THESIS ARTICLE 5
SPITSBERGEN LITERATURE LOBBY

Mary Katherine Jones

Introduction
The Spitsbergen Question was an international political issue regarding the no-man’s-land status of Spitsbergen (present-day Svalbard) in the light of European and U.S. commercial activity in this Arctic region in the early years of the twentieth century. The Spitsbergen Commission was set up by the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 to decide which nation should be awarded sovereignty of the archipelago (Singh: 3-4).1 “Spitsbergen Literature Lobby” is a term created by Elen C. Singh, categorizing texts written to influence the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question: “a spate of publications … a clear indication of concern over European historical rights in the islands, and over current economic realities” (Singh 1980: 94). In this article the genre is expanded and internationalized from 13 texts originally cited by Singh/Singh & Saguirian to just over 40 further texts. These include summaries of Spitsbergen issues and texts focusing on Spitsbergen’s history, the cartography of the region, legal and political issues, and commercial issues. They illustrate the overall nature and purpose of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby. Did the lobby achieve anything specific, can it be said to have been successful/influential in general terms, and does the authors’ ‘expertise’ emerge in the texts? Was the strength of the lobby dependent on individuals, or on groups of authors and occasionally (strategically?) unattributed authorship? What seems to have determined Singh’s choice of texts, and what has determined the choice of the additional texts? As well as textual content, this article looks at the time-scale, location and language of publication, taking a preliminary step in comparative analysis within this international topic.

Part 1 summarizes an Exposé des questions soumises à la Conférence de la Paix par le Ministre de Norvège de Paris au nom du Gouvernement Norvégien2 (Statement of issues submitted to the Peace Conference by the Norwegian Ambassador in Paris in the name of the Norwegian Government – hereafter Statement), drafted during the Spring of 1919. Details from contemporaneous diary notes written by Gunnar Isachsen,3 one of the main compilers of the Statement, illustrate the background of the Statement and its authors’ priorities. The focus of

---


2 Anonymous. 1919. Exposé des questions soumises à la Conférence de la Paix par le Ministre de Norvège de Paris au nom du Gouvernement Norvégien. Paris : [s.n.].

3 Norwegian military officer and cartographer Gunnerius Ingvald “Gunnar” Isachsen (1868-1939) took part in the second Fram expedition of 1898-1902 in the North American Arctic and led the Norwegian scientific party in Prince Albert of Monaco’s expeditions to Spitsbergen of 1906 and 1907, before leading independent Norwegian scientific expeditions to the region in 1907 and 1910.
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Part 2 is on the 13 texts cited by Singh (and Singh & Saguirian) to illustrate Singh’s concept of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby, most of which were published between the end of the Great War and early 1920; a few were published earlier, around the time of conferences addressing the Spitsbergen Question held in Kristiania in 1910, 1912 and 1914. Part 2 also focuses on 40 or so other strategic Spitsbergen texts that appeared between 1906 and 1919, specifically books and articles published in geographical or other scientific journals. These reveal links between primary actors/authors and specific journals, and between individuals. The focus of Part 3 is on selected Spitsbergen texts published in Norway and elsewhere after the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question.

One primary actor in the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question was Gunnar Isachsen, the diarist mentioned above. Other authors whose texts contributed to the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby, some of them also active agents behind the scenes, included French naturalist Charles Rabot, who had participated in several Arctic expeditions and was the influential editor of La Société de Géographie’s La Géographie from this monthly journal’s inauguration in 1900 until 1918; Norwegian geologist and Arctic researcher Adolf Hoel, who had undertaken numerous Spitsbergen expeditions; Arctic explorer, art historian and British member of parliament Sir William Martin Conway, who had achieved the first crossing of Spitsbergen in his expedition of 1896 and written the first history of the region, No man’s land (1906); Scottish scientist and polar researcher William Speirs Bruce and his assistant and Arctic researcher, botanist Robert Neal Rudmose Brown; and Swedish geologists and Arctic expedition leaders Baron Gerard De Geer and Alfred Gabriel Nathorst.

Part 1. An inside view: the Statement and Isachsen’s Paris diary, Feb-June 1919
The Norwegian Government’s 30-page Statement was printed sometime after 19 April 1919. As a Spitsbergen Literature Lobby text claiming sovereignty of the region on behalf of a particular nation, it appears to constitute a blueprint for success. It was submitted for presentation to the French, Italian, Japanese, UK and US delegates constituting the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, who would determine whether and when the Spitsbergen Question should be addressed at the Peace Conference. The Statement then formed the backbone of the material available to the Spitsbergen Commission when the Spitsbergen Question was deliberated later.

---

4 The Spitsbergen Treaty was signed on 9 February 1920, recognizing Norway’s sovereignty of this Arctic region, ending its terra nullius status for over 300 years and resolving the Spitsbergen Question.
5 Arlov (2003) and Østreng (1974) provide detailed information about the three Spitsbergen conferences held in Kristiania. The topic is also summarized in English in Mathisen (1954). The legal background to Spitsbergen’s transition from terra nullius to Norwegian sovereignty is analysed in Ulfstein (1995) and a foreign political history overview is presented in Berg (1995).
6 Numerous Spitsbergen articles were also published in regional and national European newspapers, particularly throughout Norway, but also in Britain, Sweden and elsewhere. Wråkberg has shown that as early as 1872-73, when a Swedish government in the foreign policy union with Norway and Sweden tried to claim Spitsbergen for Norway, Russian press agitation determined the official Russian decision to reject the idea, which would otherwise have led to Spitsbergen becoming Norwegian at that time (cf. Wråkberg 1999: 149-158). Nonetheless, it is beyond the scope of this article to examine newspaper items as strategic Spitsbergen texts, unless specifically cited by Singh.
in the year, supplemented by other documents. The Statement’s print run was for private circulation, not public readership.

