensions, and the viewing of pan-national movements as challenges towards existing states.²⁰

The high-political approach and the pejorative/revanchist usage often do not (or at least not always) correspond with the goals, ideas and articulations by pan-national activists themselves, Maxwell emphasises. The alternative (also a guiding principle in many of the contributions in this volume which will also discuss the multiple statehood, the success/failure criteria and the pejorative usages in different pan-national contexts) is to stay close to the primary sources, study pan-nationalism in its “individual incarnations” and apply a broader low-political cultural approach by avoiding the perception of pan-nationalism as “failed” nationalisms.²¹ By low-political we mean ideas and practices that are not primarily – at least not in a short-time perspective – aiming at statehood, or are directed at dynastic, foreign or military political aims. This does not imply, however, that low-political pan-national efforts, whether in cultural, literary, scholarly fields or elsewhere in the society, may not influence – or (be perceived as) aiming to influence – high-political developments. Here we follow Maxwell’s discussion, rejecting the traditional dichotomy between “political” and “non-political” (pan-)national aspirations as “untenable,” and instead use “low-political” to denote “any form of politics that abjures claims to statehood.”²² This approach may go a long way in explaining important features of the pan-Scandinavian and other pan-national movements, as well as the endurance and legacy of pan-national ideas and practices, as demonstrated by Tim van Gerven in his study of the enduring existence of an “ambient Scandinavianism.”²³ This does not, however, exclude the fact that promotion of pan-national ideas may also serve to bolster nationalistic projects.²⁴ In the Scandinavian context, pan-Scandinavian ideas could be connected to both Danish and Swedish pan-national aspirations, while Norwegian nationalism primarily worked against pan-national ambitions.

Pan-movements were originally a European “invention,” connected to the continent’s “meso-regional” structures – above the (nation-)state and below the continent – and the grouping of European peoples in ethnic-philological categories or ethnotypes, often perceived as “races”: the Slavic, Germanic, Latin and Celtic.²⁵ The term “pan-Slavism” was originally coined in 1826.²⁶ Later European pan-nationalisms, such as pan-Germanism/pan-Teutonism and

pan-Celticism, may be perceived, according to Leerssen, as “copycat movements” inspired by the pan-Slavic example.²⁷ By the mid-1840s, terms such as Scandinavianism (usually without the pan prefix) and pan-Germanism were frequently used.²⁸ Later European pan-movements included pan-Latinism (including mainly France, Italy, Spain as well as transterritorial areas in Latin America), pan-Celticism (Bretagne, Wales, Ireland and Scotland) and pan-Turanism (mainly Turkey, Hungary and Finland), to mention a few.

Pan-movements constituted transnational social spaces, not only including minorities in neighbouring countries but also diaspora communities of co-nationals living and working temporarily or permanently in other parts of the world. Diasporic nationalism is thus an integrated and often primarily cultural or low-political feature of pan-nationalisms. In their seminal 2002 article on methodological nationalism, Andreas Wimmer and Nina G. Schiller address the reduction of analytical focus to the boundaries of the nation-state, making transnational nation-state building invisible. Pan-movements’ organisational initiatives contributed to maintaining homeland orientation and extended homeland politics into transnational social fields.²⁹

The renewed interest in research on pan-national movements is inspired by the transnational and spatial – and related digital humanities – trends in recent scholarship, emphasising nation-states as interconnected entities,³⁰ and territorial boundaries as “created, communicated and enforced.”³¹ Transnational studies focus instead on interaction between individual groups, organisations and states that “act over national borders and form structures that go beyond the nation state.”³² In broadening the scope of historical investigation beyond the dominant nation-state narrative and framework, the last decade has provided abundant examples within global and international history, regional and local studies, comparative history and transnational history. The importance of “national indifference” – the rejection of national identification on an individual level – has also been underlined, not least in an eastern European context.³³ We want to add pan-national history to the list in uncovering the blind spots of national history and do not, by default, take the nation-state as the starting point, the explicit goal or the given result. By combining pan-national and transnational approaches, we hope to offer fresh views on alternative national affiliations and different visions of possible futures seen from a nineteenth- and early twentieth-century perspective.

