



Two Very Different Sides of the Same Coin: Nordmanns-Forbundet during World War II

Daron W. Olson

The Greek philosopher Heraclitus used the phrase two sides of the same coin to express the concept of two opposing things or ideas being linked to each other.¹ During World War II, there were two versions of the publication *Nordmanns-Forbundet* (the Norse Federation) and the Janus metaphor is appropriate for describing the journal's existence during those years. Founded in 1907, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* was an organization dedicated to creating closer cultural and social ties between Norway and its emigrated population, especially in the United States. Headquartered in Oslo, it had published a monthly journal that featured articles on Norwegians in the homeland and abroad. After Nazi Germany's invasion and occupation of Norway in 1940, the puppet government took over Norway's media, and *Nordmanns-Forbundet* met this fate in September 1941. To counter this reality, the leadership of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* relocated to the United States, and a competing version of the monthly journal was published there from December 1941 until June 1945.²

A study of the two competing journals reveals the distinctive visions each had for Norway. The *Nasjonal Samling* (NS) version projected an image of Norway as a partner in a Greater Germanic confederation, one that would serve as the protector of Western Civilization against the evils of Russian Bolshevism. Its national identity for Norway would be of the national romantic variety with a strong emphasis on the glory of Norway's past during the Viking Age and early medieval period. It also located the idealized true

Norwegian character as residing with the peasantry, and the NS journal urged Norway to embrace the rugged values associated with the nation's pristine mountains and wooded environments.

In contrast, the American or free version of the journal strove to defy this *völkisch* identity³ in favor of one that valued Norway's love of democracy, freedom, and a proclivity for a progressive society. Its symbols were Norway's democratic King Haakon VII, the Constitution, and May 17, and the Storting, the symbol of Norway's deep commitment to democracy and freedom. The American version likewise depicted Norway as an active, fighting ally alongside the fellow democracies of the United States and Britain in their struggle to rid the world of the barbarism known as the Third Reich.

This paper analyzes three areas for comparison, namely how each publication treated the war, the symbols employed, and the long-term objectives of each journal. The study of these three areas best illustrates the contrasting visions of the two journals and, in addition, reveals the ideological clash between the two sides. This clashing of values, moreover, presents a case study of how the two sides approached the war, especially the effort to win over Norwegians around the world to each side. Before that analysis, the background on *Nordmanns-Forbundet* and the war will be examined.

***Nordmanns-Forbundet* and the German Occupation**

Established in 1907, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* was part of a larger European movement that Norwegian historian Ruth Hemstad has identified as cultural diplomacy, by which the emigrated population of Norway served as vehicles in promoting the national interests of the homeland abroad. Other nations that engaged in this process included Germany, France, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland.⁴ The organization used its publication by the same name to foster closer ties with emigrated Norwegians around the world, including the large and important Norwegian population within the United States. As exemplified by its 1932 publication, *Et større Norge* (a greater Norway), *Nordmanns-Forbundet* aimed to create "a Greater Norway" that would bolster Norway's standing culturally and economically.⁵

The German invasion of Norway created a shakeup in the leadership of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*. The federation's president, Carl J. Hambro was also president of Norway's Storting (parliament) and along with the royal family and the Norwegian government evacuated to Britain. In his stead, Didrik Arup Seip, president of the University of Oslo, assumed the presidency of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*. The office of Vice President was also open after the death in early April of the Reverend N. B. Thvedt and Betzy Kjelsberg served as acting vice president. Initially, the *Administrasjonrådet* (the Administrative Council), which was sanctioned by the German forces, acted as a Norwegian authority of the German-occupied territory of Norway. It was abolished, however, in September 1940 by *Reichskommissar* Josef Terboven who decreed that *Nasjonal Samling* (NS, Norway's national socialist party) would be the sole legitimate political party in Norway. According to historian Odd S. Lovoll, who has authored the history of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, this action marked the beginning of the Nazification of Norwegian society.⁶ It should be noted, though, that Quisling had initiated this process as early as April 9, 1940, in conjunction with his coup on state radio.

For the first seventeen months of the occupation, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* retained its independent board. Led by Seip, the board instructed the journal to steer clear of material that would be considered inflammatory or controversial to the Nazis.⁷ The day-to-day operations remained in the capable hands of Secretary Arne Kildal and Editor Ludvig Saxe.

Nasjonal Samling had larger plans for *Nordmanns-Forbundet* and made early attempts to enlist the federation in its efforts to contact Norwegians abroad, especially seamen. Cloaked in the respectability of the federation, the *NS* messages would not be perceived as political propaganda. Lovoll observes that this *NS* attempt to reach thousands of Norwegians around the world served the Nazi "dream of some kind of Norwegian-German supernationalism." On December 9, 1940, the Board of *N-F* met to hear a presentation by a representative from *NS*. The representative tried to enlist the federation in its supernational cause, but it was "firmly and bravely

rejected.” A few months later, during the summer of 1941, the *NS* made a second attempt to gain cooperation, when it asked the federation to assist in arranging the *Normannafolket* (the Normanner people, a reference to Norwegians during Old Norse times) exhibition in Oslo. At its meeting of July 15, 1941, the Board unanimously voted neither to take part nor allow the name *Nordmanns-Forbundet* to be used. Lovoll contends that it was the federation’s firm stand in these two instances that led to NS taking over the operation, a fate that likewise befell other voluntary organizations in Norway that protested Nazification.⁸

As noted by historian Ole Kristian Grimnes, efforts to control Norwegian organizations and activity expanded after the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June, 1941. Although a kernel of the political and security apparatus had been present since the April days of 1940, the role of the SS (*Schutzstaffel*, or Protective Squads) increased greatly during 1941. The key instrument in the Nazification of Norwegian society was *Sikkerhetstjenesten* (*Sicherheitsdienst*, abbreviated SD), which was a political overwatch agency that charted and controlled the expression of opinion in Norwegian society. Grimnes notes that the SD was under German central control via the *Hovedkontoret for rikssikkerhet* (*Reichs-sicherheitshauptamt*, abbreviated RHSA, or the Reich’s Main Security Department), and hence the Norwegian SD answered to the chief of the RHSA, Reinhard Heydrich.⁹

On September 11, 1941, Norwegian radio reported that government authorities had removed *Nordmanns-Forbundet*’s board and functionaries from office. At a hastily convened meeting the next day, a German officer and Finn Støren, the *NS* representative and formerly Norway’s consul to Panama showed up. Støren announced that the Board was dismissed. Upon hearing the news, Editor Saxe and Secretary Kildal resigned immediately. Støren became the commissary leader, the position which replaced that of president of the federation; a Nazi Board was installed, and the Nazi Norwegian state official Ingolf Hoel was temporarily employed as editor. According to Lovoll, the era of Nazi rule in Norway meant “a dead hand was placed over *Nordmanns-Forbundet*.”¹⁰

Information about the target audiences for each publication would provide a good indication of the purpose of the journal. Although subscriber information was not available in the *Nordmanns-Forbundet* archives—possibly the information was lost or in the case of occupied Norway likely destroyed—there are clues as to the intended audience of each journal. For example, in a letter dated February 7, 1942, the general secretary of the *NS* version contacted Judicial President (*rettspresident*) Michael Hansson of Lillehammer. In the letter, the author refers to a letter received from Hansson in which the jurist had declined a lifelong membership in *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, citing various reasons for not doing so. The author acknowledged that the new leadership of the journal possibly had not been members of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, but those that had realized the great importance of the journal. The author then gives a little dig to Hansen noting that these “old” members in the association were not offended at the time he (Hansson) had joined. The author then provided a strong sales pitch to the jurist:

The new men are in agreement that our countrymen abroad must obtain the true information about the spirit which today grows strongly in our fatherland among the genuine Norwegians who in spite of everything are saving us in this time. And we find inspiration not in today’s world, but by looking back in our history.

It was out of this vision that I implored them to close ranks around that which is Norwegian, concerning everything that characterizes us as a race and a people. And, I also did that today precisely in recognition of your earlier contributions for the association, not in contradiction, to what you believe.¹¹

From this letter, it becomes apparent that the *NS*-controlled *Nordmanns-Forbundet* wanted to win over influential persons in Norway. Its larger goal was to use the journal to reach Norwegians living abroad, especially by convincing them of the “new spirit” that was renewing the greatness of Norway.