**Fig. 1. Statement of issues submitted to the Peace Conference by the Norwegian Ambassador in Paris in the name of the Norwegian Government. Table of Contents.**

1. Question of Spitsbergen.
2. Question of a border adjustment.
3. Question of reparations.

Supporting documents *pièces justificatives*:

- No. 1. Recognition of the Sovereignty of the King of Norway and of Denmark over Spitsbergen by Louis XIV in 1663.
- No. 2. Recognition of the Sovereignty of the King of Norway and of Denmark over Spitsbergen by the King of Sweden in 1679.
- No. 3. The work of Norwegian industrial companies on Spitsbergen.
- No. 4. The work of foreign industrial companies on Spitsbergen.
- No. 5. Statistics regarding navigation between Norway and Spitsbergen 1904-1917.
- No. 6. Statistics regarding exports from Spitsbergen up to 1918.
- No. 7. Norwegian commerce with Spitsbergen from 1905 to 1917.
- No. 8. Statistics regarding workers employed by the Norwegian and foreign companies on Spitsbergen. 1907-1918.
- No. 9. Telegraph communications on Spitsbergen.
  - Statistics regarding telegrams and income at the Telegraph Station at Green Harbour on Spitsbergen. 1911-1918.
- No. 10. The postal service on Spitsbergen and Bear Island.
  - Postal movement between Spitsbergen and Norway. 1911-1918.
  - Table of income and expenditure of Spitsbergen post offices. 1909-1918.

The Statement opens with copies of an exchange of letters dated 10 & 19 April 1919 between Baron Wedel-Jarlsberg (the Norwegian Ambassador in Paris) and the office of the President of the Peace Conference, Georges Clemenceau,8 and the first six pages outline the Spitsbergen Question from the Norwegian Government’s perspective.9 The *pièces justificatives* (supporting documents numbered 1-10) comprise two-thirds of the Statement, dividing into four main categories: aspects of history, commercial issues, legal/territorial claims, and a summary of statistics linked

---

7 The contents of this figure have been translated from the original French (author’s own translations throughout the article, unless otherwise stated).
8 Georges Clemenceau (1841-1929) was a journalist, political activist and writer with a background in editing and owning newspapers who later became a statesman, serving as Prime Minister of France in 1906-1909 and again in 1917-1920, in which capacity he was also appointed President of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.
9 The “Question of Spitsbergen” is followed by details of a proposed change to the Norwegian border in the Pasvik Valley area and of proposed financial compensation to Norway for marine losses during the Great War in the service of the Allies.
to Norwegian industrial and public sector activity and potential. Thus, pièces justificatives nos. 1 and 2 summarize and illustrate Norway’s historical status: recognition by the King of France in 1663 of the sovereignty over Spitsbergen of the “Roi de Norvège et de Danemark” (reversing the more usual title of “King of Denmark-Norway”), and the same recognition by the King of Sweden in 1679. The commercial focus of pièce justificative no. 3 provides details of seven Norwegian companies engaged in coal mining on Spitsbergen, with a combined social capital of 19.072 million Norwegian kroner / 27.3 million French francs / 1.05 million pounds sterling. Pièce justificative no. 4 summarizes legal/territorial claims to date in the region made by foreign companies: Spetsbergen Svenska Kolfält (Stockholm); The Northern Exploration Company (UK); Société Russe and Grumant Mining Company (Russia); and Prince Henry of Prussia (copper ore and pyrite mineral deposits) and Count Zeppelin (a meteorological and telegraph station used until the outbreak of war, both claimed by Germany). Finally, pièces justificatives nos. 5-10 provide statistics relating to Norwegian and other activity in the region: information about navigation between Norway and Spitsbergen; Norwegian exports of coal, phosphates and asbestos from the region; Norwegian Spitsbergen commerce (imports and exports) on an annual basis, rising from kr. 92,200 in 1905 to kr. 4,432,100 in 1917; personnel employed by Norwegian and foreign companies on Spitsbergen, from the 130 employees of John Longyear’s Arctic Coal Co. in 1907 to the 340 Store Norske Spitsbergen Kulkompani employees and 456 employees of foreign companies by 1918; telegraph traffic at the station in Green Harbour; and the work of the post offices in Advent Bay, Green Harbour, King’s Bay and Bear Island, with post ferried between Spitsbergen and Norway.

*   *   *

A 16-page typed transcription of diary notes written by Gunnar Isachsen in Paris in February–June 1919 provides unique insight into the compilation of the Statement. A disclaimer at the beginning of the diary transcription explains that “these notes were made in pencil in an ordinary pocket almanac, mixed in with jottings about quite different things, matters of a private nature, etc. What is relevant to the Spitsbergen Question has been selected by Fridtjof Isachsen [Gunnar Isachsen’s son], dictated by him and typed up by Miss Plum from the Foreign Office” (Isachsen 1919: 1).11

According to Isachsen’s diary, the Norwegian Minister’s letters to Georges Clemenceau, President of the Peace Conference, dispatched on 7 March, 31 March and 10 April 1919, dominated initial preparations. Isachsen felt that the first letter

10 There is no mention of the Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate, just a passing observation that “ten years ago Mr. Bruce, Scottish naturalist, had taken possession … of Prince Charles Foreland, as well as several other districts. Since then he has not carried out any operative work.” (“Il y a dix ans, M. Bruce, naturaliste écossais, a pris possession … de l’île du Prince Charles ainsi que de plusieurs autres districts. Depuis il n’a procédé à aucun travail d’exploitation.”) (Statement: 22).