Nordic pan-ideas and practices

Scandinavianism, as other pan-nationalisms, has until recently been described for the most part as a failure. The more traditional Nordic historiography has tended to declare Scandinavianism as more or less dead and buried after the Second Schleswig War in 1864, resulting in the loss of the nationally divided duchy of Schleswig, and with a final endpoint after the consolidation of the German *Kaiserreich* in 1871. This was indeed the end of what has been referred

to as political and dynastic Scandinavianism, aiming at creating a unified Scandinavian federation with a common king that could more efficiently face the geopolitical challenges in the near vicinity. International literature, such as Snyder for example, has however tended to perceive the Nordic experience more favourably, even as a success story.³⁴ By linking Scandinavianism and Nordism, Snyder claims that the “most successful of all European pan-movements has been the Nordic combination of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Iceland, and Finland.”³⁵ In his comprehensive “encyclopaedia” of macro-nationalisms, Snyder argues in his somewhat superficial and misleading description of this Nordic experience that “cultural affinity was considered sufficient as a binding element and was not extended into the political sphere.”³⁶ This was clearly not the case regarding many protagonists of mid-nineteenth-century Scandinavianism, who explicitly aimed at a Scandinavian federation. Cultural affinity did, however, play a major role in early articulations of pan-Scandinavian ideas around 1800 and throughout the century. Newer research on different aspects of the history of Scandinavianism challenges the view of the pan-Scandinavian movement as a failure, and instead highlights the low-political cultural dimension and legacy as well as the contemporary political importance and possibilities of the movement.³⁷ Recent studies furthermore underline that the pan-national aspirations must be understood in the context of similar pan-national movements, mainly pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism, but not least the Italian and German national unification projects.³⁸

Historically, and as interlinked orientations, Scandinavianism and Nordism have been of considerable significance in the Nordic region from 1840 onwards, although the relevance has varied over time. Scandinavianism, aiming at closer cultural and political ties between Denmark, Norway and Sweden – occasionally also including Finland – is intrinsically linked to the conceptualisation and construction of Scandinavia/Norden as a distinct historical transnational region.³⁹ It was based on an imagined collective of “Scandinavians” – as opposed to “Germans” and “Slavs” – and was promoted partly from ‘below,’ in addition to dynastic-political schemes, by the region-building endeavours of ideologically motivated activists mainly belonging to a societal and cultural elite.

The enthusiastic student meetings of the 1840s and visions of spiritual and cultural unity were developed during the 1850s and 1860s to include political federalist plans, mainly by Danish and Swedish national and liberal politicians and publicists, and sketched at royal courts and military chief cabinets. The quest for statehood was an important, although controversial, element in Scandinavianism, but did not play a major role after 1864/1871. This absence of high-political goals in the late nineteenth century does not, however, imply that the pan-national movement was not continuously political in a low-political sense (see discussion above). The culmination of the explicitly political and dynastic Scandinavianism was thus not the endpoint of the movement and of pan-Scandinavian ideas. In the aftermath of the defeat of 1864, the pan-Scandinavian movement was amended with several new professional groups seeking Scandinavian kinship. The “neo-Scandinavianism” arising around 1900 was

primarily culture-oriented, stimulating closer cooperation.⁴⁰ This emergence of a mostly civil society-based Scandinavianism has been lauded in more recent research as being the backbone of present-day Nordic cooperation.⁴¹ It is also worth noting that the long-term and more or less unbroken practice of Scandinavianism/Nordism has later nourished high political initiatives and cooperation in the Nordic region.

At the same time the main geopolitical concerns for this transnational region of culturally similar small states have remained. The internal factors of a sense of a shared identity and a trust in each other were in many ways tested by external factors. The limits of both Scandinavianism and Nordism were often defined as a result of external pressure, while also stimulating closer cooperation. One of the main tasks of this volume is to delve more deeply into how Scandinavian pan-nationalism was experienced from the outside. How did Russian politicians and the imperial administration look at the pan-Scandinavian movement and its influence on Finland, integrated as an autonomous grand duchy in the Russian empire since 1809? Germany, on the other side, has represented the main antagonist in the Danish-German border dispute complex, which was the central driving force behind political Scandinavianism from the beginning.

The nation's Other as seen from a Swedish perspective was Russia, while in Finland it was primarily Russia but also to some extent Sweden. In Norway, on the other hand, the nation's Other was Denmark and Sweden.⁴² Pan-Scandinavian ideas were thus seen as complementary to the national projects within Denmark, where liberal opposition to the absolutist monarchy and the increasing national conflict in the borderland were of vital importance, as well as in Sweden where a liberal-oriented elite feared political pressure from the side of its Russian neighbour. In Norway, even if there also were a number of supporters of Scandinavianism, pan-Scandinavian ideas were in general perceived quite differently, as a competing rather than a complementary national project, potentially threatening the nation's newly achieved autonomy. The Norwegian-Swedish union of 1814 was not a result of Scandinavianism but could serve as a stepping stone towards – but also a stumbling block against – a union including Denmark. In nineteenth-century Finland promoting Scandinavianism was the taking of a deliberate risk. The liberal and pro-Scandinavian movement in Finland did not succeed politically in the late nineteenth century, which saw the emergence of a national Finnish-language movement that often viewed Germany and the Baltic region as a better option for kinship and a model. However, the Swedish-Scandinavian orientation, which included a strong identification with the right of law, has been a vital part of Finnish political history. This is true even if it has not always been seen in terms of a Nordic orientation.