As for the audience of the American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, it is possible to infer its target audience in a similar fashion. In a letter dated July 28, 1945, the office manager for the newly freed *Nordmanns-Forbundet* in Oslo addressed Aksel H. Holter of Ashland, Wisconsin. The author conveyed how those still working for the NS-controlled *Nordmanns-Forbundet* in Oslo had learned via illegal channels of the free version of the organization in the United States. They also mentioned how the American version of the journal had been sent to new members in the non-occupied lands (this would have included the United States, Canada, Britain, etc.) and this process had netted many new members. Near the end of the letter, the author reveals his reason for contacting Mr. Holter: the organization had lost contact with many of its older members in the United States and hoped that Mr. Holter would be able to provide them with as many as possible of the old addresses of these older members so that the organization could reestablish contact with them.¹²

This information suggests that as part of its strategy the American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* had sought out new members in the non-occupied countries (with good success) and that the old members were not necessarily the intended target. A likely reason is that the American leadership of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* believed it could count on the support of its old members but wanted to reach new members and thus gain access to a larger audience to whom it could promote Norway's wartime cause.

As a wartime asset, the control of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* was of high importance. The Nazi-directed takeover of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* in Oslo set off alarm bells within Norway's exile government in London. On January 12, 1942, Jens Bull, an official working for the exile government sent a memo to Norway's Foreign Affairs Department (*Det kongelige Utenriksdepartement*) and a copy of the newspaper *Aftenposten* from December 16, 1941. The *Aftenposten* article was titled "Norwegians in foreign nations must obtain information on the valuable work which is happening at home" and it was an interview with Finn Støren. In the article, Støren stressed the importance for *Nordmanns-Forbundet* to make contact with the emigrated Norwegians, "especially the great conti-

ment of our countrymen in the United States” and to win them over though he lamented the difficulty in reaching them. In his memo, Bull noted how after the German occupation editor Ludvig Saxe, longtime editor of the journal prior to the Nazi takeover, had tried to steer an apolitical course for the journal and not make it inoffensive to the occupiers. Bull warned, however, that with the journal now being controlled by *Nasjonal Samling* it would assume a much more political [and obviously] pro-Nazi character. He also noted that its new editor was the “bureau head” [Ingolf] Hoel.¹³

Thus, the most important target audience for both versions of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* was the large body of Norwegian Americans. For the Norwegian government in exile, it was of paramount importance to get their message to the Norwegian-American audience and convince them that liberating Norway—including the assistance of the United States—was in the best interests of Norway and Norwegian America.

Norway’s leaders in the United States wanted to promote a strategy, aimed at the American media, in which Norway offered a test case of how Nazism operated and how it could be resisted. In an untitled letter from February 7, 1941, Carl J. Hambro writes in English to an unspecified recipient in London. In the letter Hambro states the following:

However, it would be of the utmost importance for the American press to be informed of what is going on in Norway. In the first place, because Norway is a country where the German Nazis—supported by a small group of traitors—are trying to Nazify the whole country. To follow developments in Norway is consequently a means of getting a deep insight into the nature and methods of Nazism. The vast majority of the Norwegian people are making an heroic passive resistance against this Nazification, and out of this daily struggle between the German conquerors on the one hand and the Norwegian people on the other hand come many incidents of dramatic interest.¹⁴

Hambro goes on to say that among the German-occupied countries,

Norway was in the most favorable position for getting news of internal developments to the outside world owing to Norway's long common border with Sweden where Norwegian press representatives could continue their work.¹⁵ Norway's close proximity to Britain was likely also a factor in promoting the nation as the best candidate.

Treatment of the War

From its inaugural issue, the American-produced version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* (*N-F*) made World War II its primary focus. This journal had its headquarters in Princeton, New Jersey, and it was published by Holt Publishing of Grand Forks, North Dakota. Henry Holt, the Lieutenant-Governor of North Dakota, was of Norwegian ancestry and the owner of the publishing firm. The cover of the December 1941, journal featured a Norwegian flyer giving a skyward salute as he stands at attention in front of his airplane. No longer would the tranquil landscapes of Norway grace the covers. Furthermore, the cover replaced the previous slogan, "Enige og tro" (united and faithful), which the *Nasjonal Samling* version continued to use, with a circular picture of King Haakon VII in military dress under which was printed his rallying cry for the country, "Alt for Norge" (All for Norway). Successive issues of the American-based journal would uphold this martial orientation, signifying the importance of Norway's war effort and the goal of liberation. Military planes, naval ships, flyers, sailors, soldiers, and other photos of Norway's fighting forces would be prominently displayed.¹⁶

Despite having its government in exile in England, Norway made a significant contribution to the Allied war effort, and the American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* devoted substantial coverage to Norwegian forces. The December 1941 issue featured the Royal Norwegian Air Force and its training center, Camp Little Norway, in Canada. Written by the camp's commander, Major Ole Reistad, it described how Norway's pilots were preparing to liberate Norway.¹⁷

The pilots were among Norway's greatest war assets, and Re-

istad predicted that their motivation and intelligence would make them highly successful. His prediction proved accurate for in 1943, *Norsk Jægereskvadron* (the Norwegian Attack Squadron) was the top-scoring squadron in the British Royal Air Force with over 160 German planes shot down. In the June 1944 issue of the American version of *N-F*, a member of the squadron described their successful dogfights against German Focke-Wolfs, a further testimony to the bravery of Norway's forces.¹⁸

Norway's other great asset was its merchant marine, which Reistad termed "Norway's greatest factor in the war today." The 1943 anthology *Tusen norske skip* (A Thousand Norwegian Ships) stated that the war materials carried by Norway's merchant marine were significant to the Allied war cause. A common idea of the time was that the Germans considered Norway's merchant marine to be worth a million-man army to England. After the victory over Germany, *N-F* in America concluded that the performance of the fleet was an overwhelmingly prideful chapter in Norway's history.¹⁹

Not to be forgotten was Norway's army. In a 1943 article, the American *N-F* announced the status of Norway's "new army," which was undergoing strenuous training with British forces in Scotland. Noting that the Norwegian infantryman was among the most educated of any foot soldier in the world, the Norwegians were anxious for the opportunity to use their battle skills against the Germans.²⁰

The American version likewise depicted resistance to the Nazi regime in Norway. It noted how several editors of Norway's newspapers had gone to prison rather than submit to the occupiers' demands. The Norwegian Lutheran state church, led by Bishop Eivind Berggrav, had taken a revolutionary stand against interference by the Quislings. Norway's teachers, university professors and students, and athletes had strongly resisted the puppet government, and their actions earned acclaim from the American version of *N-F* for their defense of "Norway's existence as a civilized people."²¹

At the center of its occupation strategy, the Nazi-controlled state attempted to enlist Norway's state Lutheran Church as another appendage of its rule. During 1941, the *NS* Ministry of Religion

and Education urged the church to adopt the following: 1) become detached from all non-spiritual affairs, 2) install Nazi doctrine in the church schools, 3) emplace Nazi sympathizers to the most important church offices, including the bishops, and 4) to discredit pastors who opposed the occupying powers and replace them with “loyal” pastors. In February, 1942, when Quisling became head of the government, he declared himself the Supreme Bishop of the church. He denounced Berggrav and replaced the Dean of Trondheim with a loyal supporter of the Nazi party. In response and in defense of civilization, seven anti-Nazi bishops resigned their offices as church administrators, but they retained their roles as bishops in care of the clergy of their diocese. This action created a de facto “free church” as 93% of Norway’s clergy resigned their administrative function. Directed by Berggrav, this mass resignation occurred on Easter Sunday, April 5, 1942. Berggrav further argued that the constitutional relationship between the church and state made it clear that there was a right for Norway’s clergy to refuse to obey a totalitarian state. The Norwegian Lutheran Church thus spearheaded the resistance to the occupiers from a position of moral conscientiousness.²²

Although the American version of *N-F* seemed to ironically espouse militarism and violence to a far greater extent than its *NS* counterpart, the phenomenon known as “virtue systems” explains the difference. According to Jonathan Leader Maynard, those who wrote within the pages of the American *Nordmanns-Forbundet* used its content to socialize “certain types of identity” and thereby get individuals to support “explicit and implicit codes of expected and valorized behavior associated with those identities.” He further maintains that the codes of behavior generated by this process “generate potent drives towards certain forms of action so as to obtain positive moral self-identity.”²³ The message of the American *N-F* was clear: Norwegians and their allies, including Norwegian Americans, would have to fight the bitter fight to liberate Norway, but Norwegian culture and society were worth the cost and justified in a moral sense.