11 Original text: “Disse notater er gjort med blyant i en almindelig lommealmanakk, blandet sammen med nedskrivninger om helt andre ting, saker av privat art etc. Det som angår Spitsbergen sak er her plukket ut av Fridtjof Isachsen og diktet til maskinskrivning av ham & revet av frøken Plum fra Utenriksdepartementet.”
was sent “unfortunately too early”, before the pièces justificatives were ready. Throughout the diary extracts, Gunnar Isachsen presents a scenario of himself and Charles Rabot against the world, mentioning Rabot no less than 66 times in various contexts: the latter’s presence at Norwegian legation meetings and his overall contribution to the Norwegian sovereignty claim; the publication of Rabot’s pamphlet A qui doit appartenir le Spitsberg? and his role as a co-author of the Statement (although authorship of all the submitted texts was unattributed); Isachsen’s visits to Rabot’s home; and Rabot’s involvement in translating and proofing documents. Isachsen refers to other individuals either somewhat dismissively (even with regard to “ministeren”, Ambassador Baron Wedel-Jarlsberg) or in tones of outright annoyance or disparagement (e.g. contributing authors Adolf Hoel and Werner Werenskiold, who were both based in Norway at this time), though his references to Norwegian diplomat Arnold Ræstad’s contribution are mostly respectful. The support of Prince Albert of Monaco, whose Spitsbergen expeditions in 1906 and 1907 offered Isachsen his first experience of leading scientific parties in the Arctic, is mentioned on four occasions. Fridtjof Nansen’s presence in Paris is mentioned on eleven occasions, though he was there representing the Norwegian League of Nations – “Nansen’s endeavours for the Russians” – and not in any Spitsbergen context. The entry for 18 March 1919 states that “T.T. [Tommaso Titoni, the Italian Foreign Minister and first delegate at the Peace Conference] [is] astonished that Nansen, who is here, has not been appointed as a member of the Commission” (ibid.: 5). It is unclear whether Titoni (as reported by Isachsen) is referring to the Norwegian legation submitting the claim to Spitsbergen sovereignty at that time or to the Spitsbergen Commission subsequently appointed to deliberate the Spitsbergen Question.

Work on the statistics sections of the Statement began early, but they are cited only three times (perhaps because information was sent from Kristiania in more or less finished form); Rabot translated the sections of text about the historical treaties and the coal companies into French. Isachsen mentions receipt on 15 March 1919 of “Norwegian effort in scientific respects” from the Norwegian Foreign Office (ibid.: 4, authorship attributed to Werner Werenskiold), yet the sole reference to Spitsbergen scientific achievement in the entire finished submission was a three-line paragraph in the “Question of Spitsbergen” section: “Thanks to the support of the Royal Government, Norwegian scientific expeditions have drawn topographical and geological maps. Surveys have been executed in the fjords along the coast and offshore.” (Statement: 7)

12 Original text: “dessverre for tidlig”.
13 Charles Rabot (1856-1944) took part in scientific expeditions to Spitsbergen (1882), West Greenland (1888), the Greenland Sea (1891) and Jan Mayen and Spitsbergen (1892). In addition to editing La Géographie, he translated and abridged expedition narratives by Fridtjof Nansen, Otto Sverdrup, Roald Amundsen and Sir William Martin Conway.
14 Original text: “Nansens bestrebelser for russerne”.
15 Original text: “T.T. forbauset over at Nansen der er her, ikke er oppnevnt som medlem av kommisjonen”.
16 Original text: “Nordsmennenes insats i vitenskapelig henseende”.
17 Original text: “Grace au concours de Gouvernement Royal, les missions scientifiques norvégiennes ont dressé des cartes topographiques et géologiques. Des sondages ont été exécutés dans les fjords, le long des côtes, et au large.”
Isachsen mentions the *Statement’s pièces justificatives* (using this French term) on eight occasions and they were clearly a source of pressure for him. The input of the contributing authors was not attributed in the finished publication, so it is difficult to know which text Isachsen was specifying when he alluded to a “contribution” by Werner Werenskiold, also referred to as the latter’s “scientific work” and his “book.” Isachsen was on several occasions scathing about the quality of work presented by Werenskiold, a future professor of geography, and similarly dissatisfied with the “systematic omissions and repetitions” in contributions by Adolf Hoel. Nonetheless, Isachsen relates that he and Rabot worked hard to persuade Isaiah Bowman, US President Woodrow Wilson’s chief territorial adviser at the Peace Conference and director of the American Geographical Society, that résumés of Hoel and Werenskiold’s works should be published in the society’s *Geographical Review*; this presumably resulted in the journal’s publication of “The Norwegians in Spitsbergen” (cited by Singh; see Part 2 Fig. 2), though under Charles Rabot’s name – whether or not he was the sole author – in November 1919. Authorship of an (unpublished) Spitsbergen bibliography mentioned three times in Isachsen’s diary was similarly ambiguous, being ascribed to both Hoel and Werenskiold, with Rabot as a potential co-author; in the printer’s proofs of the bibliography in its Norwegian and English versions (see Part 2 Fig. 3), authorship was ultimately ascribed to Hoel.

Isachsen noted the official approval of the textual submissions being prepared by himself, Rabot and others at the end of March 1919 – “the minister calls our preparation a masterpiece” – and by 24 May “The Statement is finished, the minister is happy!!” (ibid.: 13). The Norwegian legation continued to prepare supplementary material regarding their claim to Spitsbergen sovereignty to present to the Spitsbergen Commission later in the year. At this later stage, Adolf Hoel became directly involved with submission preparations in Paris, working in close collaboration with Charles Rabot.

---

18 Norwegian geologist and geographer Werner Werenskiold kept unpublished diaries of his participation in Spitsbergen expeditions in 1917 and 1918, and published texts in *Naturen* in the summer of 1920 on “Norsk kartlägning av Spitsbergen” [Norwegian mapping of Spitsbergen], “Basismaalingen paa Spitsbergen” [“Basic measurements on Spitsbergen”] and “Spitsbergens fysiske geografi” [“Spitsbergen’s physical geography”] (Fig. 7).

