

National Research University Higher School of Economics

University of Turin

as a manuscript

Evgenii Vitalievich Egorov

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE MEETS SCANDINAVIANISM: IMPERIAL
VISIONS, COMMUNICATION CHANNELS, AND PRACTICES OF RULE
(1843-1864)

Dissertation summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in History

Academic supervisor:

Doctor of Sciences,

Selin Adrian Alexandrovich

Saint-Petersburg – Turin, 2023

Introduction

This study focuses on the history of the Russian empire's long acquaintance with a project that proposed alternative organization of political and cultural geography of the Northern Europe. Scandinavianism, nurtured by organicist rhetoric of Romanticism together with historical and philological investigations that dealt with kinship status of the Scandinavian languages at the beginning of the 19th century, proposed a supranational vision that primarily implied different forms of consolidation – from the intensification of the cultural ties to bold political designs of Scandinavian union-federation – primarily between Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.¹ Scandinavianism as a project that challenged contemporary, legally recognized state borders was hardly unique for mid-19th century Europe. It emerged during tectonic shifts that took place across the European intellectual landscape around the 1840s, when similar tendencies surfaced in German Confederation and Italian states.² The political and cultural context of the Northern Europe, however, provided Scandinavianism with its distinct features.

In the case of (pan-)Scandinavianism, prefix ‘pan’ appears only in translation. In the Nordic mass-media, it has always been referred to as *Skandinavism(en)*³ since the first mention in a Danish newspaper in 1843 while it sometimes obtained the prefix in the foreign press with often pejorative connotations.⁴ Although Scandinavianism could back up expansionist ambitions, rhetorically it was often presented as based on agreement, trust, freedom of

¹ During the period that this research concerns with, Sweden and Norway were united by a personal union and are usually referred to as Sweden-Norway. See: Raymond E. Lindgren, *Norway-Sweden: Union, Disunion, and Scandinavian Integration* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015); Bo Stråth, *Union och demokrati: de förenade rikena Sverige-Norge 1814-1905* (Nora: Bokförlaget Nya Doxa, 2005).

² Although some scholars trace the continuity of early Romantic impulses in 1800s as shaping firm grounds for 1840s movements, I am more inclined to see the breach between the two cases, than the genealogy. However, the organicist vocabulary of brotherly peoples coined at the beginning of the century was revoked, though with altered connotations.

³ ‘En’ is a definite suffix.

⁴ Ruth Hemstad, “Scandinavianism: Mapping the Rise of a New Concept,” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 13, no. 1 (June 1, 2018): 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2018.130102>; Alexander Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice,” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 28, no. 1 (2022): 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2021.2004767>.

decision-making and even altruism.⁵ By the mid-19th century, the project, although it was contested by local nationalist and conservative programmes, gained momentum on the pages of the press, in the offices of foreign ministries, at professional and scientific conferences, and among the representatives of the royal courts in Denmark and Sweden-Norway. Scandinavianism was capable of mobilizing thousands of its adherents in the streets of the Nordic capitals and, just as importantly, dozens in the highest cabinets. Ultimately, however, Scandinavianism failed in its aspirations of the political unity of the Scandinavian nations, and the defeat of Denmark in the Second War for Schleswig in 1864 is usually presented as its end in the historiography, although these views are being challenged by modern research.⁶

The Russian empire – by virtue of being a neighbor to Sweden-Norway – worried about social and political capital of Scandinavianism, exacerbated by usually hostile rhetoric of its advocates. Moreover, since the Grand Duchy of Finland – a polity that in many regards retained Swedish culture, legal foundations, and institutions – remained under the scepter of the Russian Emperor since 1808-9, Scandinavianist echoes that resonated there produced internal concerns for the resilience of the imperial abode. Indeed, in Finland certain student groups and political associations regarded Scandinavian orientation as a compelling alternative to the power gravity of Saint-Petersburg. The reception of Scandinavianism in the Finnish society, however, produced tensions given the synchronic rise of the Finnish-centered cultural project of Fennomania that in some of its editions repudiated Scandinavian-leaning tendencies. The dynamics of the relations between Scandinavianism and Fennomania, however, was much more complex, as I attempt to demonstrate in this dissertation.

⁵ On expansionist ambitions see, for example: Einar Hedin, *Sverige-Norge och Preussen: 1860 - 1863; projekt till Danmarks delning* (Stockholm: Vitterhets historie och antikvitets akademien, 1952).

⁶ Morten Nordhagen Ottosen and Rasmus Glenthøj, *Union eller undergang* (København: Gads Forlag, 2021); Ruth Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter: skandinavisk samarbeid, skandinavisme og unionsoppløsningen* (Oslo: Akademisk Publisering, 2008); Tim van Gerven, *Scandinavism: Overlapping and Competing Identities in the Nordic World, 1770-1919* (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

The imperial concerns about the dynamics of the project in Scandinavia and in Finland, however, were not static. First, Scandinavianism itself was a vibrant and flexible project that survived through several decades by transforming its principles and rhetoric that resonated with contemporary anxieties and hopes on regional and local levels. Second, the imperial cabinets and publics perceived Scandinavianism differently. Their perceptions were conditioned by particularity of communication channels, foreign politics combinations, internal tensions, imperial languages of rationalization, visions of ethnic or class-based groupness and management style of these groups.⁷ Scandinavianism was a kaleidoscope of meanings, threats, and anxieties determined, besides the mobility and flexibility of the project itself, by how variegated imperial agents – in Scandinavian capitals, ministerial cabinets, Saint-Petersburg palaces, streets of Åbo (Turku) and Helsingfors (Helsinki) – understood the empire, its present politics, demands, and expectations.

Whereas there were synchronic contestations and debates about the nature of Scandinavianism in the press and among the government officials, I am mostly interested in how this perception changed on the diachronic timescale from the 1840s to the 1860s. The turbulent period from Nicholas I's conservative rule to Alexander II's unprecedented reforms witnessed European wars and revolutions, triumphs and defeats of the imperial power, repressions and emancipations of various scale, but most essentially, profound transformations of the social and political architecture of the regime that echoed in all composite parts of the empire. These changes resulted from comprehension of pan-imperial issues and were stipulated by imperial reactions on local manifestations, demands, and projects from the composite parts, including Finland. **The relevance of my research** is determined by addressing and reassessing essential topics of modern historiography related to Russian empire and Grand Duchy of

⁷ Ilya Gerasimov et al., “New Imperial History and the challenges of empire,” in *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. Ilya Gerasimov, Jan Kusber and Alexander Semyonov (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–32, <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004175716.i-280.4>.

Finland, imperial rule and its repertoire of power utilized within and beyond its borders, political languages, official institutional hierarchies, informal patron-client relations, practices of loyalty and opposition, and channels of information processing – all of which directly influenced imperial perceptions of and reactions on the issues related to pan-Scandinavian project.

Novelty of the research

This dissertation attempts to bring together three distinct historiographical fields that are not usually treated together, namely the history of the Russian diplomacy, the history of diversity management within the imperial abode, and the history of Finland as a special composite part of the empire. I am trying to complete this endeavor through the analysis of imperial reactions to the phenomenon of Scandinavianism. Although each of these fields have enjoyed considerable attention of scholars, I argue that only a synthetic analytical work that combines these subjects and disciplinary subfields allows for complex questions to be posed and answered. The sophisticated picture of variegated imperial and Finlandish responses to Scandinavianism, of their designs and implementations has never been provided before.

This study clarifies the workings of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian empire in presenting the threat of Scandinavianism to the emperor and acting upon it through various measures. The thesis first places the activity of the ministry in the context of the post-Napoleonic system of international relations, which established a repertoire of actions available for the Great Powers in relation to potential threats, as well as formulated a universal language for describing these threats. My research sheds light on the diplomats' attempts to *translate* regional Scandinavianist aspirations – usually regarded as perennial and geopolitical in the

relevant historiography⁸ – into this pan-European language of collective security to develop a follow-up response.

Besides, the dissertation argues that Finland was a particular object of diplomatic concerns with regards to Scandinavianism both as an externally ‘contested’ territory and as an area threatened by potential domestic agitation. The Finnish administration and especially governors-general played a particular role in diplomatic communication related to the issue.⁹ Finally, the dissertation addresses post-Crimean diplomatic perceptions of Scandinavianism, pointing to the limitations of the aristocratic-diplomatic surveillance over the project and omnipresent narrative of Scandinavianist downfall in their dispatches. The thesis reassesses the expectations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the idea of Scandinavian union during the crucial years of 1863-4, revealing adaptive rather than exclusively repressive response that was conditioned by the imperial exposure to new principles that manifested themselves in the diplomatic world.

Second, this dissertation traces previously unexplored genealogy of internal administrative reactions to the danger of Scandinavianism in the Grand Duchy of Finland that usually finds itself in the peripheral position in standard narratives about this pan-national project. The research attempts to demonstrate earlier understudied relations between the languages of rationalization of multilayered imperial diversity and instrumentalized practices elaborated to counter Scandinavianism. Ascribed revolutionary potential of Scandinavianism in the 1840s rather approximated it with other cosmopolitan threats coming from abroad, and Fennomania often stood close to the idea of the Scandinavian consolidation than seen as opposed to it in the administrative optics. Moreover, public reactions to Scandinavianism in

⁸ Emanuel Halicz, *Russia and Denmark 1856-1864: A Chapter of Russian Policy towards the Scandinavian Countries* (Copenhagen: Reitzel, 1990), 549–53.

⁹ For a similar argument on the role of the Finnish administration, see also: Lidija Lempijajnen, “Vneshnie kontakty Velikogo Knjazhestva Finljandskogo: 1809-1914 gg.” (PhD diss., Herzen State Pedagogical University, 2007); Lolo Krusius-Ahrenberg, “Finland och den svensk-ryska allianspolitiken intill 1830/31 års polska revolution,” *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier*, no. 21-22 (1946): 153–346.

Finland reinforced this vision, and some intellectuals could regard the two projects as complimentary.

Modern political-ethnographic mapping that was formulated as a result of the Crimean War and Polish Uprising as well as the development of academic inquiry into national characters and mores redefined Scandinavianism and resulted in its growing association with ostensible conspiracies of Swedish-speaking population in Finland. However, the definition was contested and in the situation of persisting censorship regulations, the struggle for this definition rather deployed in the administrative cabinets that articulated Scandinavian dangers – or their absence – to pursue their own goals. Scandinavianism appeared to be an inquisitorial label that the administration and especially governor-general used in their communication with Saint-Petersburg, attuned to the changing political language of the reforming and modernizing empire.

Third, this study introduces new agents into the history of the imperial perception of Scandinavianism. In addition to public intellectuals in Finland and Russian proper, whose opinions were not previously brought to light in the analysis of this problem, the dissertation addresses previously obscured institutions of surveillance and control – primarily that of the Third Section of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery¹⁰ – that profoundly affected the treatment of Scandinavianism in Saint-Petersburg. The Third Section headquarters in Finland constituted alternative center of knowledge-production, monitoring, and feedback provision that partook in the formulation of Scandinavianist danger, its ethnographic profile as well as in the cabinet wars as a quasi-independent ‘third party’.

¹⁰ But see relevant studies on the Third Section in Finland without, however, particular focus on Scandinavianism: Osmo Jussila, “Keisarikunnan moraalilääkärit: poliittinen santarmivalvonta Suomessa 1800-luvulla,” in *Ajankohta: poliittisen historian vuosikirja 1994* ed. Mikko Majander (Helsinki, 1993), 8–36; Marina Zagora, “Gendarme control in the Grand Duchy of Finland in the 19th century,” *Vestnik YarGU*, no. 3 (2020): 40–43; Marina Zagora, “Portraying the Local Life? Gendarme Control in the Grand Duchy of Finland and the Gendarme Reports from the ‘Periphery,’ 1866–1881,” *Journal of Finnish Studies* 25, no. 2 (December 1, 2022): 226–52, <https://doi.org/10.5406/28315081.25.2.04>.