Within the pages of *Nasjonal Samling*’s version of *N-F*, cover-

age of the war was virtually nonexistent, or mentioned only in the general sense. The most open referral to the war came in a January 1942 article by Finn Støren, the *NS* leader who had become the president of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* in Norway in September, 1941. He acknowledged that the events of the war in 1942 would determine the future of Norway. Readers of *Nasjonal Samling's* version, however, would find little mention of the war during the remaining years of publication. Most references were brief and often buried in the back pages. In the May-June 1942 issue, a short note described Minister President Quisling's flight to the Eastern Front to visit with Norwegians serving in the *Waffen SS*. The September issue of the same year described Minister Rolf Fuglesang's tour of the Eastern Front to review the *Den norske Legion* (The Norwegian Legion).²⁴

Almost as rare in the *NS* version were references to Vidkun Quisling. The earliest issues attempted to portray the puppet leader in a positive light. The March 1942 issue hailed the new regime in Norway, quoting Quisling's speech from February 1, 1942, when he assumed the title of Minister President. Quisling proclaimed that his regime represented the latest step toward full national freedom and independence for Norway. The journal likewise painted a positive picture of Quisling's visit with Adolf Hitler in Berlin on February 11 of that year.²⁵ But coverage of Quisling declined rapidly in successive issues, a clear indication of the *fører's* massive unpopularity.

For the American version of *N-F*, Quisling proved an easy target, a symbol of the hated puppet regime. In an article from June 1942, the Norwegian historian Jacob S. Worm-Müller denounced the journal's takeover by the *Nasjonal Samling* regime. On the arrest of Didrik Arup-Seip, the president of *N-F*, who was subsequently imprisoned, he commented wryly that Quisling and Støren had realized that "no Norwegian was for sale." As the end neared for Quisling, the American *N-F* noted in February 1945, that his position was more and more uncertain. The recent murder by the Norwegian Resistance of the leader of the *Hird*, Quisling's personal guard, was a harbinger of the fate that awaited the hated *fører* for his reign of brutality.²⁶

Symbols and Identity

In the battle over Norway's future control of the nation's symbols was paramount. The Quisling government wanted to appropriate as many as possible of Norway's cherished national symbols to lend legitimacy to its cause. A fascist, Quisling espoused a race-conscious, corporatist view of society, and those symbols that emphasized militarism, masculine virility, and *völkisch* characteristics were the most attractive.²⁷

The *NS* version of *N-F* devoted considerable attention to Viking-age symbolism. The most dramatic expression occurred about every three months when the publication would contain full-color inserts of images from Norway's Viking Age and early medieval history, which often referred to scenes from victorious battles. These were reprints of tapestries created mostly by Harald Damsleth, and often contained short descriptions, noting how the Vikings had founded kingdoms and established cities. Viking-age heroes and heroines such as Gange-Rolf, Leif Eriksson, Gudrun, St. Olav and Harald Hardråde were featured during the 1942 issues. In subsequent years, the inserts were devoted to Norway's medieval kings, including Sigurd the Crusader, Sverre, and Håkon IV. Moreover, Quisling deliberately appropriated Viking-age symbols for his own use, such as naming his personal bodyguard the *Hird*, the traditional Norwegian Royal Guard for his own bodyguard, and the adoption of the *Solkors*, or Sun Cross, a prominent Viking-age fertility symbol.²⁸

Efforts by the Quisling regime to employ Viking and medieval symbolism were duly reported by the *NS* version. The regime attempted to appropriate Norway's celebration of St. Olav, its great king who died a martyr at the Battle of Stiklestad in 1030, by tying it to the celebration to Norway's resurgence under *Nasjonal Samling* and by claiming a direct connection between the king and Quisling. In 1942 the Norwegian Historical Documents Institute (*Norsk Historisk Kjeldeskrift-Institutt*) published a two-volume study of St. Olav, which had begun in 1917. The product of Norwegian historian Dr. Oscar Albert Johnsen and Icelandic professor Dr. Jón Helgason, the *NS* version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* published an

article about the book in its February 1942 issue. The article gave a fairly balanced account, yet it ended by stating “Now more than ever could ever appreciate how the sympathy becomes strong and the bonds steadfast between the various branches of the Norwegian and Nordic peoples.”

The Norwegian fascists viewed the prior depression era as one of decline and contended that the New Order would make Norway great again as she had been during the Viking Age and early medieval era. The apogee of this attempt came at the 1944 celebration that featured the unveiling of a new monument to St. Olav at Stiklestad, sculpted by Wilhelm Rasmussen. The *NS* publication likewise printed several articles glorifying Norway’s Viking and medieval past, including the November 1943 issue in which Leif Eriksson, the great Norwegian-American hero, was portrayed as a symbol for the new era, i.e. a *Nasjonal Samling* hero.²⁹

A glorification of Norway’s traditional peasant culture was another common motif in the *NS* version. A common theme was that Norway’s beautiful but rugged terrain had imbued its peasantry, the most racially pure Norwegians, with toughness and resolve. It paid attention to the importance of Norwegian folk music and *bunads*, which had helped to preserve the best of Norwegian culture.³⁰

A good example comes from an article by J. Falck-Andersen titled “The Discovery of the Hidden Norway” (*Oppdagelsen av det skjulte Norge*) in the July-August 1943 issue. Referring to the year 1814, the author argues that Norway’s newly won freedom at that time owed much to the Norwegians who lived among the nation’s mountains and forests where a blue-eyed, somewhat naïve, patriotism took hold. He urged a rediscovery of this hidden Norway which inspired the great romantic works of Norway by such men as violinist Ole Bull, composer Halfdan Kierulf, and Ludvig Lindeman who composed the folk melodies associated with the folk tales of Asbjørnsen and Moe. Falck-Andersen concludes his article by quoting Henrik Wergeland, the nineteenth-century cultural personality and poet of Norway: “Our hearts know, our eyes see, how good and beautiful Norway can stand as a motto for the new age, that which leads forth from the hidden Norway.”³¹

These themes are consistent with *Nasjonal Samling's* overall attempt to remake Norwegian society. For example, the party called for "a new spirit in the schools" that would reflect its ideology. Developed by the Ministry for Church and Educational Affairs, led by *NS* minister Ragnar Skancke and chief inspector of schools, Jørgen Bakke, the new program clearly reflected the impact of the German model, which emphasized character-building of students over the acquisition of professional knowledge. Especially important for the indoctrination of pupils and to emphasize the greatness of their nation of Norway, the new standards adapted Norwegian history to the national socialist model. History in Norwegian schools was expected to refer to the Viking Age, especially when legendary King Harald Fairhair united Norway into one realm. This program of education emphasized Quisling and *Nasjonal Samling's* slogan "Norway is a realm—we shall become one people" and *NS* education would project into schooling patriotism, nationalism, the people's community, a sense of belonging to the "Germanic race," a will for combat, and the role of the "Führer principle."³²

In a 1941 radio speech in May 1941, Skancke described how Norwegian schools had to guarantee that pupils could develop their biological aptitudes as fully as possible. Moreover, each child had to learn that every human being was part of a larger unity, or the people's community. He stressed that schools had to create a "strong and healthy youth, in accordance with the doctrine of biological heritage and race." The ultimate goal was to create an "ideal type of race." Nicolas Karcher notes, however, that this statement was not specifically Norwegian or informative about achieving a corresponding education in practice. Instead, it was merely a repetition of central National Socialist principles as they were promoted in Germany.³³

In more modern guise, the *Nasjonal Samling* version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* emphasized a return to the land as a way to renew the spirit of Norway and its people. In November 1941, the *NS* version presented an article on labor service for Norway, which envisioned a labor service modeled on the one in Nazi Germany, though it was also compared to the Civilian Conservation Corps

being utilized in the United States. The *Arbeidstjeneste* (Labor Service) would feature a military-style organization. For men it proclaimed that they would sing and march from the camp where the split Norwegian flag waved. As they marched, they would swing their hoes and spades. At the end of the workday in summer, they would take brisk baths in nearby rivers or lakes. The evenings would consist of warm comradeship on the base. From this work on the farms, Norway's male youth would achieve an invigorating faith in the Norwegian people and their future. The solidarity of shared work would lead to an uplifting of Norway's people.³⁴