19 Original terms: “avhandling” (nowadays this tends to refer to a thesis, but it used to have a broader meaning, defining a substantial piece of work), “vitenskapelige arbeide” and “bok”. It is possible that they refer to material that later formed a very lightweight book on Spitsbergen’s natural history: Werner Werenskiold, *Fra Spitsbergen [From Spitsbergen]* (Kristiania, H. Aschehoug & Co., 1923). Alternatively, Werenskiold’s contribution may have been drawn from the research for the doctoral thesis that he completed in 1924.

20 Original text: “Systematiske utelatelser og gjenøgelser.”

21 Adolf Hoel (1879-1964) took part in and led scientific expeditions to Spitsbergen annually from 1907 onwards. He was a prolific author of Spitsbergen texts published both in Norwegian journals and *La Géographie*.

22 Original texts: “Et mesterverk kaller ministeren vår fremstillingen” and “Exposéet ferdig, ministeren fornøyet!!”.
Part 2. Singh’s Spitsbergen Literature Lobby and other strategic texts
Texts discussed in Part 2 include the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby publications cited by Elen C. Singh in her dissertation and subsequent co-authored article. Singh’s focus was on the literature lobby as an overall concept, rather than its component parts: text citations and authors’ names did not appear in the main text, but were scattered among various endnotes and footnotes. Singh stated the existence of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby, but went into no more detail concerning this topic. Remaining texts discussed in Part 2 comprise another 40 or so strategic Spitsbergen texts not cited by Singh, written or compiled before the Spitsbergen Question was resolved. In Figs. 2-6 below, all the texts are categorized according to their content – Spitsbergen summaries, Spitsbergen history publications (including bibliographies), texts focusing on Spitsbergen cartography, texts that addressed the Spitsbergen Question, and texts concerned with Spitsbergen commerce – in date order of publication.

Spitsbergen summaries cited by Singh
Texts discussed here approximately correspond to the Statement’s initial “Question of Spitsbergen” section. In the context of this article, a “Spitsbergen summary” provides broad coverage of several issues relating to Spitsbergen. These may include any or all of the following: the region’s legal or political issues, its commercial growth, cartography, history, and scientific discoveries in the region. A Spitsbergen summary may incorporate references to Spitsbergen’s history, but will not focus entirely on the past; it may allude to future outcomes, but its primary focus is quite likely to be the Spitsbergen status quo. Spitsbergen summaries comprise a small majority of all the published texts cited by Elen C. Singh.

Fig. 2. Spitsbergen summaries.
Texts are listed in date order of publication; texts cited by Singh are marked with an asterisk.

Scottish oceanographer and naturalist William Speirs Bruce (1867-1921) was invited by Prince Albert of Monaco to lead a small scientific party on Spitsbergen expeditions in 1898, 1899 and 1906; he then led four independent Scottish expeditions to the region between 1907 and 1914. In 1909, Bruce founded the Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate, a pioneer mineral prospecting company, with the aim of establishing claims to land and minerals in Spitsbergen (Speak 1982: ii). Singh cites two articles by Bruce from lesser-known sources: The Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society (1913, reprinted in 1914) and The Sphere, a British paper at one stage subtitled “the Empire’s illustrated weekly”. Singh’s knowledge of these out-of-the-way texts strongly suggests that Bruce, or someone on his behalf, may have been assiduous in circulating these articles to interested parties.

Owing to Bruce’s commitments abroad and his ill health in later life, Scottish scientist Robert Neal Rudmose Brown (1879-1957) sometimes spoke on his behalf and deputized for him in asserting Scottish commercial claims to Spitsbergen.\footnote{Rudmose Brown was a member of the 1909 and 1912 Spitsbergen expeditions led by Bruce, whom he assisted at the Scottish Oceanographical Laboratory before becoming established as an academic botanist in his own right. He was also a consultant to the Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate.} Rudmose Brown’s contribution to The Geographical Journal\footnote{The Geographical Journal was published monthly by the Royal Geographical Society (RGS) in London.} published in July 1915, for example, was the report of a paper he had given on Bruce’s behalf at the Royal Geographical Society (hereafter RGS) on 22 March 1915, describing Bruce’s Spitsbergen expedition of 1914 and providing a roll-call of commercial and scientific activities in the region undertaken by all nations with an interest in Spitsbergen sovereignty. The views of Rudmose Brown (and Bruce) reflected nationalist partiality regarding commercial activities on Spitsbergen and acknowledged the international ramifications of a complex legal situation. The main concern was that the findings of the 1912 and 1914 Spitsbergen conferences in Kristiania – that “Spitsbergen should remain neutral territory, open to all nations and under a joint administration carried on by a committee of the three powers [Norway, Sweden and Russia] party to the agreement” and any dispute relating to existing commercial claims in the region “was to be submitted to the Hague at a court consisting of representatives of Sweden, Norway, Russia, Britain, Germany, and the United States of America” – would result “[a]t the best … that Spitsbergen remains a terra nullius in which British subjects would have the least security of all. In these criticisms of the suggested control of Spitsbergen I am voicing also the opinions of men of many nationalities interested in the development of that land” (op. cit: 15).

Charles Rabot’s “The Norwegians in Spitsbergen”, published in the American Geographical Review, was the first and only Rabot text to be published in English, rather than French. In it, Rabot discusses ice conditions in the region, the historical involvement of the Norwegians (including their prowess in Spitsbergen navigation in such conditions), industrial developments relating to coal-mining, and commerce and communications. The article summarizes ancient claims and disputes relating to Spitsbergen, disputing the archipelago’s current terra nullius status, which had overtaken seventeenth-century claims by “Norway-Denmark” to sovereignty of the
region – claims that Rabot maintains were accepted quite widely in Europe at the time. Rabot’s article is written in much the same vein as the Norwegian Government’s Statement.