Finally, the source base for this study includes materials from eleven archival repositories located in the Russian Federation, Finland, Denmark, and Sweden. Drawing on previously unexplored sources, this work sheds light on structural elements and details of the functioning of imperial institutions, transnational communication networks, and personal relations of various agents to the dynamics of the pan-Scandinavian movement.

Purpose of the study and research question

The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze the dynamics of multidimensional governmental, public, and private reactions to the phenomenon of Scandinavianism, its real and imagined effects in the Russian empire and Finland in 1843-1864. My research question is: ‘How and under what circumstances were imperial perceptions of Scandinavianism changing during the period?’

Research objectives

- Identify structural conditions, backgrounds, and factors of governmental acquittance with Scandinavianism in Finland and Russia
- Determine genealogy, context, and details of the diplomatic response to Scandinavianism in Copenhagen and Stockholm as well as in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Saint-Petersburg
- Trace the reactions of the imperial multilingual public spheres to the dynamics of pan-Scandinavian project
- Analyze the range of institutional views on the challenges posed by pan-Scandinavian idea, as well as repertoire of measures designed and implemented to impede the intensification of this idea in the international and domestic political fields

The object of my study is the set of source materials related to the imperial diplomatic and government institutions, agents, and public spheres that in one way or another reflected and reacted on different aspects of Scandinavianism, whether real or imagined. **The subject of this dissertation** is the range of views, opinions, perceptions that crystallized in imperial cabinets and public spheres as a result of their acquaintance with pan-Scandinavian project, the context in which they were formulated, and measures that were created through the operationalization of these diverse insights.

Research methodology

This study mostly fathoms into the debates and decisions that took place in cabinets and palaces. Often, these ‘debates’ surface as my conceptual constructions since the interlocutors might have never faced each other but ‘communicated’ by the means of their reports, dispatches, and letters. The dissertation does consider broader agency and other environments, of course, but it mostly concerns itself with these two settings. On the one hand, this dissertation thus analyses institutions in a manner rather traditional for Russian imperial and Finnish national historiography.¹¹ Moreover, since these negotiations often concerned policies that were meant to be applied to particular groups defined on the basis of their confession, class, or ethnic status, the dissertation draws on studies of the imperial policies with regards to particular communities and territories.¹²

On the other hand, and I would argue most essentially, the dissertation addresses conceptual languages of these debates and decisions, their rhetoric, metaphors, allusions,

¹¹ See classic studies, for example: Anatolij Remnev, *Samoderzhavnoe pravitel'stvo: Komitet ministrov v sisteme vysshego upravlenija Rossijskoj imperii, vtoraja polovina XIX--nachalo XX veka* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010); Kristiina Kalleinen, “The Nature of Russian Imperialism in Finland During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century,” in *Ethnic and National Issues in Russian and East European History*, ed. John Morrison (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 86-102.

¹² In this regard, see, for example: Paul W. Werth, *The Tsar's Foreign Faiths: Toleration and the Fate of Religious Freedom in Imperial Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Aleksei I. Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism: Essays in the Methodology of Historical Research* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2008).

references, comparisons, and other tropes that affected their appeal and their result. In this sense, the empire crystallized itself not in concrete buildings of Saint-Petersburg and Helsingfors or bureaucratic institutions but precisely in the tensions, misunderstandings, and errors that the interlocutors made in trying to grasp the complexity of what empire was and what it was meant to become. The empire, or rather *imperial situation*, manifests itself as the context of their negotiations and actions.¹³

This methodological intervention guides my analysis of multifaceted, often asymmetric communications that spanned around the issue – or even diverse issues – that related to Scandinavianism. In addressing these misunderstandings and attempts to overcome them, I introduce the term *translation*, meaning the attempts of imperial agents to introduce associations, equations, and common denominators – often altering the nature of the subject – between local or even foreign practices, legal procedures, and political categories with those imperial ‘standards’ understandable for the interlocutor. Theoretically, translation underscored synchronization but in reality it often resulted in uncalculated consequences.¹⁴

Examining the period from 1843 to 1864, I can hardly ignore the rise of nationalism as one of the main challenges for imperial establishments across the globe.¹⁵ Challenges did not mean the inevitable imperial demise but rather required the adaptability of imperial regimes to new languages and practices of solidarity, and many European empires appeared surprisingly successful in this, being able to capitalize on respective nationalisms in the role of their guardians.¹⁶ The research on nationalisms encompasses thousands of volumes of theoretical

¹³ Gerasimov et al., “New Imperial History and the challenges of empire”; Alexander Semyonov, “Empire as a Context Setting Category,” *Ab Imperio*, no. 1 (2008): 193–204, <https://doi.org/10.1353/imp.2008.0140>.

¹⁴ I am particularly inspired by: Vicente L. Rafael, *Motherless Tongues: The Insurgency of Language amid Wars of Translation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).

¹⁵ It might be, however, that the role of nationalism as a challenge for empires was overdriven or misunderstood. See: Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

¹⁶ Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, eds., *Nationalizing Empires* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015); Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011); Krishan Kumar, “The Idea of Empire,” in *Visions of Empire: How Five Empires Shaped the World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 1–36, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc773dq.5>.

literature enriched by detailed case-studies. Some of those have found their place in the core alphabet of the humanities, like Benedict Anderson's reflections on *imagined communities* or Ernest Gellner's principle of equation between national and political body.¹⁷ Methodologically, I am mostly indebted to Rogers Brubaker's reflections on identity as a process rather than a crystallized entity. Brubaker highlights that groups – be they ethnicities or nations – are never givens but rather fields of struggle between different powers that competitively seek to categorize and classify the population while individuals or collectives, in their turn, might self-identify themselves against the grain of such imposed procedures. Brubaker suggests moving from seeing groups to analyzing practices of groupness, and I completely share this principle.¹⁸

In studying diplomatic sources, I draw on the heterogenous theoretical intuitions of the new diplomatic history. Without much doubt, best examples of the classic diplomatic history around the issue of Scandinavianism transgressed the boundaries of the traditional disciplinary field and addressed questions beyond standard limits of the inquiry.¹⁹ New diplomatic history also calls for expanding boundaries of traditional diplomatic scholarship by focusing on issues of diplomatic culture and ritual, conceptual language of letters and dispatches, varieties of socialization and leisure, asymmetric negotiation and mediation.²⁰ In building my research on subject works and these methodological interventions, I explore

¹⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

¹⁸ Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, "Beyond 'Identity,'" *Theory and Society* 29, no. 1 (February 1, 2000): 1–47, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007068714468>; Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity without Groups," *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie/Europäisches Archiv Für Soziologie* 43, no. 2 (2002): 163–89.

¹⁹ Here are some of them: Henrik Becker-Christensen, *Skandinaviske drømme og politiske realiteter: Den politiske skandinavisme i Danmark 1830-1850* (Århus: Arusia, 1981); Halicz, *Russia and Denmark 1856-1864*; Erik Møller, *Skandinavisk stræben og svensk politik omkring 1860* (Odense: G. E. C. Gad, 1948).

²⁰ Jennifer Mori, "The State of the Art. The Way of the Future," *Diplomatica* 1, no. 1 (April 10, 2019): 5–12, <https://doi.org/10.1163/25891774-00101002>; Michael J. Hogan, "The 'Next Big Thing': The Future of Diplomatic History in a Global Age," *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2004.00396.x>; T. G. Otte, "The Inner Circle: What Is Diplomatic History? (And Why We Should Study It): An Inaugural Lecture," *History* 105, no. 364 (2020): 5–27, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.12925>.

diplomatic environments and outlooks as significant variables in their perception of Scandinavianist dangers.

Finally, oftentimes I refer to the term *Scandinavian-wide framework* implying particular geography of imagination that made historical agents and groups think and act having considered similar practices of thinking and acting across the Scandinavian region with Finland often remaining in the liminal position.²¹ Intellectually, this framework made the publics and bureaucrats compare, contrast, or parallel their concerns with those within the area. Moreover, it also made implicit and explicit references to experiences of others within the borders of the region legitimate and justified by allusions to similarity of culture, origin, language, civilization, and other categories that rhetorically made them closer. On the one hand, this framework predated Scandinavianism and indeed laid foundations for its rise. On the other hand, Scandinavianism also dialectically solidified its mental reproduction.²²

State of the art

Scandinavianism as a political project

As early as 1900, Danish historian Julius Clausen made an observation that remains highly relevant even for contemporary research, namely that Scandinavianism is a term hard to define precisely.²³ Indeed, up to this day Scandinavianism is competitively fashioned as a movement, vision, political trajectory, and diplomatic problem in the historiography. My dissertation focuses mostly on political and diplomatic workings around Scandinavianism, and I propose to start this section with analysis of political repercussions of the project.

²¹ In this, I am intellectually indebted to: Harald Gustafsson, “A State That Failed?,” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 31, no. 3–4 (September 1, 2006): 205–20, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468750600930720>; Torkel Jansson, “Between Two Worlds : Nordic Political Cultures in a Comparative Perspective,” in *Scripts of Kingship: Essays on Bernadotte and Dynastic Formation in an Age of Revolution*, ed. Mikael Alm and Britt-Ingrid Johansson (Uppsala: Swedish Science Press, 2008), 185–220.

²² Ruth Hemstad, “Scandinavian Sympathies and Nordic Unity: The Rhetoric of Scandinaviness in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Contesting Nordicness: From Scandinavianism to the Nordic Brand* ed. Jani Marjanen, Johan Strang, and Mary Hilson (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2022), 35–57.

²³ Julius Clausen, *Skandinavismen: historisk fremstillet* (København: Det Nordiske Forlag, 1900).

Clausen pioneered historical reflection on the development of Scandinavianism. He limits himself mostly to Danish sources and shows how Scandinavianism emerged from political aspirations of the Danish national-liberals. Clausen discovers the roots of the project in cultural ties and romantic explorations of the late 18th century. Whereas cultural and intellectual connections are appreciated by the author, political reverberations are dismissed – in a rather teleological fashion – as nothing but a fantasy of the youngsters who misinterpreted European and regional context.²⁴ This reflection on the gene of failure in the DNA of political Scandinavianism affected a great deal of the later research.

This work was later followed by deeper investigations of the national and local lives of Scandinavianism. John Sannes explored the Norwegian reception of the project and particular groups who sought to legitimize it in the public sphere.²⁵ Examining the press and private correspondence, Sannes argues that Scandinavian idea was not particularly popular in Norwegian intellectual circles since its main objectives that included the introduction of constitution or more inclusive representation, continued existence of Denmark and Swedish revanchist plans, usually did not relate to the local interests. Although this approach is gradually being reassessed and nuanced,²⁶ my research contributes little to the Norwegian edition of the project.

The Danish historian Henrik Becker-Christensen is skeptical of the movement's political ambitions as well.²⁷ According to his argument, Denmark was in dire need of military and diplomatic support against Prussia and the German states. This necessity coupled with liberal rhetoric of the opposition turned Scandinavianism into a viable survival strategy.

²⁴ Julius Clausen, *Skandinavismen*.

²⁵ John Sanness, *Patrioter, intelligens og skandinaver: Norske reaksjoner på skandinavismen før 1848* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1959).