The actual endpoint of Scandinavianism as an imagined community of the three Scandinavian nations is the 1905 rupture of the personal union between Sweden and Norway. Even if the event at times has been highlighted as a specific Nordic way of peacefully settling international conflicts, where even a *casus belli* could have been justified, it was actually the final turning point in Scandinavian

transnational cooperation. The period 1905–1914, between the rupture and the outbreak of the First World War has rightfully been termed a Nordic winter with reference to the cold and tense relationship between the Scandinavian nations in general, and the two kingdoms on the Scandinavian peninsula in particular.⁴³ The modern twentieth-century Nordic cooperation practice emerged out of the geopolitical pressure at the outbreak of the First World War and the subsequent united declaration of neutrality in December 1914 by all three Scandinavian kingdoms. Culturally it was based on the nineteenth-century pan-Scandinavian legacy of a sense of belonging to a common cultural transnational region. However, politically it was different, since any talks of political unification soon after the war were seen as too radical, and instead the respect for each Nordic country's national sovereignty was elevated to dogmatic status in Nordic cooperation culture.⁴⁴ The Nordic region-building project, however, continued by means already developed throughout the nineteenth century, concentrating on cultural and pragmatic Scandinavian cooperation, but with a continuous ideological dimension. Meetings, associations, institutions, publications, networks and practices with a transnational scope, with Nordic participants and with the aim of strengthening Scandinavian and Nordic cooperation, became gradually more widespread after 1864, and again from around 1918, disseminating ideas of Scandinavian and Nordic unity.

Those working to redevelop Nordic cooperation during the inter-war period started gradually to refer to themselves as “Nordists,” supporters of “Nordism,” conceptually and geographically slightly different from Scandinavianism. The term itself became more widely used only after the Second World War but was introduced in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and the practice of its principles can be dated back to the early 1920s. The earlier dreams of a united Scandinavian kingdom and federation, which existed alongside cultural cooperation and efforts, were now replaced with the longing for deeper inter-governmental as well as societal cooperation between five independent nation-states in *Norden*. However, the main internal source of a legitimised sense of belonging among Nordic politicians, intellectuals, civil servants, business executives, labour union activists and others remained the same over the years. The idea of a cultural and societal affinity between the five Nordic countries has remained in its essence very similar to the cultural dimension of the pan-Scandinavian ideology of the nineteenth century, although Nordism in general may be seen as a specific combination of pan-nationalism and transnational regionalism.

The Nordic pan-idea developed during the inter-war period, which is the end of the period under study in this volume, and was firmly rooted as an ideological basis for all the concrete achievements made after the Second World War. By then any visions of a Scandinavian or Nordic union had been discarded as a political utopia, and instead a discourse of cooperation between the five nation-states was reinforced and became pivotal. Even if Nordism was based on the explicit demand of respecting the sovereignty of each nation-state, the pan-Scandinavian rhetoric remained surprisingly strong in some circles even during the period before the Second World

War.⁴⁵ Moreover, during the war, a substantial rush of pro-Nordic utopias was expressed in a state of hopeless crisis, as a reminder of the hibernating under-currents of Scandinavianism that had survived and resisted geopolitical realism.⁴⁶

The persistence of a rhetoric of unification and the ideology of cooperation have only resulted in a few shared institutions and nothing like supranational organs, a discrepancy addressed as a Nordic paradox. However, it is gravely misleading to define Scandinavianism after 1871 and Nordic cooperation as non-political in its essence. The fact that the official and institutionalised Nordic cooperation has been and is still today explicitly performed by politicians makes this obvious. Official Nordic cooperation institutions, the Nordic Council since 1952 and the Nordic Council of Ministers since 1971, are political cooperative organs equally as much as the European Union, regardless of the fact that neither seems likely to form a federation in the near future.

On a low-political level, the Nordic cooperation is – although mainly guided by a pragmatic approach – comprehensive and still ambitious. Interestingly, these official organs of Nordic cooperation have recently agreed on a common vision: that the Nordic region, based on its long historical tradition of cooperation, will become “the most sustainable and integrated region in the world by 2030.”⁴⁷ These assumptions and visions – echoing older Nordic pan-ideas and visions of alternative futures – need to be closely examined, historicised and seen in a broader international context. We may, as a preliminary attempt, underline certain aspects of the Nordic pan-idea and pan-movement, arguably representing a Scandinavian *Sonderweg*: its perceived endurance, and thus relative success as a mobilising rhetorical force; its cultural approval as an extension of national cultures; its manifestations on an organisational level as a comprehensive web of Nordic cooperation, in civil society and official levels, leading some scholars to term Norden as a regional, semi-supranational entity;⁴⁸ its constitutive connection to a historical constructed transnational region; and the lack of one clearly dominant nation-state within the movement. Scandinavianism may be nationalism written large, but it simultaneously comprised competing, and – at its best – complementary, overlapping and collaborative nationalisms, a pan-nationalism with three (later five) exceptions, to use an expression describing the later developed “Nordic model.”⁴⁹