The presence of this sentiment in the NS version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* aligns with the principles of the National Youth Service of *Nasjonal Samling* (*Nasjonal Samlings Ungdomsfylking*), which since its inception in 1933 had widely corresponded to the Hitler Youth (*Hitlerjugend*), espousing the ideas of National Socialist education. In addition to education and the National Youth Service, the Labor Service or Fatigue Duty (*Arbeidstjeneste*) was a third branch that promoted National Socialist principles. Its purpose was to shape Norwegians through outdoor work and thereby connect them, especially Norwegian youth, more closely to their nation, their people, and practical life rather than schooling based on theory.³⁵

The attempt to impose a German Nazi-style *Arbeidstjeneste* was central to the struggle against the German occupation force. Leaders of Norway's resistance aimed to strengthen the Norwegian population's resistance to the labor service and to defend Norwegian national identity. It was crucial to get Norwegians to reject the racial aspects of the service and its attempt to militarize Norway. Sabotage was a favored tactic used to thwart Nazi aims of controlling Norway's labor force.³⁶

These ideas reflected an extreme interpretation of conservative nineteenth-century National Romantic ideas. One must mention that nineteenth-century national romanticism had greatly influenced Norway's national identity, especially an emphasis on the nation's Viking-age past and peasant culture.³⁷ The *völkisch* ideology of *Nasjonal Samling* made the appropriation of these romantic symbols self-evident. The Quisling regime encountered great dif-

ficulty, however, when it attempted to appropriate the latter-day symbols of Norway's national identity.

In response, the *Nasjonal Samling* version attempted to vindicate the takeover of modern Norwegian symbols. The puppet regime located its offices in the *Storting* (parliament) building. During its September 1942 public celebrations in Oslo, on the ninth anniversary of *Nasjonal Samling*, the festivities included events in the National Gallery, the University building, and the National Theater, and a parade down Karl Johans Gate, on which was located the Royal Palace and the *Storting*. The regime also attempted to erase annual celebrations of May 1 (Labor Day) and May 17, Norway's constitution day. Instead, the regime attempted to create substitute celebrations. In early 1945 for example, Wilhelm Rasmussen sculpted his *Eidsvollssøylen* (Eidsvoll Pillar), a monument in honor of Norway's constitution, which was to be placed near the *Storting*, but was never realized.³⁸

As noted by Anthony D. Smith, the process of reappropriating one's culture through historical reappropriation is a common tactic of modern nationalists and Norway's attempt to emphasize its Viking Age and peasant past is a notable example. For Germany, however, there was limited historical material for this process to succeed. Instead, Nazi Germany recovered its ancient ethno-history by appropriating Norway's ancient past, which, as Smith observes, is the starting point for the process of vernacular nationalist mobilization, or the creation of a national identity that would appeal to all levels of German society.³⁹ This German appropriation, furthermore, reflected a common tactic of nationalism, which Smith has also identified. He contends that nationalism often "inhabits" other ideologies and belief-systems and channels their ideals and policies to nationalist ends.⁴⁰

In stark contrast, the American version of *N-F* emphasized latter-day symbolism to counter the tainted Nazi symbolism. Norway's love of freedom became a significant symbol, and the aforementioned resistance by homeland Norwegians to the Nazi government served to drive the point home. The exiled author, Sigrid Undset, wrote for *N-F* in March 1942 about the close affinities

between Norwegians and Americans, two peoples with an historic craving for freedom. Halvdan Koht, historian and Norway's former Minister of Defense, echoed similar ideas in noting that Norwegians who had emigrated to America found a natural home owing to their love of freedom.⁴¹

Norway's latter-day identity was strongly tied to a respect for law and democratic government. As such, the American version pointed to Norway's parliament and constitution as the foundations of modern Norwegian society and its values. In a May 1942 article, Johan Nygaardsvold, Norway's Prime Minister in exile, observed that as a constitutional monarchy, Norway's king and constitution were among its foremost symbols since they were the moral basis and foundation of the will of the people. At a speech given on the anniversary of the German occupation of Norway, Carl J. Hambro, the Secretary of the American *N-F*, identified "the moral power in our people," whose society "was built upon the values of the oldest constitutional society in Europe." In a December 1944 article in *N-F*, Editor Torolv Kandahl praised Hambro, president of the *Storting*, for his resolute opposition to the German invaders and his decision to fight the war in exile. The behavior of Hambro and other members of the Norwegian *Storting* demonstrated the strong constitutional bonds between the democracy that was and the one that would return once the war was over.⁴²

By linking the civilizational values of Norway to the United States, Norway's leaders engaged in what H. D. S. Greenway has identified as "kin-country" syndrome. Through this process, leaders of Norway and Norwegian America engaged in a process of "civilizational rallying" in which groups or states belonging to one civilization that become involved in a war with people from a different civilization try to rally support from other members of their own civilization.⁴³ The Allies, including Norway, frequently presented the war as a battle between civilization and the barbarism of Nazism. Presented in this fashion, the defenders of Norway could argue that Norway's struggle was more than a traditional one based on the acquisition of territory or considerations of the balance of

power. It was instead a battle over the very nature of humanity, a battle with soulful consequences.

Moreover, the condition of being in exile allowed homeland Norwegians to emphasize their cultural nationalism, especially the way it generated strong bonds between Norway and Norwegian Americans. Laura Hilton stresses that displaced persons or persons in exile for whom the legitimacy of their national identity has been challenged (as per a foreign occupation), will often rewrite shared traditions, history, and culture to provide them with a sense of place and self, as well as providing a useful outlet for survival and fighting back against the enemies of their nation. Exiled people, like displaced people, exercise these actions to present a positive identity to receptor states.⁴⁴ Both homeland Norwegian and Norwegian-American defenders of Norway revised the self-image of the homeland to both fight back against Nazi Germany and to enhance Norway's identity within the United States. Through the pages of the American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, exiled Norwegians and Norwegian Americans could learn about the altered identity of Norway and then disseminate its symbols and meanings to the larger American public.

Perhaps the strongest latter-day symbols for the American version of *N-F* were King Haakon VII and May 17. The king was a beloved, national hero for his refusal to acknowledge the Nazi government and his willingness to fight the war from abroad. In 1942, the year of King Haakon's seventieth birthday, *N-F* in America heaped lavish praise on him, calling him the people's king in "the most democratic land in the world." In recognition of his fighting spirit that same year, the United States dedicated an anti-submarine vessel as his namesake on September 15. On the occasion, President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave his famous "Look to Norway" speech, in which he identified Norway as the exemplary nation that embodied the reasons the United States was fighting tyranny. King Haakon VII frequently graced the pages of the American version of *N-F*, and his inspirational words cemented his role as a symbol for a free Norway. In the January 1944 issue, for instance, he greeted all Norwegians for whom the war "is steadily being won," and promised that "hope would soon return."⁴⁵

The effort to repudiate the Nazi appropriation of Norwegian symbols such as the Viking and romanticized peasants, while simultaneously refashioning the cornerstones of Norway's national identity closely resemble what Anthony D. Smith has termed *ethno-symbolist* approach to nationalism. In particular, he notes that the process of nation-formation is not so much one of construction or deliberate invention, but of *reinterpretation* of pre-existing cultural motifs and of *reconstruction* of earlier ethnic ties and settlements.⁴⁶ Hence, Norway's WWII identity-makers reinterpreted their national identity in terms of cultural motifs (love of democracy, the Constitution, the Storting, and the King) at the expense of Vikings and romanticized peasants because the former symbols excluded Germans and German or Germanic nationalism, while the latter symbols could not. In addition, Norwegian identity-makers also attempted to remake the Vikings into stalwarts of liberty in a further effort to stave off Nazi appropriation. One example occurred in December 1941 when Norway's envoy, Wilhelm Morgenstierne, gave a talk in Minneapolis to the local *Nordmanns-Forbundet* chapter. In his talk the envoy referred to Norway's merchant marine as "modern Vikings" whose activities supported Norway's free fighting forces.⁴⁷

The latter-day symbolic synthesis came together in the special May 1944 issue of the American *N-F*, the one hundredth and thirtieth anniversary of Norway's constitution. The cover featured a flight of birds flying a "v" formation towards Norway, which symbolized the "triple v" slogan of the home front, *vi vil vinne* (we will win), and King Haakon VII. Dedicated to Norway's constitution day, the issue affirmed May 17 as a powerful symbol of Norway. In his tribute to "our constitutional day," Carl J. Hambro explained that the *Storting* was the "living expression of the constitution, as its active symbol," and that May 17 represented the public spirit that made the nation great. In the same issue, Prime Minister Nygaardsvold reflected that May 17 showed respect for the constitution that had "shaped our independence and freedom." Minister W. Neuman of the diplomatic corps simply stated that "Norway is freedom," while President Roosevelt hoped that the next celebration of May