²⁶ Øystein Sørensen, *Norsk idéhistorie: Kampen om Norges sjel*, vol. 3 (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2001); Niri Ragnvald Johnsen, “Vi hafva ifrån morgen till qväll varit ute och agiterat”: Skandinavismen og pressen 1848-1864’ (MA diss., University of Oslo, 2018).

²⁷ Henrik Becker-Christensen, *Skandinaviske drømme og politiske realiteter: Den politiske skandinavisme i Danmark 1830-1850* (Århus: Arusia, 1981).

Becker-Christensen makes extensive use of police reports and government communications to ascertain the Danish authorities' assessment of the dangers posed by the movement prior to the regime change of 1848. The historian, moreover, sheds light on the Russian diplomats' anxieties about the progress of the movement and argues that their pressure put a stop on many Scandinavianist impulses and organizing visions. Becker-Christensen's analysis of imperial perception of the project reveals many distinct intuitions of the diplomatic agents, although his exclusive focus on Denmark does not allow him to make broader conclusions.

Other essential works put more weight on the aspects of political imagination and struggle in Denmark that affected visions of pan-Scandinavian futures there. Rasmus Glenthøj, Uffe Østergaard, Hans Vammen, Michael Bregnsbo and Kurt Villard Jensen – each in their own way – attempt to contextualize national-liberal aspirations and Scandinavianist imaginaries against the backdrop of a complex imperial situation in the Oldenburg empire.²⁸ Their works examine various aspects of nationalist and infrastructural challenges to imperial domains as well as strategies of suppression and accommodation exhibited by the Danish rule with regards to these obstacles. They address the rise of new political agents, languages, and visions of the future that competed for claiming their dominance in the political field. Their texts draw on modern theoretical and methodological foundations, but they also elaborate upon a solid tradition of the Danish political history of the 19th century, whose foundations were shaped by the works of Alexander Thorsøe, Niels Neergaard, Erik Møller and others.²⁹

²⁸ Rasmus Glenthøj, *1864 – Sønner af de Slagne* (København: Gads Forlag, 2014); Uffe Østergaard, "National-Building and Nationalism in the Oldenburg Empire," in *Nationalizing Empires* ed. Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015), 461–509; Hans Vammen, *Den tomme stat: Angst og ansvar i dansk politik 1848-1864* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2011); Michael Bregnsbo and Kurt Villads Jensen, *The Rise and Fall of the Danish Empire* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022).

²⁹ Alexander Thorsøe, *Kong Frederik den Syvendes regering, et bidrag til den danske stats historie fra 1848-1863* (København: Gyldendalske boghandels forlag, 1884); Niels Neergaard, *Under Junigrundloven*, vol. 1 (København: P.G. Philipsen, 1892). Unfortunately, I did not have a chance to read Møller's *Helstatens Fald* but I engage closely with his work on diplomatic history around Scandinavianism: Erik Møller, *Helstatens fald* (Odense: G. E. C. Gad, 1958); Møller, *Skandinavisk stræben og svensk politik omkring 1860*.

Another group of historians focus on the aspects of Danish nation-building in the nineteenth century, issues of mental mapping, imagination of the Self and Other and fostering of the national symbolics. Ole Fældbek and Inge Adriansen draw attention to the formulation of new national symbols and imaginaries that often were opposed or mutually exclusive with the semantic repertoire of Oldenburg empire.³⁰ Aladin Larguèche elaborates on the issues of the semantic border-mapping that assisted in formulating oppositions between Danish and German as well as between Scandinavian and Russian.³¹ Steen Bo Frandsen, however, demonstrates the broad range of self-identifications adhered to by the subjects of the Danish king, arguing that ‘German’ and ‘Danish’ positions were hegemonically projected by the nationalist rhetoric while the palette of statuses remained much more heterogenous even during the crisis years of wars and revolutions.³²

Although since the 2000s, there appeared a relative decline of interest for the political history of pan-Scandinavian project, giving way to research on its cultural visions, communication networks, and non-governmental agencies, Morten Nordhagen Ottosen and Rasmus Glenthøj have forcefully manifested the revival of investigations into the political dynamics of Scandinavianism in their huge volume *Union eller undergang*. Arguing against teleological narratives of the downfall of the Scandinavian union idea, the two historians reassess its chances revealing the complex dynamics of negotiations, quarrels, and decision-making on both sides of the Øresund to argue that Scandinavian union served as a final goal of many other subordinate political programmes in Denmark and in Sweden-Norway. In the scope of more than a thousand pages the authors provide new genealogies and situate driving forces

³⁰ Ole Feldbæk, *Dansk identitetshistorie: Et yndigt land 1789-1848* (København: Reitzel, 1991); Inge Adriansen, *Nationale Symboletter* (København: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2003).

³¹ Aladin Larguèche, “Resistance as the Creation of a ‘Natural Frontier’: The Language of 19th-Century Scandinavianism (1839-1867),” in *Contesting Frontiers, Resisting Identities*, ed. Lud'a Klusáková and Martin Moll (Plus-Pisa University Press, 2010), 181–94.

³² Steen Bo Frandsen, *Opdagelsen af Jylland: den regionale dimension i Danmarkshistorien 1814-64* (Århus: Aarhus universitetsforlag, 1996); Steen Bo Frandsen, “The Breakup of a Composite State and the Construction of a Nationalist Conflict: Denmark and the Duchies in the 19th Century,” *JEMIE - Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 8, no. 1 (2009): 1-20.

behind the idea of the Nordic unity both drawing on virtually all existing research and addressing previously underexplored archival materials. Without doubt, a new standard work that presents a fresh narrative of pan-Scandinavian project, the book is encyclopedic – not to say megalomaniac – in its scope. One of the main networks of communication that endowed Scandinavianism with real political capital, according to their argument, was diplomacy.³³

Diplomacy and Scandinavianism

The historiographic tradition of diplomatic history has expanded the range of instrumentalized approaches that have been used to analyze pan-Scandinavian project. As early as 1912, Hjalmar Haralds published a history of Swedish diplomatic and military support for Denmark in 1848 then elaborated and continued by Erik Löfgren and Bo Lundqvist.³⁴ Since Sweden and the Russian empire declared their collective demarche, Russian position was also briefly addressed in the texts. Although Haralds pointed to the fact that the Swedish assistance was not determined exclusively by the public impulse of Scandinavism, the political capital of the movement in 1848 was hard to ignore at the diplomatic level. Haralds, Löfgren and Lundqvist drawing on a large body of archival sources that pertained to the diplomatic discussions, have only briefly touched on another important aspect of Oscar I's politics, namely his engagement with leading Swedish journals to shape the public opinion that would favor and reinforce his Denmark-focused activities. This aspect would play a crucial role during another crisis, the Crimean War.

Although before the 1850s, Oscar I emphasized his loyalty to the Russian emperor and his commitment to the so-called policy of 1812, meaning a close alliance between Russia and

³³ Nordhagen Ottosen and Glenthøj, *Union eller undergang*.

³⁴ Hjalmar Haralds, *Sveriges utrikespolitik 1848, ett bidrag till belysning af danska frågans första skede. Akademisk afhandling av Hjalmar Haralds* (Uppsala: Akademiska bokhandeln, 1912); Erik Löfgren, *Sverige-Norge och danska frågan 1848-49: från stilleståndet i Malmö till den svensk-danska konventionen augusti 1849* (Uppsala: Wretmans boktryckeri, 1921); Bo Vernersson Lundqvist, *Sverige och den slesvig-holsteinska frågan 1849-50* (Uppsala: Appelberg, 1934).

Sweden-Norway, the window of opportunity that the Crimean War opened clearly changed his approach to building relations with his eastern neighbor. Sven Eriksson's research focuses on the change in Swedish foreign policy during 1853-6, when Oscar I was shifting from Swedish-Danish neutrality towards a military alliance with the maritime powers. This policy shift was accompanied by a propaganda campaign launched under the king's aegis in the domestic journals and even European public sphere. Oscar I, having signed the November Treaty of 1855, was ready to join the coalition of European powers, but peace negotiations that soon started confused his plans.³⁵ Mart Kuldkepp, capitalizing on the research of the Swedish position during the Crimean War, has recently revisited persistent narratives of Swedish neutrality, arguing that Sweden was in fact one step from entering the hostilities under the banners of Finnish-centered revanchism and Scandinavian union.³⁶

Åke Holmberg extends Ericsson's focus to examine the extent to which Scandinavian ideas were popular among the Swedish elite and the significance of the pan-Scandinavian agenda in Swedish foreign policy. Drawing on a wide range of diplomatic and bureaucratic sources as well as on the materials of the press, he argues that Scandinavianism became one of the main ideas around which political debates unfolded in the cabinets and courts of the Scandinavian monarchs.³⁷ Erik Møller, another researcher of Scandinavianism in the high cabinets has also stressed that the promotion of Scandinavian union was only possible in the context of a doppelganger diplomacy: monarchical figures and especially King Charles XV elaborated their programmes through personal environments and emissaries often provoking established ministries and legal hierarchies of power.³⁸

³⁵ Sven Eriksson, *Svensk diplomati och tidningspress under Krimkriget* (Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt & Söner, 1939).

³⁶ Mart Kuldkepp, "National Revanchism at a Critical Juncture: Sweden's Near-Involvement in the Crimean War as a Study in Swedish Nationalism," *Scandinavica* 58, no. 2 (December 31, 2019): 115–33, <https://doi.org/10.54432/scand/RXJE7055>.

³⁷ Åke Holmberg, *Skandinavismen i Sverige vid 1800-talets mitt (1843-1863)* (PhD diss., University of Göteborg, 1946).

³⁸ Møller, *Skandinavisk stræben og svensk politik omkring 1860*.

Emmanuel Halicz's works elaborate on preceding research and introduce new source materials from European and Russian archives. He pioneered the introduction of a new variable into the Scandinavianist equation, namely the diplomacy of the Russian empire and its influence on foreign policies of the Nordic kingdoms. Previous works, including that of Møller and Becker-Christensen have engaged with Russian materials but Halicz's exhaustive research in the Russian archives, his impeccable knowledge of diplomatic personnel and its workings set this work on another level in its Russia-focused aspects. The historian focuses particularly on the period 1853-1864 in two books. First of them explores the dynamics of the Scandinavian and, in particular, Danish neutrality arguing that non-intervention was not a simple status but rather a dynamic system of checks and balances, compromise-seeking, maneuvering, and negotiation with multiple agents.³⁹ Another book addresses Russian position vis-à-vis Denmark in 1856-1864 with particular emphasis on the tensions that erupted between Denmark and the German states over the issues of Schleswig. Halicz argues that Scandinavian fears continuously affected the trajectory of the imperial politics and reinforced its position as a guardian of the Danish integrity, although its intervention remained limited due to the necessity of implementing the internal reforms.⁴⁰ Drawing on Halicz's analysis, my dissertation expands the aspects of the Russian imperial engagements with Scandinavianism, contributing to and in some respects revising Halicz's analysis.

While this body of work illuminated the dynamics of international politics, the picture of diplomacy they painted often seems disconnected from other transnational information networks and intellectual debates. These studies portray foreign policy as a calculated world of ministerial discussion, independent of domestic political and cultural reflections while real agency is relegated to the cabinets and high emissaries. Going against the grain of this

³⁹ Emanuel Halicz, *Danish Neutrality During the Crimean War (1853-1856): Denmark Between the Hammer and the Anvil* (Odense: Odense University Press, 1977).