Pan-national civil society strategies

The regional – and we may add pan-national – shape of the associational sphere has, with Hackmann, “largely been ignored.”⁵⁰ In mid-nineteenth-century Europe in general, the belief in the merits of organisation was strong, and different kinds of associations flourished connected to national as well as pan-national movements, expanding beyond nation-state territories.⁵¹ Pan-national movements helped to build and maintain a transnational imagined community by civil society initiatives, which subsequently contributed to uphold and strengthen the movement.

The institutionalisation of the pan-movements of the nineteenth century was to a high degree non- or pre-political, or at least (apparently) low-political (as several contributions to this book demonstrate), stretching from philological and scholarly conferences, learned, linguistic and literary cooperation and associations to cultural and student festivals and similar activities utilised in promoting common culture and identification. There is a certain line extending from the German Wartburg festival in 1817 and later (pan-)German congresses and organisations, to “Young” movements of the 1830s and 1840s (*Giovine Italia* 1831, Young Europe 1834), pan-Slavic Congresses (1848 and 1867) and committees (the Slavic Benevolent Committee from 1858), Dutch and Flemish philologists’ congresses (from 1849), pan-Celtic associations and conferences (from 1900/1904), Finno-Ugric Societies and congresses (from 1918/1921), and to pan-Scandinavian and Nordic associations and meetings both within and beyond the region (mainly from the 1840s onwards). This is part of a broader picture of promoting transnational culture and contacts among nationals or kindred peoples across state borders, related to pan-national political ideas, but not necessarily claims of statehood.

The connection between pan-national thought and associational endeavours is strong – and may be particularly strong – in the Nordic region. What may thus be termed the civil society-pan-nationalism nexus in the Nordic region is worthwhile discussing in a broader pan-national context. The pan-Scandinavian movement, advocating cultural unification alongside long-term political aims, contributed substantially to Nordic region-building and a sense of common belonging, not least through associational means. A unified Scandinavia therefore was not only talked and written into existence⁵² but also *organised into existence*, as a perceived region with common institutions and a sense of identity, as well as being a common homeland for Scandinavians around the world.⁵³

The high density of transnational ties at civil society level has influenced nation- and region-building processes in the region in different ways.⁵⁴ This transnational dimension, which in certain periods has included pan-national elements, has shaped the idea of a Nordic identity and model. Stenius and Haggren argue, although admitting the lack of comparative studies on transnational organisations, that “the northerners earlier and to a greater extent than citizens in other parts of the world engaged in civic activities that extend beyond their own state borders.”⁵⁵ They call for comparative studies of different pan-movements and their respective integration strategies in view of regional constructions and their viability, and believe that there are “good arguments for claiming that the Nordic countries – paradoxically in view of the failures of their striving towards unity – can be regarded as being among the particularly successful communities, while this region developed a transnational citizenship (“*medborgarskap*”) as strong as it was unique.”⁵⁶

This Nordic tradition of border-crossing cooperation merits a thorough comparative analysis, Stenius and Haggren argue. Research literature on civil societies in the Nordic region in the nineteenth century has so far mainly focused on national preconditions and experiences, to a certain extent in a comparative,

Nordic perspective.⁵⁷ Recent research has broadened the perspective and examined transnational and international dimensions, as well as different aspects of Nordic cooperation.⁵⁸ This volume seeks to further broaden these perspectives and to contribute to the examination of the Nordic transnational pan-experiences within a wider historical, pan-national European context, seeing Scandinavianism and Nordism as an integrated part of a wider development of pan-nationalisms in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Roadmap to the book

This volume is divided into four thematic sections that follow this introduction and the synthetic chapter on pan-nationalisms by Joep Leerssen. When asking the question of whether pan-nationalism is to be regarded as a constant quixotic failure, Leerssen sheds a much-needed revisionist light on the latent importance of pan-movements in European history. Not only does he show the pivotal importance of the territorialisation of romantic national culture during the mid-nineteenth century, but he also suggests that there is reason to reconsider many nation-state projects as rather instable. This is an important element and argument connected to the need for a reappraisal of pan-national movements proposed by this book.

A wide array of sources are examined in the following chapters, underpinning the influence of pan-national ideas in European political, as well as everyday, life. While theoretical and methodological approaches vary, all chapters apply transnational perspectives and discuss the encounters of pan-national and national ideas in different regional, cultural and societal contexts, chronologically spanning from the early nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century.