The other two Spitsbergen summaries cited by Singh were American and British government texts, published in 1919 and 1920, respectively. Singh’s citation of a text published after sovereignty of Spitsbergen had been awarded to Norway is explained by the 1920 edition of the UK Foreign Office Spitsbergen handbook being a public issue of information earlier provided for the British Delegates to the Peace Conference on every aspect of “the different countries, districts, islands, &c., with which they might have to deal” (op. cit.: editorial note). It embraced the region’s physical and political geography, its economic conditions (including communications and natural and mineral resources) and its political history. Closing “General Observations” regarding the basis of claims to sovereignty by Britain, Norway, Sweden and Russia were neutral; the “[o]pinion of [presumably British] Mining Companies” was cited, acknowledging an unsatisfactory status quo without suggesting any resolution of the Spitsbergen Question.

Spitsbergen histories and bibliographies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Nathorst, A.G.</td>
<td>“Svenskarnes arbeten på Spetsbergen (1758; 1837; 1858-1902).”</td>
<td><em>Nordisk tidskrift</em>: 461-477.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Louis Herbert Gray (1875-1955), author of the American government text, was a member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace at the Paris Peace Conference in 1918 and attaché to the American embassy.
1912  Shidlovskiy, A.F. Špicbergen v russkoj istorii i literaturё: kratkij istoričeskij očerk russkich plavanij i promyslov na Špicbergenë i podrobnij ukazatel' literaturë i archivnych dël", otmosaščijshaja k etim" voprosam". [Spitsbergen in Russian history and literature: a brief historical review of Russian sea voyages and trade on Spitsbergen, and a detailed list of references and archive files concerning these issues.] St. Petersburg: Tipografija morskogo ministerstva. 64 pages. [includes bibliography]


Texts discussed here serve broadly the same purpose as the Statement’s pièces justificatives nos. 1 & 2. History publications about this Arctic region (some comprising or including bibliographies of Spitsbergen publications of various types) form a significant category of Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts, but none of them were cited by Singh.

Many of the historical texts listed here had a strong connection with two individuals, one of them Charles Rabot, whose influence has already been discussed in Part 1. The other was Sir William Martin Conway (1856-1937),26 whose articles about the seventeenth-century history of Spitsbergen were published in The Geographical Journal at the very beginning of the twentieth century and

---

26 A British mountaineer who led expeditions in the Alps, the Himalayas (for which he was knighted for his surveying work in 1895), to Spitsbergen in 1896 and 1897, and afterwards to the Andes, Conway was also a Professor of Art at University College, Liverpool and at the University of Cambridge, and President of the Alpine Club from 1902 to 1904. He was elected Member of Parliament for the Combined English Universities in 1918, at about the same time as being appointed inaugural Director-General of the Imperial War Museum.
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incorporated in *No man’s land* (1906), the first published history of Spitsbergen. *No man’s land* does not qualify as a strategic Spitsbergen text in one sense, since the issues of the region’s sovereignty and its future in legal/commercial terms are never addressed in the book at all (though there is an unmistakeable British bias in Conway’s narrative). However, the reference sections in *No man’s land* — a chronology of principal voyages, a bibliography of the history and geography of the region, a cartography section, a chronological list of maps, and a history of the region’s place-names — clearly acted as a catalyst for several subsequent publications of a similar bibliographical and reference nature that were strategic Spitsbergen texts in their own right.

The first such publication was a series of texts on “Swedish explorations in Spitzbergen, 1758-1908”, published in *Ymer*27 in April 1909. These comprised a “Historical sketch” by A.G. Nathorst,28 a “Swedish Spitzbergen bibliography” by J.M. Hulth29 and “Swedish Spitzbergen maps until the end of 1908” by Gerard De Geer.30 The series extended to over 90 pages and was published in English (exceptionally for *Ymer* at that time), presumably to internationalize the information they contained. Much of this historical, bibliographical and cartographical material was more or less a duplication of Nathorst’s less strategic summary of Swedish scientific work on Spitsbergen (in Swedish) that appeared in *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap konst och industri* in 1906 — when Conway’s *No man’s land* was published.31 The reference texts compiled by Nathorst, Hulth and De Geer in 1909, and their strategic choice of English as the language of publication, offer a clear response to Conway’s limited coverage of Swedish historical events in his Spitsbergen history narrative.

These European texts seem to have acted as the catalyst for a compilation of bibliographical and other information about Spitsbergen in Russian history and literature by A.F. Shidlovskiy, published in 1912.32 The author acknowledges their

---

27 *Ymer* is the journal of the Swedish Association for Anthropology and Geography in Stockholm. It was a quarterly publication from 1881 until 1995, after which it changed to a yearbook format.

28 Swedish Arctic explorer, geologist and paleobotanist Alfred Gabriel Nathorst (1850-1921) took part in and led five expeditions to Spitsbergen and Greenland between 1870 and 1899. He was editor of *Ymer* 1896-1898 and Swedish Association for Anthropology and Geography committee member for many years afterwards.

29 Dr. Johan Markus Hulth (1865-1928), librarian at Uppsala University Library from 1905 and chief librarian from 1918, compiled a bibliography about Swedish explorer A.E. Nordensköld (1902), a *Bibliographia Linnaeana* (1907) and bibliography of Swedish Arctic and Antarctic expeditions 1758-1910 (1910).

30 Swedish geologist Baron Gerard De Geer (1858-1943) participated in six expeditions to Spitsbergen from 1882 onwards, including Russian-Swedish arc of meridian expeditions and culminating with the International Geological Congress expedition in 1910. De Geer was Professor of Geography at the University of Stockholm and the University’s President from 1902-1910.

31 Although Conway and Nathorst are known to have exchanged letters prior to 1906 about Swedish literary sources relating to the history of the region (Wråkberg 1999: 118), there is no evidence that the two authors had any knowledge of the content of each other’s texts prior to publication.