⁴⁰ Halicz, *Russia and Denmark 1856-1864*.

perspective, Ruth Hemstad addresses grassroot diplomacy and professional corporations that began to shape in Scandinavia after the idea of political integration was abandoned in the late 1860s. Shifting the focus from the political field to entrepreneurial cooperation enables her to formulate a new periodization of Scandinavianism, stretching it into the early 20th century. She convincingly demonstrates how the idea of Scandinavian rapprochement adapted to the new conditions of the globalizing world, association, and cooperation pushed forward by non-governmental organizations.⁴¹

Other investigations conceptualized students as main low-level diplomatic agents behind the dynamics of Scandinavianism. Scandinavian student festivals, a tradition invented in the 1840s, surfaces as the main arena where new programmes and designs of the Scandinavian future crystallized, spread, and were negotiated while emotive bonds tied these students in networks of trust, friendship, and altruism in these investigations. Moreover, as Henrik Ullstad demonstrates, students conventions gravitated city-dwellers and commoners into their performative spectacles, contributing to the enwidening of the boundaries of participation in Scandinavianist affairs.⁴² Fredrik Nilsson argues that Scandinavian students capitalized on the features of modernity in their appearances and in their imagination where their vehicles – steamships cruising through the Baltic shores – became significant entities of the semantic system. While the scenes of students conventions became more and more politicized, internal tensions and disagreements were alleviated by emotional aspects of the festivals.⁴³

Niri Ragnvald Johnsen, in his turn, argues that student conventions contributed to the shaping of transnational networks that were crucial in distributing Scandinavianist agitation in

⁴¹ Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter*.

⁴² Henrik Ullstad, “Med mjöd och manligt glam på fäders sätt”: studentskandinavismen som ideologi och performativ praktik,” in *Skandinavism: en rörelse och en idé under 1800-talet*, ed. Magdalena Hillström and Hanne Sanders (Göteborg: Makadam förlag, 2014), 82–113.

⁴³ Fredrik Nilsson, *I rörelse: politisk handling under 1800-talets första hälft* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2000).

local contexts.⁴⁴ The general turn towards networks of participation and action is evident in the studies of the pan-Scandinavian movement. This cluster of works lays bare the agency of transnational horizontal cooperation as opposed to hierarchical relations. The map of the Nordic universities as well as the circuit of academic and professional societies produced alternative matrix of integration. The geography of the universities, spanning from Copenhagen to Christiania, Lund, Uppsala and to a degree even Helsingfors shaped the knots of this web. These networks of cooperation could either behave independently of power hierarchies or occasionally surface as tools that could reinforce governmental projects, as happened during the students convention in 1856 extensively and coordinately covered across the regions producing transnational media event.⁴⁵

Language, culture, and communication

Indeed, cross-border communication, translation, organization of media programmes that contributed to the creation of Scandinavian-wide historical and literary narratives previously eluded the focus of historical investigations and relatively recently manifested themselves in the study of Scandinavian identities-in-the-making. Kari Haarder Ekman frames pan-Scandinavism as a politically modest but culturally appealing identity programme. Ekman investigates literary connections and cultural projects within the Scandinavian context, conceptualizing the multitude of these relations as a ‘republic of letters’. As it is rather the state of connectedness that manifests Scandinavianism in her reading, political perturbations of 1864 do not represent the stalemate but rather a point of its reconfiguration. Ekman regards pan-Scandinavism as an umbrella-project that implied competing visions of integration.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Johnsen, “Vi hafva ifrån morgon till qväll varit ute och agiterat”: Skandinavismen og pressen 1848-1864.’

⁴⁵ Jonas Harvard and Magdalena Hillström, “Media Scandinavianism: Media Events and the Historical Legacy of Pan-Scandinavianism,” in *Communicating the North* ed. Jonas Harvard and Peter Stadius (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013).

⁴⁶ Kari Haarder Ekman, “Mitt hems gränser vidgades”: en studie i den kulturella skandinavismen under 1800-talet (Göteborg: Makadam förlag, 2010).

Ruth Hemstad addressed the issue of self-naming and terms that the advocates and critics of Scandinavianism used, concluding that concepts like *Scandinavia* and *Norden* changed their contents throughout the 19th century, and pan-Scandinavian project greatly contributed to the reformulation and wide-spread use of the terms.⁴⁷ This reformulation and attempts to accentuate a macro-national identity, however, were often opposed by local identity-building processes that rejected the region-wide allure of the project.⁴⁸ However, Scandinavianism often demonstrated potential for adaptability to local conditions, and trans-border communication networks that fostered its development mostly by the means of public press serve as a testament to that, as Jonas Harvard, Peter Stadius, and Magdalena Hillström demonstrate.⁴⁹

Oftentimes, the echo of Scandinavianist events reached as far as to Finland where students festivals, diplomatic twists, and political tensions in the North were enthusiastically followed by liberal public and apprehensively looked at by the administration. Pieter Dhondt in his study explores Nordic university anniversaries of the 19th century, and the Alexander Imperial University in Helsingfors also falls in his scope.⁵⁰ In the chapter dedicated to the University of Helsingfors bicentenary in 1840, Dhondt finds imperial orchestrated attempts to formulate Finnish national tradition that would, however, manifest itself as loyal to Saint-Petersburg. This move arguably produces concerns and irritation among liberal and Swedish-leaning groups in Finland and in Sweden. Dhondt's analysis, however, does not go far enough

⁴⁷ Ruth Hemstad, “Scandinavian Sympathies and Nordic Unity: The Rhetoric of Scandinavianness in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Contesting Nordaness* ed. Jani Marjanen, Johan Strang and Mary Hilson (Boston: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2022), 35–57.

⁴⁸ Øystein Sørensen, ed., *Jakten på det norske: perspektiver på utviklingen av en norsk nasjonal identitet på 1800-tallet* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 2007).

⁴⁹ Jonas Harvard and Peter Stadius, “A Communicative Perspective on the Formation of the North: Contexts, Channels and Concepts,” in *Communicating the North*, eds. Jonas Harvard and Peter Stadius (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), 1–24; Jonas Harvard and Magdalena Hillström, “Media Scandinavianism: Media Events and the Historical Legacy of Pan-Scandinavianism”.

⁵⁰ Pieter Dhondt, *National, Nordic or European?: Nineteenth-Century University Jubilees and Nordic Cooperation, National, Nordic or European?* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 13–38.

in analyzing the threats and anxieties that the Russian rule in Finland faced during the 1830s and 1840s, and my dissertation seeks to address this context in more detail.

Russian empire and management of diversity

The Russian empire governed diverse populations across its domains. The imperial rule demonstrated different faces in its borderlands and composite parts, that ranged from colonial exploitation to granting autonomous legal regimes. Such distribution of rule depended on many factors that included classificatory regimes, national and racial taxonomies, imperial position in the European system of international affairs, historical precedents, and monarchical will among other variables of the equation. Finland was granted with legal autonomy that became an exception, especially after the suppressions of the Polish Uprisings in 1830-1 and 1863 which justified administrative intervention of the Russian rule into earlier autonomous system while the special position of the Baltic provinces was gradually corroding during the 19th century.⁵¹

It is unnecessary to provide a historiographical overview of the imperial designs and transformations across all the domains. However, it is important to understand that Finland was often viewed by Saint-Petersburg and local administration as a part of the larger realm, and patterns of thinking, anxieties, epistemological regimes elaborated with regards to one territory and population often expanded to other areas of the imperial rule either to find contrasts or to discover parallels there. Recognizing this habit of the imperial rule, I draw on wide array of studies devoted to Russian rule in different territorial contexts. Andreas Kappeler's pioneering study of Russia as a 'multinational realm' gave impetus to broader and deeper reflections on

⁵¹ Alexander Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia: A Study in Imperial Expansion, 1814–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020); Darius Staliūnas, *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus After 1863* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007); Edward C. Thaden, ed., *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

the consequences of this multinationalism for the government apparatus.⁵² With regards to the administrative borderland practices, I particularly draw on the analysis and conclusions made by Edward Thaden, Theodore Weeks, Alexei Miller, Mihail Dolbilov, Anatoliy Remnev, Jane Burbank, and many others.⁵³

Another conceptualization of the empire is proposed by a group of scholars behind the journal *Ab Imperio*. Their contributions, drawing on new analytical vocabulary of imperial situation, languages of rationalization and self-description, focus on the visions that those in power forge to manage the diversity. Distancing empire from the rigidness of a state that is usually supplied with territory and homogenous nation, their works provide optics able to address hybrid strategies of coexistence and management within the imperial abode. Flexible with regards to narration modes and theoretical frameworks, their umbrella-conceptualization seeks to avoid grand narratives and center-periphery dichotomies, providing a space for new interpretations. Focusing on the tensions between competing projects of self-organization and imperial aspirations to management of diversity, Marina Mogilner, Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, and Alexander Semyonov highlight ambiguities of the imperial means as well as unpredictability of its ends.⁵⁴

Finland in the structure of imperial governance

As Vadim Roginskiy, Päiviö Tommila, Carl von Bonsdorff demonstrate in their works,

⁵² Andreas Kappeler, *Russland als Vielvölkerreich: Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall* (Münich: C.H. Beck, 1992).

⁵³ Edward C. Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014); Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier 1863 - 1914* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 2008); Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism*; Mihail Dolbilov, *Russkij kraj, chuzhaja vera: Jetnokonfessional'naja politika imperii v Litve i Belorussii pri Aleksandre II* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2014); Mihail Dolbilov and Aleksej Miller, eds., *Zapadnye okrainy Rossijskoj Imperii* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2006); Lev Mihajlovich Dameshek and Anatolij Viktorovich Remnev, eds., *Sibir' v sostave Rossijskoj imperii* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2007); Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*; Karsten Brüggemann, "Representing Empire, Performing Nation?: Russian Officials in the Baltic Provinces (Late Nineteenth / Early Twentieth Centuries)," *Ab Imperio* 2014, no. 3 (2014): 231–66, <https://doi.org/10.1353/imp.2014.0079>.

⁵⁴ Gerasimov, Kusber, and Semyonov, eds., *Empire Speaks Out*; Semyonov, "Empire as a Context Setting Category"; Il'ja Gerasimov, Marina Mogil'ner, and Sergej Glebov, *Novaja imperskaja istorija Severnoj Evrazii,: Chast' 2: Balansirovanie imperskoy situacii: XVIII – XX vv.* (Kazan': Ab Imperio, 2017).

Finland was not only a contested territory during the Napoleonic Wars but also a field of political experiment upon its annexation to the Russian empire in 1808-9.⁵⁵ Its organization, legal status, configuration of government, and even its borders were being discussed and to a certain degree invented in the dialogue between the nobility of the duchy – mostly Swedish-speaking – and imperial administration during the 1810s. Politically and culturally, Finnish identity also fluctuated between the two poles: Stockholm, with which Finland for a long period of time preserved institutional and commercial bond,⁵⁶ and Saint-Petersburg, a new center of power and an alluring place for migration and career pursuits as studied by Max Engman.⁵⁷

The history of Finland in the imperial context was extensively addressed in by Matti Klinge, Osmo Jussila, Robert Schweitzer, Juhani Paasivirta, and Lev Suni who formulated the picture of asymmetrical but ultimately peaceful negotiations – cultural, legal, and political – that characterized most of the Finnish-Russian political relations up to the 1880s when the imperial reactionary programmes interfered in the borderland policies.⁵⁸ Other works focus on the issues of administrative institutions in Finland, their range of responsibilities, power-relations between them, and their role in securing or thwarting the privileged position of Finland.⁵⁹ Finally, a series of volumes address biographical trajectories of highest Finnish

⁵⁵ Carl Gabriel von Bonsdorff, *Opinoner och stämningar i Finland, 1808-1814* (Helsingfors: Söderström, 1918); Päiviö Tommila, *La Finlante dans la politique européenne en 1809-1815* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1962); Päiviö Tommila, *Suomen autonomian synty, 1808-1819* (Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kanslia, 1984); Vadim Roginskij, *Bor'ba za Skandinaviju: mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija na Severe Evropy v jepohu Napoleonovskikh vojn 1805-1815* (Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2012).