In the first section nineteenth-century Scandinavianism is studied in the context of great power politics in Northern Europe. It clearly illustrates the political ambitions and possibilities of the movement during the 1840s to the 1860s – but also its shortcomings. These contributions offer a broader international approach, underlining the contemporary possibilities and influence of the movement, based on new archival findings, some of which has never previously been used. Morten Nordhagen Ottosen's contribution discusses a very specific time period, ranging from the revolutionary year of 1848 to the aftermath of the Crimean War. He introduces the idea of a real window of opportunity for a Scandinavian unification, contradicting much previous research which, perhaps in an exaggerated act of teleological reasoning, has discarded any idea of real importance in the subject. Rasmus Glenthøj's chapter follows the same line, as it looks at the pivotal time period around the Second Schleswig War. Based on partially new archival findings and new readings, both contributions manage to reintroduce the high politics perspective to an important historical moment, questioning the previously ingrained view that there was no real pan-nationalist prospect of unification. The last contribution in this section by Evgenii Egorov also offers a new and much-needed perspective on Scandinavianism, which is the Russian view. Based on extensive use of Russian archival sources, Egorov narrates the

Scandinavian story from the eastern enemy perspective. There has been very little archival research on how Russian authorities viewed Scandinavianism, even if the hostile attitude is well known. Egorov's contribution also shows the shifting attitudes and internal debates within the Russian administration concerning Scandinavian unifying efforts.

The second section deals with the concrete networks of pan-nationalist activists. The study of agency has recently been brought to the fore in efforts to renew the theoretical underpinnings for studying pan-nationalisms. One fruitful way is to look at the persons, actions and articulations, in short "categories of practice," rather than aiming at fitting various movements into theoretical models of success/failure criteria.⁵⁹ In Niri Ragnvald Johnsen's contribution the transnational contacts and influence transfers are studied systematically, shedding new light on how concretely pan-Scandinavian actors were influenced by other pan-national and national movements and central actors, such as Mazzini, notably the Young Europe ideas, the Italian unification movement and the Polish independence movement. The seeking for inspiration and benchmarking of pan-national action is vital to the understanding of how most of these movements developed, including the Scandinavian case. Mikael Björk-Winberg and Evgenii Egorov's co-authored chapter revolves around one such case. The Finnish-born Emil von Qvanten rose to become one of the most central actors in pan-Scandinavian circles with the protection of the Swedish court. Having been expelled from the Grand Duchy of Finland for expressing pan-Scandinavian sympathies, he continued his quest and made use of extensive international networks of like-minded souls. One of them was the Russian revolutionary Michail Bakunin, whose political aims and goals to some extent coincided with that of the pan-nationalists. These chapters show how tight and important international networks were, and shed light on inner tensions between many fierce minds of the European nineteenth-century liberal-revolutionary circles.

The third section is dedicated to studies looking at the inner developments of pan-national thought in the Nordic countries. The connection between nation-building efforts and their relationship to expressions of pan-national sympathies is the object of Anna Bohlin's chapter on nineteenth-century Scandinavian literature. In a comparative study of – among others – the authors Camilla Collett, Mathilda Fibiger and Frederika Bremer, she draws a contrasting picture of their relation to pan-Scandinavian efforts, some stronger than others. Through a variety of examples, Bohlin shows how literary metaphors were used to promote – but also dismiss – pan-Scandinavian thought. Ruth Hemstad's contribution examines the rarely studied phenomenon of the practice of pan-nationalism in diaspora communities and their interaction with pan-Scandinavian associations in the homelands during the long nineteenth century. At least within the Nordic setting there are only a handful of previous studies on Scandinavianism and Scandinavian associations abroad. The practicalities of oscillating between the national and Scandinavian – and new pan-national Swedish and Norwegian projects after 1905 – are exposed through an extensive empirical study, where new findings on diaspora pan-Scandinavian practice are presented. The tension

between the nation-state and the transnational region is also one of the main points in Peter Stadius' chapter on the seldom studied Nordic pan-national transition period of the inter-war years. This was the period when the modern form of Nordic cooperation emanated from the ruins of nineteenth-century political Scandinavianism, while yet building on earlier cultural cooperation. By looking at important non-governmental organisations, Stadius exposes the principles for a new and geopolitically realist "Nordist" take on pan-nationalism, where the respect for national sovereignty is paired with a set of values, notably that of seeing the Nordic region as a fascist-free and democratic region.