32 A.F. Shidlovskiy (Šidlovskij) published a 276-page volume on materials relating to the fauna of hydroid polyps in the Arctic Seas (1901) and compiled a bibliography of texts relating to Novaya Zemlya (1910) that was printed by the Admiralty Office in St. Petersburg. Shidlovskiy was a member of the Russian Royal Geographical Society and an honorary member of Archangel Society for Russian Northern Studies.
influence: “over the past ten years foreign scientific literature has been enriched by a whole number of bibliographical works concerning the Northern Arctic countries, and the Spitsbergen archipelago has been especially lucky in this respect." (Shidlovskiy 1912: i). He states Russia’s territorial claim to the region as his inspiration to publish the bibliographical compilation:  

Not so long ago the islands of Spitzbergen were considered Russian property on many foreign maps and works; if Swedes and Norwegians as well as some Americans and British have started their industrial exploration of minerals on Spitsbergen and have based some industries there for the extraction of coal, it doesn’t mean that there is no place left in this no man’s land for Russian enterprise. (ibid.: i)

Two other historical texts stating a fairly evident claim to the region were written by Isachsen: his article “La découverte du Spitsberg par les Normands” citing the discovery of “Svalbard” in 1194, reported in the Icelandic Annals, was published in La Géographie in June 1907, and part of Isachsen’s contribution to Volume 40 of the Prince of Monaco’s scientific results of his expeditions to Spitsbergen (1912) bears a shortened version of the same title. One reason for categorizing this later publication as a strategic Spitsbergen text is that it was cited as one of five “authorities” (references) in the UK Foreign Office Spitsbergen handbook published in 1920 (Fig. 2).

Isachsen published texts lobbying for Norwegian sovereignty of Spitsbergen in his country’s own academic journals, including two history articles that took up almost all of the 1916-1919 edition of Det norske geografiske selskabs årbok (hereafter DNGSA). One of these examined the diaries of Arctic Ocean voyager Sivert Tobiesen; the other was entitled “People, hunting and voyagers, Norwegians on Spitsbergen and the Arctic Ocean”. The first article was 119 pages long, the second 130 pages, and both were written in Norwegian (the only language of publication used in this journal). It is difficult to conceive of such unwieldy texts being used in any kind of lobbying context – their strength is likely to have been in

---

33 Shidlovskiy text citations translated by Olga Komarova.
35 “Les Normands”/“Normanner” in French/Norwegian signify both “Norsemen” (as primarily intended by Isachsen) and “Normans”, the descendants of the North Germanic and Viking conquerors and present-day population of Normandy in northern France. The linguistic link may have been intentional (a complimentary nod to the French), chosen in preference to “les Norrois” (Norrøn), “les Norvégiens” or “les Vikings”.
36 Isachsen explained at the beginning of the 1912 text that the first part was taken from his article in La Géographie, reprinted with a number of additions, but the second part of the text, completed in 1909, was being printed for the first time (op. cit.: 100).
37 The other authorities cited in the 1920 handbook were Conway’s No man’s land and Shidlovskiy’s bibliography (Fig. 3), as well as Arnold Ræstad’s article series published in La Géographie and René Waultrin’s article published in Revue générale de droit international public (Fig. 5).
38 The Norwegian Geographical Society’s Yearbook, published annually (but less often during the Great War) by the Society in Kristiania.
39 Original title: “Folk, fangst og færder, nordmændene paa Spitsbergen og Ishavet.”
the fact of their publication, rather than their detailed comment – but they are included here because Isachsen referred in his Paris diaries to a suggestion by Rabot that the written materials to be submitted to the Spitsbergen Commission “could also include our hunting history as this is extraordinarily interesting” (Isachsen 1919: 6).\textsuperscript{40} Isachsen and Ræstad also discussed the citation of a thesis about an eighteenth-century seal-hunting expedition from Bergen (ibid.: 4). Isachsen and Rabot even “agreed to advise the minister [Wedel-Jarlsberg, on a diplomatic trip to London] to leave out the two texts concerning hunting, so as not to hand documents to the English”\textsuperscript{41} (ibid.: 11) – presumably to the Norwegians’ strategic advantage. Since historical Norwegian hunting activity in the Spitsbergen region was clearly of perceived significance to Isachsen, to the extent of his caution in distributing this information internationally, the above-mentioned lengthy articles on this topic should be considered strategic lobbying texts of some sort – if only inside the author’s head.

Finally, the 1918 edition of Lord Dufferin’s \textit{Letters from high latitudes: being some account of a voyage in 1856 in the schooner yacht ‘Foam’ to Iceland, Jan Mayen and Spitzbergen} is included here as a historical, strategic text. A dozen editions of this work had been issued in the UK since its original publication in 1857, but a pocket-sized hardback edition issued by Oxford University Press in a series including \textit{Kingsley’s Heroes, Greek Legends, Celtic Stories, Norse Tales, Selections from Malory} and \textit{Mediæval Romance} nudes just sufficiently in the direction of national propaganda to warrant inclusion.

\textbf{Spitsbergen cartography}

Rabot’s increasingly generous coverage in \textit{La Géographie} of Norwegian activity on Spitsbergen between 1907 and 1918 amounted to 15 articles by Norwegian writers and over 50 news items concerning Norwegian activities on Spitsbergen. All of these qualify – at least to some degree – as strategic Spitsbergen texts (cf. Jones 2012); of these, Gunnar Isachsen’s 1907 article (Fig. 3) and Arnold Ræstad’s 1912 article series (Fig. 5) are included as representative texts. Spitsbergen scientific reports (though listed in Spitsbergen bibliographies, see previous sub-section) tended not to be sufficiently strategic in their own right to be included in this article: scientific references in the texts examined in Part 2 thus generally fall into one of the other publication categories. Léonie Barnardini’s article in \textit{Questions diplomatiques} (Fig. 5) focused on Swedish scientific issues, for example, but was primarily concerned with the legal resolution of the Spitsbergen Question; J.M. Hulth’s “Swedish Spitzbergen bibliography” in \textit{Ymer} and A.G. Nathorst’s presentation of Swedish scientific work in \textit{Nordisk Tidskrift} (Fig. 3) listed expedition narratives and scientific results, but these were incorporated within a depiction of the history of the region in bibliographical terms. Isachsen, Hoel, Nathorst, De Geer and other Spitsbergen scientists had been diligent for decades in narrating their scientific achievements, and this caused their field of expertise to expand over time to embrace

\textsuperscript{40} Original text: “Kunne også gitt vår fangsthistorie der er overordentlig interessant.”