⁵⁶ Arvi Lajdinen, *Razvitie kapitalizma v promyshlennosti Finljandii: pervaja polovina XIX v* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979); Torkel Jansson, *Rikssprängningen som kom av sig: finsk-svenska gemenskaper efter 1809* (Stockholm: Atlantis, 2009); Jansson, “Between Two Worlds.”

⁵⁷ Max Engman, *Ett långt farväl: Finland mellan Sverige och Ryssland efter 1809* (Stockholm: Atlantis, 2009).

⁵⁸ Osmo Jussila, *Suomen perustuslait venäläisten ja suomalaisten tulkiintojen mukaan 1808-1863* (Helsinki: Frenckellin Kirjapino Oy., 1969); Robert Schweitzer, *Autonomie und Autokratie: die Stellung des Grossfürstentums Finnland im russischen Reich in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (1863 - 1899)* (Giessen: W. Schmitz, 1978); Matti Klinge, *Imperskaja Finljandija* (Saint-Petersburg: Kolo, 2005); Lev Suni, *Ocherk obshhestvenno-politicheskogo razvitiya Finljandii, 50-70-e gg. XIX v* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979); Lev Suni, *Velikoe kniazhestvo Finljandskoe: (pervaja polovina XIX v.); stanovlenie avtonomii* (Petrozavodsk: Izdat. PetrGU, 2013); Juhani Paasivirta, *Finland and Europe: The Period of Autonomy and the International Crises, 1808-1914* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962).

⁵⁹ Kristiina Kalleinen, *Suomen kenraalikuvernemenneti: kenraalikuvernöörin asema ja merkitys Suomen asioiden esittelyssä, 1823-1861* (Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1994); Raimo Savolainen, *Suosikkisenaaattorit: Venäjän keisarin suosio suomalaisten senaattoreiden menestyksen perustana 1809-1892* (Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1994);

bureaucrats and intellectuals often touching on the issues of their self-identification, career paths, and aspirations provided by Finlandish-imperial context.⁶⁰

Many of these works, besides addressing new archival collections, drew on earlier historiography of Finland's relations with the Russian empire that grew out of the strife about the position of the duchy in the legal and political imperial system that escalated at the end of the 19th century.⁶¹ While this part of historiography was usually highly politicized since intentions behind their publications were explicitly and implicitly articulated in the critical debate, many of these works still retain their relevance given the scope of the source materials and, in general, diligence of the authors in addressing historical issues. I would argue that the contributions by Mikhail Borodkin, Kesar' Ordin, Magnus Schybergson, and Boris Nolde among others are still useful when critically approached.⁶² Besides addressing the administrative system and tensions within it, they shed light on the multitude of public reactions in Finland.

Raimo Savolainen, "Släktsenaten 1809-1870 - Senatorssläkterna i kollegialitetens bojor," *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 77, no. 2 (June 1, 1992), 173-210; Keijo Korhonen, *Suomen Asiain Komitea: Suomen korkeimman hallinnon jarjestely ja toteuttaminen vuosina 1811-1826* (Turku: University of Turku, 1963); Robert Schweitzer, *The Rise and Fall of the Russo-Finnish Consensus: The History of the "Second" Committee on Finnish Affairs in St. Petersburg (1857-1891)* (Helsinki: Edita, 1996); Kalleinen, "The Nature of Russian Imperialism in Finland During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century."

⁶⁰ Carl von Bonsdorff, *Gustav Mauritz Armfelt, levnadskildring*, 3 vols. (Helsingfors: Mercators tryckeri, 1932); Hans Hirn, *Alexander Armfelt: början av en statsmannabana, 1832-1841*, (Helsingfors: Mercators tryckeri, 1948); Lars Gabriel von Bonsdorff, *Lars Gabriel von Haartman intill 1827* (Helsingfors: Mercators tryckeri, 1946); Erkki K. Osmonsalo, *Fabian Langenskiöld: valtiollinen elämäntyö*, vol. 1 (Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1939); Rolf Lagerborg, *Sanningen om Casimir von Kothen (1807-80) enligt aktstycken och brev* (Helsingfors: Söderström, 1953); Thiodolf Rein, *Johan Vilhelm Snellman*, 2 vols. (Helsinki: Otava, 1895); Gunnar Castrén, *Herman Kellgren: ett bidrag till 1840- och 1850-talens kulturhistoria* (Helsingfors: Mercators tryckeri, 1945); Kristiina Kalleinen, *Isänmaani onni on kuulua venäjälle: vapaaherra Lars Gabriel von Haartmanin elämä* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2001); Johanna Wassholm, *Svenskt, finskt och ryskt. Nationens, språkets och historiens dimensioner hos E. G. Ehrström 1808–1835* (Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 2014); Raimo Savolainen, *Med bildningens kraft: J.V. Snellmans liv* (Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 2019); Jens Grandell, *Från ett årtionde i Finland: August Schauman, republikanism och liberalism 1855–1865* (Helsinki: Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten, 2020).

⁶¹ Aleksandra Petuhova, "Russkoe nacional'noe dvizhenie i finljandskij vopros vo vtoroj polovine XIX - nachale XX veka" (PhD diss., Moscow State University, 2022); Elisabeth Stubb, *Rätt som argument: Leo Mechelin och finska frågan 1886-1912* (Helsinki: Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten, 2012).

⁶² Mikhail Borodkin, *Istorija Finljandii: Vremja imperatora Nikolaja I* (Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaja tipografija, 1915); Kesar' Ordin, *Pokorenie Finljandii: Opyt Opisanija Po Neizdannym Istochnikam.*, vol. 2 (Saint-Petersburg: Tip. I.N. Skorohodova, 1889); Magnus Gottfrid Schybergson, *Finlands historia* (G.W. Edlund, 1903); Boris Nol'de, *Ocherki Russkogo Gosudarstvennogo Prava* (Saint-Petersburg: Tip. "Pravda," 1911).

Contemporary studies highlight both institutionalized censorship regime and practices of self-censorship that limited the space for public manifestations in the duchy, but they also necessitated the search for alternative ways that editors, journalists, and arising politicians used to discuss domestic problems.⁶³ Jani Marjanen and Jussi Kurunmäki argue that Finlandish mass media utilized politics of comparison in presenting news from abroad as guiding lights or examples to be avoided.⁶⁴ By the 1840s, identity-politics broadly taken consumed the attention of the editors and educated publics. While earlier studies drew on the notions of simplified opposition between so-called Fennomania that put forward Finnish-centered cultural endeavors and Svekomania guarding the privileged position of Swedish language, the multifaceted debates on identity were more complex than that.

Kurunmäki addresses the fact that besides language issues, the debates focused on the principles of nationality-definition as well as on cultural repercussions that were attached to various visions of political system.⁶⁵ Liberalism, for example, was often attacked as a foreign, Swedish-leaning viewpoint, incompatible with Finnish national project, as perceived by a part of the Fennoman group. Jens Grandell, however, demonstrates that Fennomania and Svekomania might have been less antagonistic than traditionally believed, especially during earlier stages of the formulation of respective programmes while also arguing that Finnish liberalism did not always imply Scandinavianist foundations.⁶⁶

Gradually, as Axel Lille, Max Engman, Ilkka Liikanen and Jussi Kurunmäki demonstrate, cultural positions were reformulated into the language of party or platform

⁶³ Jani Marjanen, “Gränserna för det offentliga samtalet i Finland 1809–1863,” in *Frie Ord i Norden?*, ed. Ruth Hemstad and Dag Michaelsen (Oslo: Pax forlag, 2019), 111–40; Lars-Folke Landgren, “Censuren i Finland 1809 - 1919,” in *Filologi og Sensur*, ed. Hilde Bøe, Christian Janss, and Stine Brenna Taugböl (Oslo: Novus, 2015), 53–68.

⁶⁴ Jussi Kurunmäki and Jani Marjanen, “Catching up through Comparison: The Making of Finland as a Political Unit, 1809–1863,” *Time & Society* 30, no. 4, (2021): 559-80.

⁶⁵ Jussi Kurunmäki, “On the Difficulty of Being a National Liberal in Nineteenth-Century Finland,” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 8, no. 2 (December 1, 2013): 83–95, <https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2013.080205>; Jussi Kurunmäki, “Kan en nation byggas på politisk vilja? Debatten mellan J. V. Snellman och August Schauman 1859–1860,” *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, no. 1 (2007): 63-89. <https://journal.fi/htf/article/view/53785>.

⁶⁶ Jens Grandell, *Från ett årtionde i Finland: August Schauman, republikanism och liberalism 1855–1865*.

politics, especially after 1863 when Finlandish Diet was reintroduced and Finnish language gradually obtained its administrative status.⁶⁷ Finally, it is essential that Finnish administration attentively followed these debates, distributing social and political capital to the loyalist and – in their views – more politically reliable groups.⁶⁸ The principles of the administrative assessment of reliability, however, were not stable or consistent, leading to internal tensions and often haphazard reactions, characteristic for other ‘borderland’ territories as well.

Before the reintroduction of the Diet and censorship relaxation of the Alexander II’s epoch, main arenas for debate were lecture halls, student reading clubs and various grassroots organizations. Matti Klinge’s fundamental work analyzes ideas that circulated among the students at the University of Helsingfors and practices of their political manifestation. He focuses on cultural and political tendencies that captured students’ attention, including Scandinavianism and Fennomania during the years 1840s-1860s. Most importantly, however, the university provided them with education and space for their practices of self-organization, shared action, and network building that would become crucial for later political struggles and formulation of the principles of Finnish autonomy.⁶⁹

As other researchers demonstrate, visions of the united Scandinavia appeared appealing for certain groups in the duchy either due to the reasons of its liberal rhetoric or given the hopes of geopolitical redistribution that could bring Finland into the union as well.⁷⁰ I would argue,

⁶⁷ Axel Lille, *Svenskt i Finland: ställning och strävanden* (Helsingfors: Söderström, 1914); Engman, *Språkfrågan*; Ilkka Liikanen, *Fennomania ja kansa: joukkojärjestäytymisen läpimurto ja Suomalaisen puolueen synty* (Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1995); Jussi Kurunmäki and Ilkka Liikanen, “The Formation of the Finnish Polity within the Russian Empire: Language, Representation, and the Construction of Popular Political Platforms, 1863-1906,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 35, no. 1/4 (2017): 399–416.

⁶⁸ Juhani Paasivirta, *Finland and Europe: The Period of Autonomy and the International Crises, 1808-1914*.

⁶⁹ Matti Klinge, *Studenter och idéer*, 2 vols. (Helsinki: Studentkåren vid Helsingfors Universitet, 1969); Henrik Stenius, *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt: föreningväsendets utveckling i Finland fram till 1900-talets början med speciell hänsyn till massorganisationspincipens genombrott* (Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 1987).