17 would take place in a Norway again free and democratic. King Haakon VII contended that May 17 represented Norway's cause to liberate itself from Germany's attempt to impose a slave-state.⁴⁸

A Greater Germany versus a Greater Norway

The Quisling regime had seized control of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* because it viewed it as a propaganda tool. At a practical level, it was hoped that the journal might influence Norwegians living abroad to return to Norway, especially once the war was over. In Quisling's dreams of a future Nazi-Norway, he hoped that the nation's population would reach ten million by the year 2000 through an emphasis on larger families and return migration. An article from the February 1943 *Nasjonal Samling* version was especially blunt in its assessment that Norway needed to increase its number of births if it were to survive. In January 1942, it urged Norwegian women to return to working the land. The article was accompanied by a picture of happy, robust, farm girls weeding potatoes and smiling in the glorious sunshine.⁴⁹ Within the article, the NS version idealized the farm and the need for women to do agricultural work. Encouraging women to realize the character-building efforts that came with hard work:

All Norwegian young women should get out and work with the earth. Most do not like it to begin with, but when they are stricken with stiffness and water blisters, and they become accustomed to the work, most are comfortable with it. They learn to respect the farmer and his work and see that his life is hard toil and exhausting year after year, and yet he is content with his existence. They discover that it must be something exceptional in God's free nature. They learn to work for work's sake, and then they place a much greater worth both on themselves and that which they work for.⁵⁰

Despite being at war with the United States, the *NS* version steadfastly promoted positive images of Norwegian America. It took every opportunity to congratulate Norwegian-American leaders on

their birthdays or to pay tribute to milestones reached by Norwegian-American institutions such as newspapers, colleges, and churches.⁵¹

More importantly, though, was the need for the regime, including *N-F*, to persuade Norwegians that the nation's fortune was tied to the good fortune of Hitler's Germany. *N-F* in Oslo quoted speeches from *Reichskommissar* Josef Terboven and Quisling on February 1, 1942. Terboven predicted that the Norwegian people would be united and strengthened through National Socialism, becoming an "indispensable part of the Germanic fellowship." The *fører*, meanwhile, stressed the need to build Norway on national socialist principles: Norway had become "one regime, it shall become one folk." Yet he maintained that Norway's fate was tied to Germany, for "Germany's victory is Norway's victory."⁵²

According to scholar Nicola Karcher, when the "new order" was established on September 25, 1940, the Nazification of Norway became the main task of *Nasjonal Samling* and the main goal was to transform Norway into a racially pure "people's community" that would be integrated as an equal partner in the "Greater Germanic Reich," albeit under the leadership of Nazi Germany.⁵³

This promotion of Norway's role in "a Greater Germany" or "some kind of Norwegian-German supernationalism" was a common theme in the *NS* version of the journal.⁵⁴ Writing in January 1942, Støren observed that *Nordmanns-Forbundet's* mission supported everything that characterized Norway as a race and a people, namely the desire to be united (based on national socialist principles). In the October 1942 issue, Rolf Fuglesang claimed that the future relationship between Germany and Norway would allow Norway to receive its free and rightful position in the new Europe. In February, 1945, the *NS* version of *N-F* reported that Quisling and his ministers had traveled to Germany to learn from Hitler about Norway's place in the Germanic people's future. The January 1945 issue expressed concern that Norway's promising future would be abruptly terminated before the end of 1945—that the National Socialist revolution would be uncompleted owing to an Allied victory.⁵⁵

The Greater Germany concept attracted numerous responses from the American *N-F*. In its first issue, Hambro attacked the concept of a Norwegian-German super-nationalism as a ruse for having Norwegians serve a greater Germany. He compared the Nazi takeover of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* as an attempt to smuggle a Nazi virus among Norwegians all over the world, especially by promising to restore to Norway its medieval possessions such as the Orkneys, the Shetlands, the Isle of Man, and northern Scotland. Sigrid Undset wrote mockingly in 1942 that the Germans' desire to be part of the Nordic race, by appropriating Norway's proud past, were suspect owing to the racial blending of peoples. More importantly, she added, the desire for freedom and democratic government were the true characteristics of the Nordic nations, something lacking in Germany.⁵⁶

In place of the Greater Germany concept, the American version offered the Greater Norway concept, which called for close ties between a democratic and free Norway and its emigrated population living in other areas of the world. The American *N-F* was careful to distinguish the difference. It published an interview with the Norwegian Foreign Minister in exile, Trygve Lie, in April 1943. Lie emphasized that Norway had no territorial ambitions and was a steadfast member of the Allies. In an article from January 1942, Jacob Worm-Müller stressed that *Nordmanns-Forbundet* existed to promote greater cultural and economic ties between Norway and Norwegians living abroad. The cultivation of those close ties, especially between Norway and Norwegian Americans, proved crucial to Norway's war effort. Einar Lund, the editor of *Decorah-Posten*, wrote in *N-F* in November 1942 about the connection. "Norway's influence in the war," he observed, brought "feelings of pride in the Norwegian heritage" and that Americans of Norwegian ancestry would take the lead in rebuilding "our fathers' land." In an article appearing in *N-F* after the war, the new Prime Minister of Norway, Einar Gerhardsen, gave thanks to America, especially Norwegian Americans, for their relief efforts. He noted that the struggle against common enemies had created strong bonds between the Norwegian people and the United States of America.⁵⁷

Two considerations arise from this formulation. The first involved the need for Norwegian and Norwegian-American identity-makers (both part of the Greater Norway) to tie their national identity to a code of morality. In describing the essential differences between Norwegian greater nationalism and German greater nationalism, the proponents of the Greater Norway linked Norway's identity to the identity of the United States, especially its perceived commitment to liberal values. As noted by Catherine Frost, this espousal of a liberal nationalism meant that there was "a trade-off relationship with the qualities we associate with nationalism."⁵⁸ In other words, the American *Nordmanns-Forbundet* signaled that Norway's national identity would abandon its territorial (nationalist) ambitions in favor of a liberal international order that valued justice and the process of law.

The second issue is the very framework of the Greater Norway, which suggested that Norway's orientation would be based on internationalism after the war, a position that would move away from traditional Nordic neutralism. This effort created a type of national identity that Marcus Nicolson termed cosmopolitan nationalism in his recent chapter of Scottish nationalism and the appeal of transnational European structures such as the European Union. He argues that modern Scottish national identity is outward-looking and reliant on the continued cooperation of other European nations.⁵⁹ In a similar vein, the Nazi occupation and subsequent resistance by Norway created a reappraisal of Norway's national identity, and Norway's identity-makers, as evidenced by the pages of the American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, chose an identity that was outward-looking and favorably disposed to international cooperation.

Treatment of the Jews

In April 1940 2,173 Jews lived in Norway, mostly in Oslo and Trondheim where they owned businesses or worked in the professions or crafts. Immigration rules for Jews in Norway, as elsewhere in Europe, were restrictive as well. In May 1940, one month after the start of the occupation, the first anti-Jewish measure was intro-

duced when the radios owned by Jews were confiscated. Soon after, the occupying regime registered Jewish property and firms, and these were confiscated. In January 1942, the authorities required Jews to have a “J” stamped on their identification papers and arrests followed shortly thereafter. Beginning in October of that year, the authorities in Norway arrested Jewish men and they were sent to concentration camps, where they suffered murder, execution, or suicide. As a result, many Jews fled Norway and between these two actions the Jewish population of Norway severely declined. Among those trying to escape Norway, at least 900 Jewish refugees made their way across the border to Sweden.⁶⁰

Neither the *NS* version nor the American version of *N-F* had much to say about the treatment of the Jews. In its back pages, the *NS* version would post short notices, usually about the restrictions on the Jews in Norway or sometimes notices to report to a local *NS* authority. The American version hardly touched the subject. One exception was an article from February 1945 by the writer Johan Borgen, which raised issues about how Norwegians had traditionally treated the Jewish population of Norway. Borgen was an intellectual with leftist political leanings who was imprisoned in the Grini detention camp near Oslo during the war for writing epistles in newspapers with hidden anti-German messages. After the war, he submitted articles for the Sosialistisk Folkeparti’s newspaper *Orientering*.⁶¹