The fourth section is dedicated to comparative studies of other adjacent European pan-nationalisms, with reference to Scandinavia. Tim van Gerven compares nineteenth-century memory politics within three pan-movements, that of pan-Germanism, Greater Netherlandism and Scandinavianism. In a groundbreaking study he makes comparisons between the three movements, including new suggestions for the taxonomy of pan-nationalism features. Van Gerven applies the Scandinavian experience as a benchmark for assessing the two other pan-nationalisms. In Alvin Jackson's contribution the focus is on the complex interrelationship of Scottish, Welsh and Irish national identities with the overarching pan-national Britishness within the UK. This example has some similarities with the Norwegian-Swedish case, and the chapter offers a comparison which has seldom been made. Ainur Elmgren's chapter takes an approach from another angle, as she examines the pan-Turanian movement as part of a pan-national challenge of Slavic hegemony and promoting an alternative pan-Turkish identity project. With a wide array of examples Elmgren shows how pan-Turanism also became a considerable factor in Finland and thus constituted an overlapping pan-nationalist project within the Nordic region. Pan-Slavism, one of the main pan-nationalist movements in Europe, is treated by Stefano Petrungaro. In his chapter he develops a thorough analysis of the variation of interpretations and internal projects within the larger frame of pan-Slavism, focusing on low-political features, especially in Central- and South-Eastern Europe. The study also offers new perspectives for understanding Scandinavianism. The pan-Slavic example helps to identify the comparatively uniform and concordance-oriented quality of Scandinavianism and Nordism.

Seen together, the chapters illustrate different pan-national windows of opportunity, a range of door openings – and closures – during the century after 1840, when pan-national ideas and practices flourished, playing an often underestimated role in European national and political development. Different possible transnational imagined communities, different potential frameworks of loyalties and solidarity than the nation-state-based ones could have been chosen, as pan-national ideas overlapped and closely interacted with regional and national projects and aspirations. Through discussing entangled parts of the pan-national history of the region and beyond, the aim has been to offer a reappraisal of the Nordic experiences of pan-nationalism seen in a transnational and comparative context.

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to thank UiO:Nordic for funding the research project which gave rise to this book, Nordic Civil Societies: Global, Regional and Transnational Encounters since 1800 (University of Oslo), and ReNEW and the Letterstedt Society for funding workshops and open access. The editors would also like to express our gratitude to participants at workshops in Helsinki and Oslo in 2021, and the reviewers for useful comments in the editing process.

Notes

- 1 In this volume, the term “pan-nationalism” is used interchangeably with macro-nationalism.
- 2 Giladi, “Origins and Characteristics,” Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism,” Mishkova and Trencsényi, *European Regions*, Reill, *Nationalists*.
- 3 Snyder, *Macro-nationalisms*, 4; Danielsson, “Pan-Nationalism,” 43.
- 4 Snyder, *Macro-nationalisms*; Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism.”
- 5 See Glenthøj’s and Ottosen’s contributions to this volume.
- 6 Hobsbawm, *Nations*.
- 7 Reill, *Nationalists*, 12.
- 8 Ibid, 12–13.
- 9 See for instance Jackson’s new book *United Kingdoms: Multinational Union States in Europe and Beyond, 1800-1925* (Oxford University Press, 2023), and his contribution to this volume.
- 10 Danielsson, “Pan-Nationalism,” 42.
- 11 See also Johnsen’s contribution to this volume.
- 12 Snyder *Macro-nationalisms*, 4.
- 13 Leerssen, *National Thought*, 154. See also his contribution to this volume.
- 14 Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism”; Danielsson, “Pan-Nationalism”; Reill, *Nationalists*; Giladi, “Origins and Characteristics”; Lomová and Hesová, *Between Hegemony*.
- 15 van Gerven, *Scandinavism*; Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism.”
- 16 Snyder, *Macro-nationalisms*; Gellner, *Nations*, 43–50; Giladi, “Origins and Characteristics,” 254.
- 17 Breuilly, “Nationalism,” 149.
- 18 Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism,” 5.
- 19 Ibid, 6.
- 20 Ibid, 7.
- 21 Ibid, 14–15.
- 22 Ibid, 10.
- 23 van Gerven, *Scandinavism*; see also Leerssen’s contribution to this volume.
- 24 Mishkova and Trencsényi, *European Regions*, 6.
- 25 Troebst, “European History,” 235; Leerssen, *National Thought*; Jalava and Stråth, “Scandinavia/Norden,” 39; Litvak, *Latinos*.
- 26 Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism”; Kohn, *Pan-Slavism*, 1953.
- 27 Leerssen *National Thought*, 156.
- 28 Hemstad, “Scandinavianism”; Hemstad, “Scandinavian Sympathies.”
- 29 Wimmer and Schiller, “Methodological Nationalism,” 316; Brubaker, “The ‘diaspora’ Diaspora,” 5.
- 30 Fossat, *Transnationale historier*, 11; Putnam, “The Transnational”; see also Johnsen’s contribution to this volume.
- 31 Penros, “Nations, States and Homelands,” 7.
- 32 Jonsson and Neunsinger, “Comparison and Transfer,” 259.
- 33 Zahra, “Imagined Noncommunities,” 93–119.