⁷⁰ Runar Johansson, “Skandinavismen i Finland,” *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier*, no. 6 (1930): 256–68; Hugo E. Pipping, “Finlands Ställning till Skandinavismen,” *Förhandlingar och uppsatser*, no. 34

however, that local receptions of Scandinavianism exhibited a more complex dynamics and besides self-identification involved the processes of categorization and classification performed by the government. The most prominent Scandinavian intellectual of Finnish descent, however, resided in Stockholm, far from imperial government's direct reach. Emil von Qvanten authored the doctrine that united the struggle for Finnishness with pan-Scandinavian agenda. His work was assaulted by Johan Vilhelm Snellman, one of the leading ideologists of Fennomania, and scholars argue that their debate was crucial for accentuation of respective Scandinavian-leaning and Fennoman positions.⁷¹ The fact that this debate was transnational and regional, pertaining to the logic of communication characteristic for the Nordic media systems, however escaped the attention of earlier researchers.

Sweden-oriented programmes of certain groups and newspapers – primarily that of liberal *Helsingfors Dagblad* – deeply concerned the government officials as Lolo Krusius-Ahrenberg and Lars-Folke Landgren demonstrate.⁷² Lolo Krusius-Ahrenberg's works, although they came out almost a hundred years ago, still retain their relevance due to her extensive archival research and especially synthetic design that addressed respective positions of Saint-Petersburg, Finlandish administration and public, and even that of Russian diplomats in Stockholm when she had a chance to investigate them. Finland's liminal position not only in terms of identity-building as set in-between Swedishness, Finnishness and imperial loyalty, but also concerning institutional dynamics that placed it in a paradiplomatic networks of

(1921): 131–95; Mikko Juva, “Skandinavismens påverkan på de politiska strömningarna i Finland,” *Historisk Tidskrift (Stockholm)*, no. 77 (1957): 330–37.

⁷¹ Arvid Mörne, “Kring Emil von Qvantens Fennomani och Skandinavism,” *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier*, no. 8 (1932): 1–85; Arvid Mörne, *Axel Olof Freudenthal och den finlandssvenska nationalitetstanken* (Helsinki: Svenska folkpartiets centralstyrelse, 1927); Mikael Björk-Winberg, “Opposition from Abroad: Emil von Qvanten and Finnish Scandinavianism in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,” *Journal of Finnish Studies* 24, no. 1–2 (July 1, 2021): 16–41, <https://doi.org/10.5406/28315081.24.1.2.03>.

⁷² Lars-Folke Landgren, *För frihet och framåtskridande: Helsingfors dagblads etableringsskede, 1861-1864* (Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 1995); Lolo Krusius-Abrenberg, *Der Durchbruch des Nationalismus und Liberalismus im politischen Leben Finlands 1856-1863* (Helsinki: Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1934).

communication and made its administration into agents of foreign politics was also addressed by Robert Schweitzer and Lidija Lempijajnen.⁷³

Krusius-Ahrenberg's explanations and terminology require clarifications in the light of new studies while her rigid pairing of Scandinavianism and liberalism remains utterly questionable. Her work, however, appears in the bridging position between Finnish imperial history as the history of an entangled institutional system and Finnish history as a story of self-organizations, public manifestations, political imaginations, and cooperations conditioned by the imperial, often repressive context. In a way, my dissertation also seeks to find a bridging position between the two in studying cabinet manifestations and ministerial visions – products of the bureaucratic system – through the optics of the second approach, attentive to political rhetoric, performative practices, and to empire as a context-setting category.

Sources

Since the research design examines, first, the dynamics of information processing and decision-making in the power grid between Saint-Petersburg, Russian diplomats in Copenhagen and Stockholm, and Finnish administration, one set of sources addresses the workings of the bureaucratic institutions and patron-client networks that conditioned hierarchy of rule. Archival materials include personal and official documentation of governors-general Alexander Sergeevich Menshikov⁷⁴ and Fedor Fedorovich Berg⁷⁵, minister state-secretary Alexander Armfelt⁷⁶, vice-chair of the economic department of the Senate and architect of Finnish economic policy Lars Gabriel von Haartman⁷⁷ between themselves and with other

⁷³ Robert Schweitzer, “Konsensus v period mezhdu ‘narushenijami konstitucii,’” in *Russkij sbornik*, vol. 17 (Moscow: Modest Kolerov), 144-197; Lidija Lempijajnen, “Vneshnie kontakty Velikogo Knjazhestva Finljandskogo”.

⁷⁴ Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj arhiv Voenno-Morskogo Flota (RGAVMF), Saint-Petersburg. F. 19. Menshikov Alexander Sergeevich, Admiral (1787-1869).

⁷⁵ Gosudarstvennyj arhiv Rossijskoj Federacii (GARF), Moscow. F. 547. Berg Fedor Fedorovich. Op. 1. Inventory of the affairs of F.F. Berg' fond for 1700-1918.

⁷⁶ Kansallisarkisto (KA), Helsinki. Alexander Armfeltin arkisto.

⁷⁷ KA. L.G. von Haartmanin arkisto.

representatives of Finnish administration, including Casimir von Kothen, Ivan Nordenstam, Robert Henrik Rehbinder, Constantin Fisher, Platon Rokassovsky and others. Bureaucratic documentation of governor-general is stored in the respective chancellery,⁷⁸ just as documentation of ministry state-secretary.⁷⁹ I also use the documents of censorship committee primarily for the 1840s.⁸⁰ Besides, a part of these materials was copied by GARF in the form of microfilms: governors-general's documentation,⁸¹ documentation of minister state-secretary and Committee for Finnish Affairs.⁸² The analysis of workings of the Ministry of War and Third Section also played important roles in my research. I am particularly interested in the reports of military attaché in Stockholm⁸³ and in the reports of the Third Section headquarters in Finland.⁸⁴

Published sources that shed light on the principles of the imperial rule include collections of legal amendments,⁸⁵ treatises and manifests,⁸⁶ protocols of the Diet proceedings.⁸⁷ Besides, some contemporary and later reflections of influential members of the Finlandish administration were published, including Alexander Armfelt's memoirs,⁸⁸ Emil Stjernvall-Walleen's exposition of the years 1857-61,⁸⁹ and his letters to Aurora Karamzine.⁹⁰

⁷⁸ KA. Kenraalikuvernöörinkanslia (KKK).

⁷⁹ KA. Valtiosihteerinvirasto (VSV).

⁸⁰ KA. Painoasiain ylihallituksen sensuurikomitean arkisto.

⁸¹ GARF. F. R8091. Collection of microphotocopies of documents from foreign archives. Op. 1. Finland, entry ZA-1. 1627–1917.

⁸² GARF. F. R8091. Collection of microphotocopies of documents from foreign archives. Op. 1a. Finland, entry ZA-1a. 1811–1917.

⁸³ Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj voenno-istoricheskij arhiv (RGVIA), Moscow. F. 442. Collection of the military-scientific archive “Sweden and Norway”.

⁸⁴ GARF. F. 109. Third Section of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery.

⁸⁵ *Samling af placater, förordningar, manifester och påbud*, vol. 1-17 (Helsingfors: A.W. Gröndahl, 1808-1859).

⁸⁶ Petr Shilovskij, *Akty, Otnosjashchiesja k Politicheskому Polozheniju Finljandii* (SPb: Tip. M.M. Stasulevicha, 1903); *Storfurstendömet Finlands grundlagar jemte bihang* (Helsingfors: G.W. Edlund, 1877); Fedor Fedorovič Martens, *Sobranie traktatov i konvencij, zakluchennyh Rossieju s inostrannymi derzhavami*, vol. 1-15 (Saint-Petersburg: Tipografija A. Benke, 1874-1909).

⁸⁷ *Borgareståndets protokoll vid Landtdagen i Helsingfors*, vol. 1 (Helsingfors: J.C. Frenkell & Son, 1864).

⁸⁸ Carl von Bonsdorff, “Ministerstatssekreteraren Greve Alexander Armfelts Memoarer,” *Historisk Tidskrift För Finland*, no. 1 (1929): 77–107.

⁸⁹ *Ur Friherre E. Stjernvall-Walleens efterlämnade papper* (Stockholm: O. L. Svanbäcks boktryckeri, 1902).

⁹⁰ Adolf Törngren, “Ur Friherre Emil Stjernvall-Walleens brev till Aurore Karamzine,” *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier*, no. 15 (1939): 135–270.

Russian-Finlandish relations of the period in question were addressed by many high-ranking officials who socialized themselves with the court and elites in their diaries and memoirs that were later published, including Peter Valuev, Alexander Polovtsov, Konstantin Fisher, Alexander Golovnin, Dmitrij Miljutin, Dmitrij Obolenskij.⁹¹

Diplomatic aspects of this research are primarily addressed through examining dispatches that were delivered to Saint-Petersburg from Stockholm and Copenhagen. Those were primarily collected from Archive of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Empire,⁹² but also from the Royal Archive of Denmark.⁹³ I also make use of internal proceedings of the ministry in the form of yearly reports.⁹⁴ However, I also argue that some aspects of the diplomatic workings are attainable through personal correspondence of the diplomatic representatives. I address Russian diplomat in Stockholm Jakov Dashkov's archive⁹⁵ and archives of Russian representatives in Copenhagen Paul and Nicholas Nicolay⁹⁶ together with other agents who could play diplomatic roles, like Grand Duke Constantin Nikolaevich,⁹⁷ Nicholas Alexandrovich,⁹⁸ and, again, Alexander Menshikov and Fedor Berg.

⁹¹ Petr Aleksandrovich Valuev, *Dnevnik P. A. Valueva ministra vnutrennih del. T. 1. 1861-1864 gg.* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1961); Alexander Aleksandrovich Polovcov, *Dnevniyi. 1859-1882*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Sviaz' Jepoh, 2022); Konstantin Fisher, *Zapiski senatora* (Kyiv: Strelbytskyy Multimedia Publishing, 2018); Aleksandr Vasil'evich Golovnin, *Zapiski dlja nemnogih* (Saint-Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2004); Dmitrij Alekseevich Miljutin, *Vospominanija general-fel'dmarshala grafa Dmitrija Alekseevicha Miljutina: 1863-1864* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2003); Dmitrij Alekseevich Miljutin, *Vospominanija general-fel'dmarshala grafa Dmitrija Alekseevicha Miljutina: 1856-1860* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004); Dmitrij Aleksandrovich Obolenskij, *Zapiski kniazja Dmitrija Aleksandrovicha Obolenskogo, 1855-1879* (Saint-Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2005).

⁹² Arhiv vneshej politiki Rossijskoj imperii (AVPRI), Moscow. F. 133. Chancellery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁹³ Rigsarkivet (RA), Copenhagen. Departementet for de Udenlandske Anliggender.

⁹⁴ AVPRI. F. 137. Reports of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Op. 475. 1830-1916.

⁹⁵ GARF. F. 912. Dashkov Jakov Andreyevich, consul general to Walachia and Moldavia, ambassador to Sweden and Norway, director of the Asian department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Op. 1. Cases of permanent storage. 1771-1872, 1887-1889, 1897, 1900-1901, 1907.

⁹⁶ Otdel rukopisej Rossijskoj nacional'noj biblioteki (OR RNB), Saint-Petersburg. F. 519. Nicolay A.L., P.A., N.P., A.P.; Kansalliskirjasto, Helsinki. Monrepos Collection. Ms. Mf. 833-9.

⁹⁷ GARF. F. 722. Konstantin Nikolaevich, Grand Duke, son of Emperor Nicholas I, Admiral general. Op. 1. Inventory of documents of Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich for 1810-1917.

⁹⁸ GARF. F 665. Nicholas Aleksandrovich, Tsesarevich, son of Emperor Alexander II. Op. 1. Inventory of documents of Tsarevich Nikolai Alexandrovich for 1852-1865.