\textsuperscript{41} Original text: “Ble enig om å foreslå ministeren å utelate 2 pièces angående fångsten for ikke å levere engelskmennene dokumenter.”
political and/or commercial influence;\(^{42}\) ironically, they had comparatively little opportunity to reference their earlier work whilst advocating their country’s territorial claims.

**Fig. 4. Spitsbergen cartographical publications.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Anon. <em>Spitsbergen</em> (GSGS map 2877) ; <em>Spitsbergen: location of estates held by companies of various nationalities</em> (GSGS map 2877a) ; <em>Spitsbergen, provisional geological map</em> (GSGS 2878). London: General Staff, Geographical Section [GSGS], War Office. 3 maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One exception was cartographical publications. Texts discussed here addressed Spitsbergen cartographical issues in greater detail than was attempted in the *Statement*, where cartographical reference was limited to a map of the archipelago set in an Arctic context.\(^{43}\) The science of cartography can be used to make major territorial claims;\(^{44}\) the translation of place-names into a particular language when compiling a map, even the inclusion or exclusion of cartographical details, may also heighten the nationalistic slant of the published item (Wråkberg 2002: 155-197, Drivenes 2004b: 51-57). *The Dutch discovery and mapping of Spitsbergen (1596-1829)*, cited by Singh, was compiled as a statement of the Netherlands’ historical

---

\(^{42}\) Polar explorers, Arctic industrialists and polar scientists who were either called upon as ‘experts’ by their own nations, or who offered themselves in this role as lobbyists, activists and authors are discussed in Avango (2005), Drivenes (2004b) and Wråkberg (1999, 2012).

\(^{43}\) The majority of the place-names on the *Statement* map are Norwegian, together with a number of long-standing historical place-names in English or Dutch, such as “Cross Bay”, “Verlegen Hoek”.

\(^{44}\) The introductory text of *The Dutch discovery and mapping of Spitsbergen (1596-1829)* ends with Wieder’s assertion that “[i]f ever the evidence given by maps was conclusive, it is so in the case of Spitsbergen. From its discovery in 1596 till the end of the historic period in the commencement of the XIXth century, the Dutch did not for a year loose their hold on the group, so that Spitsbergen is as fixedly connected to Holland by historical ties as are the several islands of the East Indian Archipelago.” (Wieder 1919a: 45)
Mary Jones, *Spitsbergen literature lobby*

47 territorial claim to Spitsbergen and as an expansion of Conway’s presentation of Dutch exploration and cartography in *No man’s land* (1906).46

Gerard De Geer’s major article in *Ymer* on the production of a map showing the northernmost parts of James I Land and Andrée Land on a scale of 1:50,000 (photographically reduced to a scale of 1:100,000) is a 48-page *tour de force*. It is divided into sections encompassing earlier sketches and general maps of the area, newer special maps, soundings, the construction of the present map, principles of nomenclature, coast-lines, land-forms, recent glaciations and earlier Quaternary glaciations, all presented in an objective, scientific style. De Geer’s decision to map part of Andrée Land had a nationalistic aspect47 and publishing in English continued the initiative of *Ymer* publishing “Swedish explorations in Spitsbergen, 1758-1908” in English four years previously (Fig. 3), facilitating international access to the information contained in the article. De Geer’s closing reference to “this interesting Every Man’s Land of Science” (op. cit.: 277) reads more like an effort to maintain the territorial *status quo* than a push for Swedish sovereignty of the region.

Along with the British Foreign Office historical handbooks on Spitsbergen (Fig. 2), three maps of Spitsbergen were prepared by the General Staff of the Geographical Section (GSGS) of the War Office. The maps relate to the “location of the estates held by companies of various nationalities” and geological aspects of the region, illustrating potential British commercial interests on Spitsbergen. Two further texts by Wieder, published in 1919 by the Royal Dutch Geographical Society in Dutch, provide details of a Spitsbergen globe and a map dating from the early seventeenth century; to a lay person their content may seem esoteric, but they indicate active Dutch national interest in the region.

---

45 The title page states that the work was “edited by order of the Netherland Minister of Foreign Affairs by Dr. F.C. Wieder”. Frederik Caspar Wieder (1874-1943), was the librarian of the Dutch Royal Library in The Hague. His earlier publications had included an account of sixteenth-century Dutch hymnbooks (1900) and Dutch historical-geographical documents in Spain (1915).

46 Wieder relates how he came to the decision that “even Conway’s representation, however favourable to the Dutch, ought to be revised with the result that the Dutch came out as the discoverers and earliest explorers of Spitsbergen to an extent as was hitherto not thought of” (op. cit.: 2). On European whaling and early territorial conflicts on Spitsbergen, see Hacquebord (1984) and Hacquebord, Steenhuisen & Waterbolk (2003).

47 Andrée Land, a district between Woodfjorden and Wijdefjorden on the northern coast of Spitsbergen island in the present-day Svalbard archipelago, is named after Salomon August Andrée (1854-1897), Swedish engineer and Arctic explorer, who led the ill-fated North Pole balloon expedition of 1897 (Norwegian Polar Institute, *The place names of Svalbard*, 2003: 29).
### Texts addressing the Spitsbergen Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal/Volume/Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Texts discussed here draw on information that is to be found in every part of the *Statement*: the initial discussion of “The Spitsbergen Question”; the legal precedent of historical recognition of Norwegian sovereignty of the region (*pièces justificatives* nos. 1 & 2); and the logistics of Norwegian and foreign industrial activity (*pièces justificatives* nos. 3-8). Texts addressing the Spitsbergen Question were written by lawyers, diplomats and politicians, and by non-experts. Texts focusing on Spitsbergen’s contemporaneous legal status were generally written in a quasi-objective style, though national partiality might nonetheless be evident. Texts more concerned with the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question (i.e. the decision concerning the sovereignty of the region) tended to be written in a more subjective style; most of the other Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts cited by Singh come into this category.