Borgen pointed out that Norway was massively anti-Semitic. While he observed that Jews were generous, full of initiative, energetic, and displayed polite mannerisms, Norwegian sources (even prior to the Nazi occupation) seldom depicted them that way in everyday life. Borgen contended that these racist attitudes and the resulting murder of the Jews had created a dark stain over Norway’s history. He insisted that Norwegians must take responsibility for allowing antisemitism to reside in the souls of the people. The author admonished Norwegians in the future to work for social justice as the basis of a future Norway.⁶²

Norwegian antisemitism prior to the war likely arose out of similar structural conditions to those happening in Central and Eastern Europe, albeit on a lesser scale. William Hagen’s com-

parative work on antisemitism in Germany and Poland during the interwar period identifies the “embourgeoisement” of the Jewish middle classes at this time as they sought advantageous positions in the economy and professional life. Their success provoked a counterreaction on the part of the non-Jewish middle classes who were also striving for status and advancement. Those members of the non-Jewish professional classes in Germany and Poland, including lawyers, physicians, teachers, engineers, and other highly-trained technicians as well, seized upon antisemitism to improve their prospects of employment and mobility, regardless of whether they accepted Nazi policies of “Aryanization with equanimity or enthusiasm.”⁶³ Borgen observed both types of behavior, which he termed familiar chauvinism (prejudice) and antisemitism, noting that they were not the same. But he noted that both types of behavior are present in situations of ill-intentioned agitation towards the Jews. He also noted that such behavior manifested more commonly after the formation of the modern middle classes brought Jews and non-Jews into closer contact with each other,⁶⁴ a seeming confirmation of Hagen’s analysis.

Antisemitism had deep historical roots in Norway. For example, the 1814 Eidsvoll Constitution originally banned Jews and Jesuits from entering the country, though the ban on Jews was lifted in 1851. In the late 1800s conservative religious groups promoted negative stereotypes of Jews. During the 1920s and 1930s conspiracy theories about the Russian Revolution spawned negative portrayals of Jews in Norway. Perhaps the culminating act was in 1929 when the Norwegian Storting voted 88 to 21 in favor of a law that banned “schächting,” or the Jew’s ritual slaughter of animals. The debates surrounding the vote were harsh and anti-Semitic. A key element of *Nasjonal Samling*’s propaganda was the idea of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy that would overthrow modern civilization.⁶⁵

Although Norway’s Lutheran church spearheaded the resistance movement against Nazi rule, it was largely silent in protesting the treatment of Norway’s Jews. The only public declaration was on November 10, 1942, when a letter of protest—signed by the entire church leadership—was read out in all the churches of Norway.

The letter stated that the Jews were being punished for their biological origins, a denial of their human rights, and a contradiction of the Word of God. The letter urged Quisling to stop the persecution of the Jews and to “bring to an end the racial hatred which through the press is spreading in our land.” In 1941, Berggrav had also protested the condemnation of mixed marriages with Jews and that any attempt to assert the racial superiority of one race over another was contrary to the constitution of the church.⁶⁶

Norway traditionally has not addressed its role in the Holocaust. Until the mid-1990s, the “National Consensus Syndrome” of Norway’s World War II narrative intoned a strict division between the King and the Homefront as symbols of resistance on one hand and Quisling and his Nazi party as symbols of treason on the other.⁶⁷ That narrative received a strong jolt when a photo of Aker-shus harbor in Oslo on November 26, 1942, appeared in *Aftenposten* in January 1994. The photo had been discovered in an old desk at *Aftenposten* by journalist Liv Hegna and it was part of an article titled “The death-trip of the Jews with ‘Donau.’” The photo captured the German ship *Donau* leaving the harbor at 2:55PM with more than 500 Norwegian Jews on board as several Norwegian citizens watched.⁶⁸ The photo and article triggered an examination of Norway’s true role in the Holocaust.

Over twenty years later, in 2018, Marte Michelet published her book *Hva visste hjemmefronten? Holocaust in Norge: Varslene, unnvikelsene, hemmeligholdet*. (What Did the Homefront Know? The Holocaust in Norway: Warnings, Evasions, and Secrets) The book created a firestorm of controversy in Norway as the author accused Norway’s resistance movement (the Homefront) of failing to act in time to save the deportation and ultimate murder of nearly half of Norway’s Jewish population despite advanced warning of the massive arrests. The book triggered a controversial debate in Norway about the degree of responsibility that Norway bore for the Holocaust and the degree to which Norwegian society was and continued to be anti-Semitic. Several of Norway’s historians rushed to condemn the book. Øystein Sørensen and Kjetil Braut Simonsen, the editors of *Historie og Moral* (History and

Morality) noted that the Michelet book made moralistic judgments based on questionable sources. Three other historians—R. Berggren, Bjarte Bruland, and Mats Tangestuen—pointed out that Michelet’s interpretation was based on misleading and selective sources.⁶⁹

The more conventional interpretations, however, while not going as far as Michelet, do not exonerate Norway’s role in the Holocaust. Bjarte Bruland, for example, observes that while German authorities favored the policy of rounding up Norway’s Jews, it was Norway’s leadership under Quisling—whose government ordered the arrests—and the implementation of the arrest by Norway’s State Police officers, officers from the Oslo Police, and selected members of the *Hird* and the Norwegian SS that initiated the first action in the deportation of Norway’s Jews. In effect, it was Norwegians, not Germans, who carried out the dirty work. Despite the chaotic way the arrests were carried out, the effort meant that 772 of Norway’s approximately 1,536 registered Jews were deported and only 34 survived, which brought the overall number of victims to 766—a murder rate of 49%. Only the Netherlands and Germany had a higher total. Bruland also notes how the German authorities tended to hold back on aggressive policies, including the publication of anti-Jewish decrees, closing Jewish shops, and painting anti-Jewish slogans because they were not well received by Norway’s civilian population and, in fact, these actions increased sympathy for the Jews.⁷⁰ And yet this sympathy should not be mistaken for solidarity. As stated by Ole Kristian Grimnes in his study of Norway and World War II, the Danes were willing to rescue Danish Jews because the Danes viewed an attack on the Danish Jews as an attack on themselves. Contrarily, he writes, the Jewish arrests “were not understood as an attack against Norwegian society, but a defined group within this society.”⁷¹

Against this historical backdrop, the historian must view the free or American version of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* as an example of the “National Consensus” interpretation of the war in which King Haakon, the Homefront, the government in exile, and Norway’s military assets were the good guys and Quisling and his Nazi

party were the bad guys. While the American version portrayed Norway's war effort in a favorable and highly effective manner, it should not blind us to the reality that Norwegians during the war were not totally innocent of responsibility for the Holocaust. With the exception of the Borgen article, the historical irony is that both versions of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* largely ignored the Jews, an irony with deadly consequences.

Conclusion

The ideological clash waged by the two versions of *Nordmanns-Forbundet* revealed the extent to which Norway had become a modern, progressive, and democratic nation. Although nostalgia for the Viking Age and romanticized peasant culture had formed the initial Norwegian national self-image in the nineteenth century, they alone could not form the basis for a comprehensive national identity. The Nazi regime did have some success in its appeals to Norway's romantic and mythical past, but for most Norwegians those symbols were not adequate. Mid-twentieth century Norwegians might be proud of being descended from Vikings and peasant-stock, but their national identity was just as strongly tied to their concept as a free, democratic, and modern people. For them, symbols such as their parliament, May 17, and King Haakon VII, albeit highly romanticized themselves, proved just as important, if not more so, than the Viking-Age and peasant symbols favored by Quisling and his regime.

The ideological constructs employed and developed by the American-based *Nordmanns-Forbundet* adumbrated the features of Norway's postwar identity. The *Nasjonal Samling*-tainted symbols of the Viking Age and the mythical peasant would be downplayed or ignored, while the symbols of liberation—the *Storting*, May 17, and King Haakon—would be the primary symbols of Norway's postwar identity. A strong anti-German sentiment would be a significant component as well.⁷² The misappropriation of the Viking heritage and symbolism would long leave a certain distaste for that part of Norway's identity following World War II; thus, skewing the nation's self-image in the direction of the "modern, pro-

gressive Norway” theme. Finally, the war solidified the relationship between Norway and it emigrated compatriots, especially those living in America, and it validated the Greater Norway concept, which *Nordmanns-Forbundet* already had worked to promote for many years.⁷³ Yet, as critics like Borgen remarked, Norway would need to work on crafting a more just society.