Finally, I also utilize Alexander Gorchakov's extensive documentation and correspondence with Russian diplomats abroad.⁹⁹ Printed materials related to Russian diplomacy include Nesselrode's collection of letters and Peter von Meyendorff's correspondence.¹⁰⁰ Besides, I make use of foreign diplomatic collections, primarily that of Prussia, France, and Sweden.¹⁰¹ Although the fonds of Russian State Historical Archive and Institute of the Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences contained only fragmentary information concerning Finland or the foreign policy of the Russian Empire with regards to Scandinavianism, several materials on the preparation of cultural events, scientific communications, and pieces of official and personal documentation proved useful for my research.¹⁰²

Addressing personal anxieties and hopes as well as group discussions on the phenomenon of Scandinavianism in Finland, I use both published and archival materials. Archival materials include personal correspondence and documents of those individuals who either self-fashioned themselves as Scandinavianist, took part in the activities under the banner of the Nordic consolidation, or were suspected in Scandinavian-leaning conspiracies. Those include August Schauman's and B.O. Schauman's collections,¹⁰³ Carl Aspelund's archive,¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ ГАРФ. Ф. 828. Гorchakov Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince, diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs, State chancellor. Op. 1. Inventory of the affairs of the fond of A.M. Gorchakov for 1770-1919.

¹⁰⁰ Anatole Nesselrode, ed., *Lettres et Papiers Du Chancelier Comte de Nesselrode, 1760–1850, Extraits de Ses Archives, Publiés et Annotés, Avec Une Introduction*, vol. 9-10 (Paris: A. Lahure, n.d.); Otto Hoetzsch, ed., *Peter von Meyendorff - Ein Russischer Diplomat an den Höfen von Berlin und Wien*, vol 2-3 (Leipzig und Berlin: De Gruyter, 1923).

¹⁰¹ *Die Auswärtige Politik Preussens 1858-1871: Diplomatische Aktenstücke Abt. 2: Vom Amtsantritt Bismarcks Bis Prager Frieden*, vol. 4 (Oldenburg: Gerhard Stalling, 1938); *Les Origines Diplomatiques de La Guerre de 1870-1871: Recueil de Documents*, vol. 1 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1910); Henning Hamilton, *Ur Henning Hamiltons brefsamling: ett urval* (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 1914); *Diplomatiska Handlingar rörande den danska Frågan, Februari 1863* (Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt & Söner, 1863).

¹⁰² Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj istoricheskij arhiv (RGIA), Saint-Petersburg. F. 733. Department of Public Education; F. 1101. Documents of personal origin that do not constitute separate funds; F. 1018. Paskevich-Ervansky Ivan Fedorovich; F. 1250. Papers of chairmen and members of the State Council; Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IRLI RAN), Saint-Petersburg. F. 143. Kiselev Pavel Dmitrievich. Op. 1. Materials for the biography and activities of P.D. Kiselev, materials of A.A. Zakrevsky and various persons (1809 - 1871).

¹⁰³ Kansalliskirjasto. Coll. 201. August Schauman; Coll. 198. Bengt Otto Schauman.

¹⁰⁴ Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland Arkiv (SLSA), Helsinki. Coll. 146. Carl Edvard Aspelund's memoirs (1810-1900); Coll. 664. Carl Edvard Aspelund's travel diary.

Edvard Bergh's collection,¹⁰⁵ Emil von Qvanten's collection.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, I use published memoirs, diaries, and published correspondence collections of Finnish intellectuals to shed light on their mapping of social and political situation in the duchy and in the empire.¹⁰⁷ Addressing the relations between imperial emigres and Scandinavianist advocates, I rely on Alexander Herzen's and Mikhail Bakunin's published collections of letters as well as on some materials preserved in the Swedish Royal Library and Bakunin's digitalized collection of complete works issued on CD-ROM.¹⁰⁸

While the analysis of political and cultural processes in Denmark and Sweden-Norway is primarily based on secondary literature, I also use respective digitalized newspaper collections as well as diaries and memoirs of main Scandinavianist ideologists and their opponents to analyze the dynamics of Scandinavianism in respective contexts.¹⁰⁹ Besides, I make use of public declarations pronounced by Scandinavianist advocates that usually happened in the context of Scandinavian students conventions and were documented in respective accounts of the festivals.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ SLSA. Coll. 357. Edvard Bergh's letters (1852-1899).

¹⁰⁶ SLSA. Coll. 933. Emil von Qvantens manuscript (1867-1891).

¹⁰⁷ August Schauman, *Från sex årtionden i Finland: levnadsminnen upptecknade av Aug. Schauman* (Helsingfors: H. Schildt, 1922); Sven Gabriel Elmgren, *S.G. Elmgrenin muistiinpanot* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Kirjapainon Oy, 1939); Zacharias Topelius, *Finlands krönika 1860-1978* (Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 2004); G. G. Estlander, "Ungdomsminnen. XIII," *Finsk Tidskrift* 74, no. 4 (1913): 252-265.

¹⁰⁸ Mikhail Bakunin, *Pis'ma M.A. Bakunina k A.I. Gercenu i N.I. Ogarevu* (Geneve: Ukrainskaja tipografija, 1896); Mikhail Bakunin, *Sobranie sochineneij i pisem, 1828-1876* (Moscow: Izd-vo Vsesojuznogo obshhestva politikatorzhan i ssyl'no-posalencev, 1935); Alexander Herzen, *Mikhail Bakunin i pol'skoe delo* (Geneve: M. Elpidine, 1904); Kungliga Biblioteket (KB), Stockholm. KB1/Ep. Q 1. Emil von Qvanten; KB1/L 10 August Sohlman's archive; KB1/Ep. H. 7:1 Sven Hedin's archive; Mikhail Bakunin, *Oeuvres completes* (Amsterdam: International Institute of Social History, 2000), CD-ROM.

¹⁰⁹ Orla Lehmann, *Efterladte skrifter*, 4 vols. (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1873); Henrik Nicolai Clausen, *Optegnelser om mit levneds og min tids historie* (Odense: G. E. C. Gad, 1877); A. F. Krieger, *Andreas Frederik Kriegers Dagbøger 1848-1880*, vol. 2-3 (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1921); Louis Gerhard De Geer, *Minnen*, 2 vols. (Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt, 1892); Carl Fredrik Akrell, *Minnen från Carl XIV:s, Oscar I:s och Carl XV:s dagar*, 2 vols. (Stockholm: M.W. Wallberg & Comp. Boktryckeri, 1884).

¹¹⁰ *Berättelse om Uppsala-studenternas skandinaviska fest: den 6 April 1848* (Uppsala: Wahlström & C., 1848); *Berättelse om studentågen till Lund och Köpenhamn, sommaren 1845* (Uppsala: Wahlström & C., 1846); *Beretning om studentertoget til Upsala i juni maaned 1843* (København: Berlingske Bogtrykkeri, 1844); Anton Rosell, *Studentbesöket i Finland, 1857* (Stockholm: C.A. Leffler, 1858).

Chronological framework

As stated in the title, the research addresses the period from 1843 to 1864. First date has been chosen since Scandinavianism as a term for the first time appeared in the Danish newspaper in 1843. Besides, first coherent programmes of the political consolidation under the aegis of Scandinavianism were formulated and declared during this year. One could argue, however, that the genealogy of Scandinavianism spans to earlier period that encompasses the Napoleonic Wars, rise of Romanticism, and union-projects of the beginning of the 19th century. I posit, however, that the driving forces and ideas behind Scandinavianism, apart from obvious continuity, demonstrated ruptures with earlier Romanticist formulations in being generally more exclusive towards German-speaking population of the Oldenburg composite monarchy, more federative-centered, and, essentially, much more diverse in the visions of consolidation.

Although the research formally starts with 1843, I also attempt to elucidate processes that spanned from 1830s and involved the intensification of political struggle in Sweden for the reform of representation, liberal agitation there and their echoes in Finland that resulted in administrative concerns. Those years prepared governmental patterns of perceiving Swedish and Scandinavian politics that were afterwards projected onto Scandinavianism as well. Moreover, besides sharpening imaginations and visions, the decade witnessed the elaboration of specific policies aimed at increased administrative control over the Swedish-Finnish border and circulations of material objects, people, and ideas across it.

The period from the 1840s to the 1860s was, undoubtedly, the most flourishing with regards to the range of imagined opportunities and expected futures under the flags of Scandinavianism. The proponents of Scandinavian consolidation produced various scenarios of the foreseen community or commonality. Ranging from the establishment of cultural connections to the Scandinavian federation or dynastic union, these projects often followed separate lines of argumentation, rooted in diverse discourses and practices. On the one hand,

Scandinavian-wide context facilitated the quest for similarities, parallels, and closeness of the Nordic nations in past and present that were often framed in terms of their kinship relations. On the other hand, comparative framework also emerged in which differences of political systems or, in some radical editions, even of national cultures were regarded as nuisances on the way of their rapprochement. The contingency between formulated projects of the Scandinavian future produced certain tension, but their proponents often sought for a path of reconciliation and compatibility, opting rather for hybrid alliances than for the purity of dogmatics.

Finally, the year 1864 when Denmark was defeated during the Second War for Schleswig is regarded as a traditional watershed that put a stop to many ambitions projects of the Scandinavian consolidation, especially in the political field. This view has recently been more and more contested by addressing previously unexplored archival materials¹¹¹ and by demonstrating the persistence of Scandinavianist imaginations and Scandinavian-wide framework of thinking and acting in other spheres.¹¹² This dissertation, although formally its research scope is limited by 1864, also seeks to challenge the date from another angle. While political impulses of Scandinavianism slowly withered after 1864, the fears of the geopolitical ambitions and revolutionary inclinations of ostensible Scandinavianist ideologists persisted long until the end of the 19th century in Russian imperial cabinets. This perseverance of Scandinavianism-related concerns is addressed in conclusion of the dissertation.

Research design

The work consists of six chapters supplemented by introduction and conclusion.

Chapter 1

Chapter one addresses Scandinavianism as heterogenous project that embraced popular

¹¹¹ Ottosen and Glenthøj, *Union eller undergang*.

¹¹² Hemstad, *Fra Indian Summer til nordisk vinter*; van Gerven, *Scandinavism*.

movements, pan-national visions, dynastic and diplomatic programmes. It examines political and social background of the Nordic kingdoms in the 1830s-1840s when Scandinavianism was conceived as an umbrella project that united variegated interpretations of the Nordic consolidation under its label. The text situates Scandinavianism in the web of contemporary European pan-national and regional visions. The chapter analyses trajectories of identity projections utilized by the advocates of the Scandinavian project, and it pays particular attention to the imaginaries of the Russian empire that circulated in the Scandinavianist press and public conventions tied to the project.

Chapter 2

The second chapter focuses on the case of the Grand Duchy of Finland and its incorporation into the Russian empire. It sets to explain the status of the duchy, its legal framework and administrative functioning. The chapter analyses the negotiation of Finnish political and cultural identity, pursued both by ex-subjects of the Swedish king who changed their loyalties to the Russian throne and by the imperial agents who came to administer Finland. It stresses collaborative efforts between governor-general Alexander Menshikov and local administration that sought to preserve the autonomy of the duchy in the turbulent decades of 1830s-1840s. The text elucidates political visions shared by the representatives of the administration that were grounded in pan-imperial vision of the estate conservatism. The second part of the chapter addressed the problems of Finnish relations with its ex-metropole that became especially precarious for the administration in the 1830s-40s due to the changing political dynamics in Sweden. The Finnish administration wanted to establish institutional distance with Sweden by implementing tighter control for the circulation of press, goods, suspicions personalities, and ideas. On the other hand, Finnish educated society, encouraged by European nationalist-Romanticist trends, invented popular projects that centered on the idea of the Finnish national identity as based on the Finnish language. The first encounter of Finnish

society and administration with Scandinavianism happens in this context of imperial concerns and novel intellectual pursuits. I argue that in the 1840s, Fennomania and Scandinavianism were perceived by the educated society and the administration as potentially intermingled and co-directional. While the students regarded Scandinavianism as pattern to be followed by then nascent Finnish-centered ambitions, the administration, following class-based and vocation-driven categorization, saw similar cosmopolitan dangers that emanated from two projects.