- 34 See also Etzioni, *Political Unification*, 213; Stenius and Haggrén, “Det nordiska.”
- 35 Snyder, *Macro-nationalisms*, 111.
- 36 Ibid, 7.
- 37 Hemstad, “Scandinavianism”; Hemstad, “Scandinavian Sympathies”; Ekman, *Mitt hems gränser*; van Gerven, *Scandinavism*; Glenthøj, 1864; Glenthøj and Ottosen, *Union eller undergang*.
- 38 Glenthøj and Ottosen, *Union eller undergang*.
- 39 Stråth, “The Idea”; Hemstad, “Scandinavian Sympathies.”
- 40 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer*; see also van Gerven, *Scandinavism*.
- 41 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer*; Stråth, “The Idea.”
- 42 Aronson, “Nordic National Histories,” 259.
- 43 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer*.
- 44 Stadius, “Hundra år av nordism”; Elmersjö, “Between Nordism.”
- 45 Stadius, “Hundra år av nordism”; Hemstad, “Promoting.”
- 46 Stadius, “Kristid och väckelse.”
- 47 www.norden.org, accessed 14 October 2022.
- 48 Elmersjö, “Between Nordism,” 44.
- 49 Strang, “Introduction.”
- 50 Hackmann, “Voluntary Associations,” 11.
- 51 te Velde and Janse, *Organizing Democracy*.
- 52 Neumann, “A Region-Building.”
- 53 See Hemstad’s contribution to this volume.
- 54 Strang, “Introduction.”
- 55 Stenius and Haggren, “Det nordiska samarbetets,” 80.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Jansson, *Scandinavian Journal of History*.
- 58 Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer*; Hemstad, “Promoting Norden”; Götz, Haggrén and Hilson, “Nordic Cooperation”; Alapuro and Stenius, *Nordic Associations*; Strang, *Nordic Cooperation*; Stadius, “Hundra år av nordism.”
- 59 Brubaker, “The ‘diaspora’ Diaspora”; Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism.”

Bibliography

- Alapuro, Risto and Henrik Stenius (eds). *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2010.
- Aronsson, Peter, Narve Fulsås, Pertti Haapala and Bernard Eric Jensen. “Nordic National Histories.” In *The Contested Nation. Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, edited by Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, 256–82. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Breuilly, John. “Nationalism and National Unification in Nineteenth-Century Europe.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Brubaker, Roger. “The ‘Diaspora’ Diaspora.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28, no. 1 (2005): 1–19.
- Danielsson, Sarah K. “Pan-Nationalism Reframed: Nationalism, ‘Diaspora,’ the Role of the ‘Nation-State’ and the Global Age.” In *Nationalism and Globalisation: Conflicting or Complimentary?*, edited by Daphne Halikiopoulou and Sofia Vasilopoulou. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Ekman, Kari Haarder. “Mitt hems gränser vidgades.” *En studie i den kulturella skandinavismen under 1800-talet*. Centrum för Danmarksstudier 23. Göteborg, Stockholm: Makadam Förlag, 2010.
- Elmersjö, Henrik Åström. “Between Nordism and nationalism: the methods of the Norden Associations’ educational efforts, 1919–1965”, *Nordic Journal of Educational History*, 7, no. 2 (2020): 31–49.