Notes

¹ <https://www.thecollector.com/panta-rhei-heraclitus/>. Accessed on May 18, 2022.

² Odd Sverre Lovoll, *Celebrating a Century: Nordmanns-Forbundet and Norwegians in the World Community 1907-2007* (Oslo: Nordmanns-Forbundet, 2009), 88-93.

³ Völkisch is derived from the German word Volk, meaning the people. Unlike its English counterpart, folk, it connotes having exclusive racial characteristics that define a people by ethnic and cultural homogeneity. See Alexa Lenz, “‘Völkisch’ and ‘Überfremdung.’” Public Seminar, July 14, 2017. <https://publicseminar.org/2017/07/volkisch-and-uberfremdung/> Accessed on March 2, 2025.

⁴ Ruth Hemstad, “A Colonial Empire of the Future. Scandinavian experiences of cultural diplomacy through nationals abroad” in *Media Tactics in the Long Twentieth Century*, eds. Marie Cronqvist, Fredrik M. Norén, and Emil Stjernholm (Abingdon, U.K. and New York: Routledge, 2024) 1-17.

⁵ *Et større Norge: fra Nordmanns-Forbundets arbeidsmark, artikler, og taler*. Red. Wilhelm Morgenstjerne (Oslo: Aschehoug and Co., 1932), 6-7; Hemstad, “A Colonial Empire,” 2-3.

⁶ Lovoll, *Celebrating a Century*, 87-88

⁷ Lovoll, *Celebrating a Century*, 91.

⁸ Lovoll, *Celebrating a Century*, 88-89.

⁹ Ole Kristian Grimnes, *Norge under andre verdenskrig 1939-1945* (Oslo: Aschehoug and Co, 2018), 126-127. In a 2022 conversation between the author and Knut Djupedal, former director of Norsk utvandermuseum (the Norwegian Emigration Museum), Mr. Djupedal indicated that the Germans in Norway were at first light-handed in their treatment of the Norwegians because of their string of victories and because they hoped to win over the Norwegians to their side. By the fall of 1941, however, the setbacks faced by Nazi Germany meant a change of policy and Heydrich ordered a crackdown in the occupied territories, including the takeover of previously free Norwegian organizations such as *Nordmanns-Forbundet*.

¹⁰ Grimnes, *Norge under andre verdenskrig*, 89-90.

¹¹ Letter from General Secretary (PB) to Judicial President Michael Hansson, February 7, 1942. Nordmanns-Forbundet Archive Box C6 1937-1945. Norsk utvandermuseum, Ottestad, Norway.

¹² Letter from Nordmanns-Forbundet Kontorsjef [Office Manager, likely Arne Kildal] to Aksel H. Holter of Ashland, Wis., July 28, 1945. Nordmanns-Forbundet

Archives Box C6 1937-1945. Norsk utvandreremuseum, Ottestad, Norway.

¹³ Facsimile of "Nordmenn i utlandet må få underretning om de verdifulle som skjer hjemme," *Aftenposten* 16 desember 1941. Memo from Jens Bull to Det kongelige Utenriksdepartement, 12 january 1942. Nordmanns-Forbundet Archives Box N.F. Amerika 1940-1945. Norsk utvandreremuseum, Ottestad, Norway.

¹⁴ Carl J. Hambro, Untitled Letter in English dated February 7, 1941. Nordmanns-Forbundet Archives Box N.F. Amerika 1940-1945. Norsk utvandreremuseum, Ottestad, Norway. The author discovered this letter in the folder for Carl J. Hambro, which consisted of his correspondence to London.

¹⁵ Hambro, Untitled Letter in English dated February 7, 1941.

¹⁶ *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks, ND] (Dec. 1941): cover. Successive issues of the American-based production maintained this military orientation; see the issues from Jan., 1942 through June, 1945. As a contrast, the *Nasjonal Samling* version from late in the war, April 1945, featured a Norwegian couple fishing in a stream. See *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo, Nasjonal Samling (NS)] (April, 1945): cover.

¹⁷ Major Ole Reistad, "Norge og norske flyvere i kamp," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (December, 1941): 196-198.

¹⁸ Kristen Johansen, "Norsk Jagereskadron [sic] toppscorer I 1943" *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (June, 1944): 137-139.

¹⁹ Reistad, "Norge og norske flyvere i kamp," 198. Kaptein Erling Hostvedt, "Camp Little Norway og Den norske marine," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Jan. 1942): 6; *Tusen norske skip: en antologi over norske sjøfolks innsats i den annen verdenskrig*, ed. Lise Lindbæk (New York: Arnesen Press, 1943), 9-218; *Nordisk Tidende*, 21 May 1942. "Norge til sjøs," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (June-July, 1945): 226.

²⁰ Einar Diesen, "Norges nye hær," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Oct. 1943): 251-253.

²¹ Torolv Kandahl, "Den norske presse under okkupasjonen," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Sept. 1942): 217-218; George A. Stausland Møller, "Norges kirke og dens kamp," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1943): 117-126; "Måneden i Norge" *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Aug. 1942): 213. John Sannes, "Studentene i Oslo," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Feb. 1944): 33-36; Olav Paus Grunt, "Nazismen og den norske skole," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (June 1942): 136; Jørgen Juve, "Norges idrett under Nazi okkupasjonen," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Feb. 1944): 41-45, and continued in N-F (March 1944): 71-75.

²² Edwin Robertson, *Bishop of the Resistance: The Life of Eivind Berggrav, Bishop of Oslo, Norway* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2002), 113-122.

²³ Jonathan Leader Maynard, "Identity and Ideology in Political Violence and Conflict" *St. Anthony's International Review*, Vol. 10 No. 2. The Resurgence of Identity Politics (February 2015): 35.

²⁴ F. Støren, "Det nye år," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1942): 2; "Ministerpresident Quisling," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (May-June 1942): 116; "Minister Fuglesang," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Sept. 1942): 161.

²⁵ “Nytt statsstyre i Norge,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [NS-Oslo] (March 1942): 26; “Norsk besøk i Berlin,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (March 1942): 49.

²⁶ Jacob Worm-Müller, “*Nordmanns-Forbundet*,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (June 1942): 5; “Quislingenes stilling,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, [Grand Forks] (Feb., 1945): 61.

²⁷ For a full description of Quisling’s fascist ideas, see Oddvar K. Hoidal, *Quisling: A Study in Treason* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1989), esp. 165-221, 292-308, 545-594; and Hans Fredrik Dahl, *Quisling: A Study in Treachery*, trans. Anne-Marie Stanton-Ife (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), 71-76, 208-250.

²⁸ See the inserts for *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] Jan. 1942; April 1942; Sept. 1942, March 1943 and subsequent issues. Most of the tapestries were created by Damsleth but the tapestry honoring St. Olav, from 1943, was drawn by Arnold Thornam and woven by Sigrid Mohn. On Quisling’s use of symbols see Hoidal, 189-190, 653, 658; and Dahl, 104-108, 122, 190; and Haakon Hoch-Nielsen, “Solur i sagatiden,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (July-Aug. 1942): 135-136; Hans Fredrik Dahl, Bernt Hagtvæt, and Guri Hjeltnes, *Den norske nasjonalismen: Nasjonal Samling 1933-1945 i tekst og bilder* (Oslo: Pax Forlag, 1982), 163. Hans Fredrik Dahl, *De store ideologiernes tid, 1914-1955*, in *Norsk idéhistorie*, vol. 5, eds. Trond Berg Eriksen and Øystein Sørensen (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2001), 304-305.

²⁹ “På Stiklestad,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Sept. 1942): 163; “På Stiklestad,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1943): 21; “På Stiklestad,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (May-June 1944): 128; “Stiklestad-Stevnet,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Sept. 1944): 179; Kaare Keilbau, “Norsk billedhøggerkunst,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Oct. 1942): 171, 173; Gunnar Gran, “Traveling in Lovely Mid-Norway,” *The Norseman* (2: 2007): 56. Articles on Viking-Age and medieval topics included: Knut Knutson Flane, “Soga om Olav den Heilage,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (March 1942): 35-36; Othar Frode Bertelsen, “Dronning Ragnhilds drøm,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (April, 1942): 74-76; and “Minnesmerke over Eirik Raude—Leiv Erikson?” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Nov. 1943): 199-202.