Chapter 3

This chapter focuses on the diplomatic world and imperial diplomatic corps abroad at the beginning of the 1840s. It argues that the context of post-Napoleonic establishment was essential for the language and practice of the diplomatic communication. The Nordic kingdoms surfaced in this scheme as nodal points in the broader picture of European political equilibrium, and (pan-)nationalist popular imaginaries surfaces as contestants against this conservative establishment. I argue that the notions of revolution, movement, and agitation, central for the discourse of Vienna establishment, were instrumentalized by the Russian diplomats for the analysis of the events that deployed under Scandinavianist banner in the 1840s in Denmark and Sweden. The diplomats reinterpreted bourgeois, Romanticism-inspired, nationalist rhetoric, and practice of Scandinavian student meetings into a revolutionary provocation that sought to shatter established social and political order in the kingdoms while also espousing anti-imperial stance. Their dispatches rather painted a picture of dangerous agitation propelled more by class struggle and anti-government action than a geopolitically-framed hazard.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 examines imperial politics in Finland and in Scandinavia during the European revolutionary events of 1848. It demonstrates that the Swedish influence remained an essential

problem for the Finnish administration that it sought to curb through various measures. The chapter also argues that Fennomania was again perceived by the government as dangerous tendency related to the Swedish politics via the interpretation of biographical trajectories and intellectual avenues of its main advocate, Johan Vilhelm Snellman. The chapter addresses the necessitated occupation of trusted imperial agents with variegated missions that went beyond their usual scope of responsibilities. Prince Alexander Menshikov who stood close to the emperor, embarked on one of such missions that related to the imperial diplomatic assistance to Denmark in the light of its conflict with rebellious communities in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, joined by Prussia and German states. In the context of this critical juncture, Scandinavianism surfaced in diplomatic correspondence as a project that enjoyed broad popularity and even some degree of support in the respective courts and cabinets. Menshikov, imperial diplomats, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs sought to prevent the reification of the political union, firmly holding to the framework of Vienna establishment. Its close collaboration with Sweden, however, exposed it to necessary accommodation to Scandinavianist public authority that the empire sough to apprehensively reconcile with its foreign policy goals.

Chapter 5

This chapter analyses the challenges that the imperial government and Finnish administration faced during and after the Crimean War. In many ways, the imperial system of rule dramatically changed in the wake of the war, and Emperor Alexander II pursued new course that was meant to reform the outdated legal, social, and political architecture of the empire. In this chapter I am trying to demonstrate the intermingled nature of the ‘central’ and ‘peripheral’ reform politics, uncovering variegated ways in which imperial agents operationalized new rhetorical devices, repertoires of action, and institutional frameworks to

reify their visions of the imperial and Finlandish future. The situation of the prolonged warfare, prospects of the Swedish intervention, and expectations of the internal unrest in Finland came to influence the policy of new governor-general of Finland, Fedor (Friedrich Wilhelm) Berg. New governor-general, alarmed by the prospects of the Scandinavian union, Swedish revanchism, and internal agitation, instrumentalized ethnic classifications and favored Finnish-centered cultural endeavors to set them against Swedish-leaning sympathies. Scandinavianism became a fluid label that he, other administrators, and monitoring institutions negotiated and debated in their communications with Saint-Petersburg to request resources, draw attention, and discredit political opponents.

Swedish-leaning liberal intellectuals provided fertile grounds for governor-general to reinterpret their endeavors in a dangerous light and present them as workings of secret societies and clandestine correspondents preparing upheaval. Since Berg came to shatter previously established patterns of administration, other influential agents sought to discredit his picture of the situation in the duchy, stressing fabricated nature of the dangers that he presented or accentuating his responsibility for their manifestations. In these cabinet struggles, functionaries alluded to the notions of morality, credibility, progress, markers of ethnicity, civilization, groupness, legality, and emancipation that became essential for the public and court politics of the reforming empire. Particular position of Finland set in the crossroads of foreign policy and control of the border and internal imperial management of the province, again accentuated significance of diversified communication channels and perceptions.

Chapter 6

This chapter examines position of Finland in the context of the imperial crisis of 1863 that resulted the Polish Uprising and imperial foreign policy with regards to the Schleswig-Holstein question that erupted again in 1864. It analyses the formation of new conservative

nationalist public press in Russia that forged its position in the light of the Polish struggles for independence and their suppression. The Grand Duchy of Finland, another province with legal privileges and representative political institutions, came under scrutinizing criticism by the flagship of conservative press, highly influential *Moskovskie vedomosti* newspaper. New cohort of nationalist modernizers also regarded Finland and especially ethnic Swedes as precarious element with ostensible endemic Scandinavian political sympathies. On the other hand, imperial revolutionary emigres tried to reconcile Finnish and Polish independence, imperial break-up, and Scandinavianism in their active campaigns in Stockholm, led by Mikhail Bakunin.

In 1863-4 when Danish crisis came at the forefront again, Finnish liberal intellectuals demonstrated their support for the Danish and broader, Scandinavian cause, again eliciting the attention of Saint-Petersburg and conservative press. Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pursuing the strategy of non-involvement, however, feared the prospects of the Scandinavian union that became closer than ever to practical reification. The ambiguity of the foreign policy trajectories spurred variegated reactions in the public press that ranged from comparing Schleswig-Holstein problem to that of rebellious Poland to envisioning the sovereignty of the novel state that would comprise the duchies. Scandinavianism, as a pronounced trend of the Nordic public press and diplomatic negotiations, also drew the attention of the press that actively discussed its prospects and chances, pointing out threats that the reification of Scandinavian union would present for the Russian empire. Although Gorchakov and Russian diplomats abroad sough to curb the intensification of the Scandinavian ideas, the necessity to abstain from intervening in the tensions also made them expect the realization of the Scandinavian union and even reconcile Russian foreign policy with potential emergence of a new neighboring state in the North.

Conclusions put to defense

1. The encounter of Finnish administration with Scandinavianism was conditioned by the broadening boundaries of political participation in Sweden and its concerns initially relegated to the domain of political action and revolutionary agitation rather than to geopolitical imagination.
2. The flexibility of interpretation that Scandinavianism enjoyed allowed Finnish students to formulate their interest to the project through the vocabulary of inspiration and witnessing that they sought to utilize for their domestic Fennoman project.
3. Finnish administration also regarded Fennomania and Scandinavianism as related and cross-fertilizing endeavors in need of surveillance at this period.
4. Russian diplomatic corps in Denmark and Stockholm presented Scandinavianism as a cell of cosmopolitan revolutionary conspiracy, pertaining to anti-monarchical and class-centered principles in the 1840s.
5. During the revolutions of 1848, the Russian administration consciously but apprehensively approached the forces of Scandinavianism during Swedish-Russian assistance to Denmark, although this rapprochement dialectically presupposed conservative gravitation of the Russian empire seen by some of its agents as able to divert Scandinavian governments from taking path to Scandinavian union.
6. The experience of the Crimean War and the looming threat of Swedish intervention in 1855, allowed new governor-general Berg to tie his mapping of unloyalty to the notions of Scandinavianism and Swedish-speaking groupness. In his reading, Fennomania surfaced as counterweight to Scandinavianism as a popular project.
7. Scandinavianism appeared to be a contested term, mostly debated in Finnish cabinets and monitoring institutions. The performative invocation of Scandinavianism-related

threats was used in communication with Saint-Petersburg as grounds for variegated requests and demands.

8. Gradually, the mapping of loyalty in Finland was translated into the language of ethnographic observation with Finns and Swedes appearing on the different sides of the loyalty spectrum as conditioned by their natural proclivities.

9. In 1864, the Russian empire regarded the idea of Scandinavian union as a serious threat with real potential for reification. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs wished to avoid this result of the warfare, instructing its agents correspondingly.

10. The principles of non-intervention outweighed ascribed dangers of the unification, and the imperial administration rationalized the danger of Scandinavian union as unable to affect the interest of the empire thus manifesting its readiness to new combinations of the political geography in the Northern Europe.

Information about the organization in which the research was carried out and about the academic supervisor

The dissertation was completed at the Department of History of the St. Petersburg School of Arts and Humanities at the St. Petersburg Branch of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education National Research University Higher School of Economics in cooperation with University of Turin (Italy). Academic Supervisors – Doctor of Science in history, Professor of the Department of History of the St. Petersburg School of Arts and Humanities at the St. Petersburg Branch of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education National Research University Higher School of Economics Adrian Selin.

Degree of reliability and approbation of results

The reliability of the study is determined by a wide range of historical sources, selected in accordance with the goals and objectives of the research. The results of the work were presented and discussed in two workshops, two international conferences and two schools:

1. Autumn school “Human, too inhuman: observed, observer, field, city”, Tyumen State University, Russia, November 24–27, 2022. Report: “City as an unsafe space of provocations” (together with Tatiana Borisova).
2. Workshop “Pan-nationalisms, a Reappraisal”, University of Oslo, Norway, December 14, 2021. Report: “The Russian empire and pan-Scandinavianism: grasping a moving target”.
3. Workshop “Pan-movements, macro-regions and nation-building: Reflections on Nordic experiences in an international context, 1840–1940”, University of Helsinki, Finland, September 27–28, 2021. Presentation: “Emil von Qvanten, Mikhail Bakunin and Pan-National Activist Networks.
4. International Conference “Loyalty, Subjecthood, Citizenship: Between Empire and Nation”, National Research University “Higher School of Economics” – St. Petersburg, Russia, February 4–5, 2021. Report: “Macronationalism as gift exchange: the case of pan-Scandinavianism”.
5. International conference “Usable Pasts 2019”, “Higher School of Economics” – St. Petersburg, Russia, April 15, 2019. Report: “From “system” to “brotherhood”: discussing the unity of Scandinavian kingdoms”.
6. Summer School “Russian Empire / Soviet Union through the prism of world and new imperial history”, Tyumen State University, Russia, June 30–July 5, 2019. Report: “The Russian Empire Meets Pan-Scandinavism in the 1840s.”

List of author's main publications in the journals, included in the list of high-level journals, recommended by HSE, as well as indexed by Scopus and Web of Science:

1. Björk-Winberg, Mikael, Egorov, Evgenii. "Emil von Qvanten, Mikhail Bakunin and pan-national activist networks." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius, 117-36. London: Routledge, 2023.
2. Egorov, Evgenii. "The Russian empire and Scandinavianism: Grasping a moving target, 1840–1864." In *Nordic Experiences in Pan-nationalisms: A Reappraisal and Comparison, 1840–1940*, edited by Ruth Hemstad and Peter Stadius, 76-95. London: Routledge, 2023.
3. Egorov, Evgenii. "Danish visions of the Scandinavian union (1809–1810): a genealogy of the rhetoric and pragmatics of justification." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 46, no. 5 (2021): 619-41.
4. Egorov, Evgenii. "Perevod so shvedskogo na 'finljandskij': politicheskaja identichnost' Velikogo knjazhestva Finljandskogo (1831–1854) [Translation from Swedish to "Finland": The Political Identity of the Grand Duchy of Finland (1831–1854)]." *Ab Imperio*, no. 4 (2021): 203-37.