- Etzioni, Amitai. *Political Unification: A Comparative Study of Leaders and Forces*. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Fossat, Sissel Bjerrum (ed.). *Transnationale historier*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2009.
- Gellner, Ernst. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Gerven, Tim van. *Scandinavism: Overlapping and Competing Identities in the Nordic World 1770–1919*. Amsterdam: Brill, 2022.
- Giladi, Amotz. "Origins and Characteristics of Macro-Nationalism: A Reflection on Pan-Latinism's Emergence at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century." *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* (2020): 252–67.
- Glenthøj, Rasmus. *1864: Søner af de slagne*. Copenhagen: Gads Forlag, 2014.
- Glenthøj, Rasmus and Morten Nordhagen Ottosen. *Union eller undergang: Kampen om Skandinavien*. Copenhagen: Gads Forlag, 2021.
- Götz, Norbert, Heidi Haggrén and Mary Hilson. "Nordic Cooperation in the Voluntary Sector." In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang, 49–68. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Hackman, Jörg. "Voluntary Associations and Region Building: A Post-National Perspective on Baltic History." *Center for European Studies, Working Paper Series 105*, 2002.
- Hemstad, Ruth. *Fra Indian summer til nordisk vinter. Skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen*. Oslo: Akademisk Publiserings, 2008.
- . "Promoting Norden and Nordic Cooperation in the 1930's." In *Nordic Media Histories of Propaganda and Persuasion*, edited by Fredrik Norén, Emil Stjernholm and C. Claire Thomson, 31–54. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022.
- . "Scandinavianism: Mapping the Rise of a New Concept." *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 13, no. 1 (2018): 1–21. doi: 10.3167/choc.2018.130102.
- . "Scandinavian Sympathies and Nordic Unity: The Rhetoric of Scandinavianness in the Nineteenth Century." In *Contesting Nordicness From Scandinavianism to the Nordic Brand*, edited by Mary Hilson, Jani Marjanen and Johan Strang, 35–57. Helsinki Yearbook for Intellectual History, 2. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2022.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Jalava, Marja and Bo Stråth. "Scandinavia/Norden." In *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*, edited by Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi, 36–56. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- Janson, Torkel (ed.). "Special Issue." *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 13, no. 4 (1988).
- Jonsson, Pernille and Silke Neunsinger. "Comparison and Transfer: A Fruitful Approach to National History?" *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 32, no. 3 (2007): 258–80.
- Kohn, Hans. *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1953.
- Leerssen, Joep. *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History*, 3rd edn. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018.
- Litvak, Lily. *Latinos y anglosajones: Orígenes de una polémica*. Barcelona: Puvill, 1980.
- Lomová, Olga and Zora Hesová. *Imagining Regions: Hegemony and Emancipation in Europe and Asia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, forthcoming.
- Mamadouh, Virginie and Martin Müller. "Political Geography and Geopolitics." In *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*, edited by Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi, 258–79. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- Maxwell, Alexander. "Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice." *Nationalism and ethnic politics*, 28, no. 1 (2022): 1–19. doi: 10.1080/13537113.2021.2004767.
- Mikkeli, Heikki. *Europe as an Idea and an Identity*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.

- Mishkova, Diana and Balázs Trencsényi (eds). *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- . “Introduction.” In *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*, edited by Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi, 1–12. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- Neumann, Iver B. “A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe.” *Review of International Studies*, 20, no. 1 (1994): 53–74.
- Penrose, Jan. “Nations, States and Homelands: Territory and Territoriality in Nationalist Thought.” *Nations and Nationalism*, 8, no. 3 (2002): 277–97.
- Putnam, Laura. “The Transnational and the Text-Searchable: Digitized Sources and the Shadows They Cast.” *American Historical Review*, 2 (2016): 377–402.
- Reill, Dominique Kirchner. *Nationalists Who Feared the Nation: Adriatic Multi-Nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- Snyder, Louis L. *Macro-Nationalisms: A History of the Pan-Movements*. Contributions in Political Science: Global Perspectives in History and Politics, 112. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- . *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. Chicago and London: St James Press, 1990.
- Stadius, Peter. “Hundra år av nordism.” In *Meningen med föreningen. Föreningarna Norden 100 år*, edited by Henrik Wilén, 9–72. [Copenhagen]: Föreningarna Nordens Förbund, 2019.
- . “Kristid och väckelse: Den nordiska enhetstanken under det andra världskriget.” In *Köpa salt i Cádiz och andra berättelser: Festskrift till professor Henrik Meinander den 19 maj 2020*, edited by Henrika Tandefelt, Julia Dahlberg, Aapo Roselius and Oula Silvennoinen, 211–27. Siltala, 2020.
- Stenius, Henrik and Heidi Haggren. “Det nordiska samarbetets vardagspraktiker. Vad vet vi om dessa förutom att de har varit/är viktiga?” In *Finland i Norden: Finland 50 år i Nordiska Rådet*, 79–90. Helsinki: Pohjala-Norden, 2005.
- Strang, Johan. “Introduction: The Nordic Model of Transnational Cooperation.” In *Nordic Cooperation: A European Region in Transition*, edited by Johan Strang. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Stråth, Bo. “The Idea of a Scandinavian Nation.” In *People, Citizen, Nation*, edited by Lars-Folke Landgrén and Pirkko Hautamäki. Helsinki: Renvall Institute, 2005.
- Te Velde, Henk and Maartje Janse (eds). *Organizing Democracy: Reflections on the Rise of Political Organizations in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Troebst, Stefan. “European History.” In *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*, edited by Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi, 235–57. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- . “Introduction: What’s in a Historical Region? A Teutonic Perspective.” *European Review of History*, 10, no. 2 (2003): 173–88.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller. “Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences.” *Global Networks*, 2, no. 4 (2002): 301–34.
- www.norden.org/en/our-vision-2030 (accessed 14 October 2022).
- Zahra, Tara. “Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis.” *Slavic Review*, 69, no. 1 (2010): 93–119.