³⁰ Kristian August Ingulstad, “Heimlandet,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Dec. 1942): 217-218; Jim Johannessen, “Norsk folkemusikk,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Sept. 1942): 145-148; “Norske folketoner,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Sept. 1943): 161-162; Lif Barfoed, “Norske bunader,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1943): 2-4.

³¹ J. Falck-Andersen, “Oppdagelsen av det skjulte Norge” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [NS-Oslo] (July-August 1943): 126-128.

³² Nicola Karcher, “A National Socialist school for Norway: concepts of Nazification during the German occupation.” *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol. 56 No. 5 (2020): 669-671.

³³ Karcher, “A National Socialist school for Norway,” 671.

³⁴ “Arbeidstjeneste for Norge,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [NS-Oslo] (Nov. 1941): 243, 245-246.

³⁵ Karcher, “A National Socialist school for Norway,” 671.

³⁶ See especially Lars Borgersud and Inge Bjørnar Eriksen, *Sabotører i vest: sa-*

botasjeorganisasjonen på Vestlandet 1940-1945 (Bergen: Bodoni Forlag, 2015).

³⁷ Oscar J. Falnes, *National Romanticism in Norway* (1933; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1968), 123-124.

³⁸ "Statsstyret i Norge," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [NS-Oslo] (Oct. 1942): 169-170; "Den 17 mai," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (May-June 1943): 120; "1. mai," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (May-June 1942): 126; "Eidsvoll søylen," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Feb. 1945): 49.

³⁹ Anthony D. Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era* (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1995), 64-66.

⁴⁰ Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Second Ed. (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 2010), 27.

⁴¹ Sigrid Undset, "Vi står på felles grunn," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (March 1942): 57-59; Halvdan Koht, "Nordmennene i Amerika," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (April 1942): 90-92; Sigrid Undset, "Nytt år 1944," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Jan. 1944): 2-3.

⁴² Toralf Kandahl, "Interview med statsministeren," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1942): 111; C. J. Hambro, "Niende April, Tale i sjømannskirken i Brooklyn," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (April 1942): 83; Toralf Kandahl, "C. J. Hambro 60 år," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Dec. 1944): 306.

⁴³ Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72. No. 3 (Summer 1993): 34. In his article, Huntington cites H. D. S. Greenway, an American journalist who coined the term "kin-country" syndrome. The phenomenon occurs when groups or states belonging to one civilization become involved in a war with people from a different civilization and try to rally support from other members of their own civilization.

⁴⁴ Laura Hilton, "Cultural Nationalism in Exile: The Case of Polish and Latvian Displaced Persons" *The Historian*, Vol. 71 No. 2 (Summer 2009): 286.

⁴⁵ C. J. Hambro, "Til Kongens 70 årsdag," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (July 1942): 169; Ingeborg Barth, "Jageren 'King Haakon VII' skjenket Norge," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Oct. 1942): 257-259; *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, compiled with special material and explanatory notes by Samuel I. Rosenman, vol. 11, 1942: *Humanity on the Defensive* (New York: Harper and Row, 1950), 377-378; "Hilsen fra Kongen," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Jan. 1944): 1.

⁴⁶ Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*, 90-93.

⁴⁷ See Daron W. Olson, *Vikings across the Atlantic: Emigration and the Building of a Greater Norway, 1860-1945* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 195-200. "Merchant Fleet Wins Praise of Norway Envoy" *Star Tribune* (Minneapolis, MN) December 2, 1941.

⁴⁸ C. J. Hambro, "Vår grunnlovssdag," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1944): 34-36; Johan Nygaardsvold, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1944): 39; W. Neuman, "Norge er frihet," *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1944): 52-53; Franklin D. Roosevelt, letter to *Nordmanns-Forbundet*, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (May 1944): 27; King Haakon VII, *Nordmanns-*

Forbundet [Grand Forks] (May 1944): 25.

⁴⁹ Dahl, *Quisling*, 211; “Livslengde og barnetall,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Feb. 1943): 31-34. Tordis Bergquist Andresen, “Kvinnelig Arbeidstjeneste,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1942): 3-4.

⁵⁰ Andresen, “Kvinnelig Arbeidstjeneste,” 4.

⁵¹ For example, see “Et kapittel slutt,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (May-June 1942): 110-111; “Den norske kirke i Amerika er 100 år,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (March 1943): 60-62; “St. Olaf college 70 år,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Oct. 1944): 187-188; “Det største bygdelag,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Nov. 1944): 224; “Sønner av Norge,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1945): 5-6.

⁵² “Nytt statsstyre i Norge,” 25-27.

⁵³ Nicola Karcher, “A National Socialist school for Norway: concepts of Nazification during the German occupation,” *Paedagogica Historica* Vol. 56 No. 5 (2020): 663.

⁵⁴ Lovoll, *Celebrating a Century*, 88.

⁵⁵ Støren, “Det nye år,” 2; “Statsstyret i Norge,” 169-170; “Ministerpresident Quisling,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Feb. 1944): 46-47; “Det nye år,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Oslo-NS] (Jan. 1945): 26.

⁵⁶ C. J. Hambro, *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Dec. 1941): 193-194. Undset, “Vi står på felles grunn,” 58-59.

⁵⁷ Dr. Edvard Hambro, “Interview med utenriksministeren,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (April 1943): 83-85; Worm-Müller, “Nordmanns-Forbundet,” 4-5; Einar Lund, “Norsk og amerikansk,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (Nov. 1942): 276; “En takk til Amerika,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* (Sept. 1945): 310. For a full explanation of the development of the Greater Norway concept, see Daron W. Olson, *Vikings across the Atlantic*.

⁵⁸ Catherine Frost, *Morality and Nationalism* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 175-176.

⁵⁹ Marcus Nicolson, “‘Leave a Light on for Scotland’: Examining Cosmopolitan Nationalism in Scotland,” in *Contesting Cosmopolitan Europe: Euroscepticism, Crisis and Borders*, eds., James Foley and Umut Korkut (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2022), 131-133, 137-138.

⁶⁰ Preeta Nilesh, “Norway and World War II: Invasion, Occupation, Liberation,” *Proceedings of the Indian History Conference* Vol. 73 (2012): 1121.

⁶¹ Johan Borgen – Store norske leksikon Microsoft Word - 141109 Komplette master-mac2.docx Accessed March 2, 2025.

⁶² Johan Borgen, “Forgiftning,” *Nordmanns-Forbundet* [Grand Forks] (February 1945): 40-42.

⁶³ William W. Hagen, “Before the ‘Final Solution’: Toward a Comparative Analysis of Political Anti-Semitism in Interwar Germany and Poland,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (June 1996): 378-379.

⁶⁴ Borgen, “Forgiftning,” 41.

⁶⁵ Ministry of Local Government and Modernization, “Action plan against anti-semitism 2021-2023—a continuation” (Government of Norway, 2021), 15.

⁶⁶ Robinson, *Bishop of the Resistance*, 120-121.

⁶⁷ Annette H. Storeide, "Local and Transnational Memories of WWII in a Transnational Age: the Case of Norway," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 32 (2019): 463.

⁶⁸ Storeide, "Local and Transnational Memories," 464-465.

⁶⁹ Jan Heiret, "Hva kan vi vite om det norske holocaust?," *Historisk tidsskrift* Vol 82 no. 1 (2023): 7-8.

⁷⁰ Bjarte Bruland, "Norway's Role in the Holocaust." Chapter in *The Routledge History of the Holocaust*, edited by Jonathan C. Friedman (London: Routledge Publishers, 2010), 236-237.

⁷¹ Ole Kristian Grimnes, *Norge under andre verdenskrig*, 364-365.

⁷² Hans Fredrik Dahl, *De store ideologienes tid, 1914-1955*, in *Norsk idéhistorie*, 265-267; Dahl, Hagtvet, and Hjeltnes, *Den norske nasjonalismen*, 98-102, and esp. the color inserts between 176 and 177.

⁷³ See Daron W. Olson, *Vikings across the Atlantic*, 221-224; Dahl, *De store ideologienes tid, 1914-1955*, 354-371, 410-411; Interview by author with Øystein Sørensen, Professor of History, Historisk Institutt, University of Oslo, in Oslo, 18 February 2004. For a treatment of how *Nordmanns-Forbundet* promoted a greater Norway, see Odd S. Lovoll, "A Greater Norway," *The Norseman* (1: 2007): 6-31.