Robert Lansing’s article on Spitsbergen as “A unique international problem” appeared in *The American Journal of International Law* six months after the USA declared war on Germany and less than a year after the American mining operations of The Arctic Coal Company had been bought up by Store Norske Spitsbergen Kulkompani in November 1916. Lansing proposed that responsibility for Spitsbergen might successfully be undertaken by a neutral Scandinavian power, i.e. Norway, and this strongly influenced the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, which participated at the 1919 Peace Conference (Singh 1980: 21, 89-90). Lansing also specified that “political sovereignty might exist without reference to the possession of territorial sovereignty” and thus that “sovereign authority might be exercised over a certain class of persons within a particular area, without regard to the right of sovereignty over the area itself” (enabling international commercial activity in the region), though acknowledging that if “there should not be substantial unanimity by all the Powers interested in Spitzbergen in the delegation of their political sovereignties, a government founded on this theory would be inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which it is created” (Lansing 1917: 766-767).

These last recommendations prompted an article by J.E.G. de Montmorency, published six months later in response to Lansing’s article. In “The international legal position of Spitsbergen”, de Montmorency picks up the particular legal difficulty regarding the use and ownership of land in a *terra nullius*. De Montmorency cites Roman law to recommend that the British Government – or any other government in the case of its own national involvement – should “recognise and ... protect the temporary physical [commercial] occupation of land in Spitsbergen”, conceding that this solution “affords no final settlement of the position in Spitzbergen”. De Montmorency tentatively suggests instead “a declaration of territorial and political sovereignty by the persons who are permanently resident in Spitzbergen”, though acknowledging “new perils for Northern Europe” if “in some

---

48 Robert Lansing (1864-1928) was the U.S. Secretary of State from 1915-1920 and a founding associate of *The American Journal of International Law*. He was later the member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace who was appointed to the Spitsbergen Commission at the Paris Peace Conference.

49 James Edward Geoffrey de Montmorency (1866-1934) was Quain Professor of Jurisprudence at University College London during the 1920s and for many years was Literary Editor of *The Contemporary Review*. He seems never to have written another word on the topic of Spitsbergen and I have not seen this article cited by any other Spitsbergen secondary source.
such way Germany, for instance, might acquire the sovereignty over these regions”. De Montmorency makes no attempt to endorse British sovereignty over the region, but his article is clearly written with an eye to its economic significance to Britain.

Charles Rabot’s nine-page pamphlet *A qui doit appartenir le Spitsberg?* fits perfectly the template of a geographical journal article that was nonetheless not published as such; in appearance it resembles the standalone reprints of individual journal articles circulated by W.S. Bruce and other Spitsbergen authors. Rabot’s editorship of *La Géographie* ended in the summer of 1918; this text may be defined as the editorial Rabot would have published had he still been editor the following year. In Rabot’s opinion, the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question merely required the endorsement of sovereignty already possessed by Norway, recalling the King of Norway’s proclamation during the 13th century of sovereignty over Greenland “and of all the Arctic lands ‘as far as the Polar Star’” (op. cit.: 2). Rabot focused on Norwegian colonization of the region as a positive move; in a similar vein to de Montmorency he, too, worried that “over the past twenty years, the German Empire has worked methodically to create property titles on Spitsbergen and neighbouring islands” (op. cit.: 7). Rabot’s completion of the pamphlet and its publication in March 1919 was mentioned several times in Gunnar Isachsen’s Paris diary (see Part 1) and there are similarities between the compilation of Rabot’s pamphlet and the *Statement*.

Adolf Hoel and Rabot worked closely together in Paris during the latter half of 1919, compiling materials to be presented to the Spitsbergen Commission (Skarstein 2008: 68-69, citing Hoel 1977). Hoel’s article for *France-Scandinavie* would have been translated and almost certainly edited by Rabot. It echoes the historical argument presented a few months earlier in Rabot’s pamphlet concerning King Haakon’s sovereignty claim in 1261 to islands in the north and extends this argument further back to Norwegian discovery of the region in the eleventh century, presenting geographical as well as historical findings to support the Norwegian claim to sovereignty.

L. Bernardini’s article on the Spitsbergen Question and scientific interests in the region, published in *Questions Diplomatiques* before the first international Spitsbergen conference in 1910, expresses views in marked contrast to those of Rabot or his associates. Léonie Bernardini was a French essayist engaged to a Swedish writer and foreign correspondent. This may account for her bias towards the Swedes, on the basis of their scientific pedigree in the region, despite her attempt to present a multi-faceted and impartial view with regard to Spitsbergen’s status as a

---

50 It is possible that the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, signed the previous month (March 1918) between Germany and the Russian Soviet government, which incorporated a clause obliging Russia to support a German territorial claim to Spitsbergen, may also have served as a catalyst for de Montmorency’s article.

51 Original text: “et de toutes les terres arctiques « jusqu’à l’Étoile polaire »”.

52 Original text: “Durant ces vingt dernières années l’empire allemand a travaillé méthodiquement à se créer des titres de propriété sur le Spitsberg et les îles voisines.”

53 Erik Valentin Sjöstedt (1866-1929). Other publications by Bernardini included “Swedish pages, essays on the psychology of a people and a land” [“Pages suédoises, essais sur la psychologie d’un peuple et d’une terre”].
*terra nullius* and various sovereignty claims. Bernardini seems at pains throughout the article to suppress the reader’s support for the Norwegians, without expressing outright negativity in the process. This article may be the first instance of a writer of a Spitsbergen text making overt use of history to look more towards the future than to the past. The concept of texts either depicting the long-term potential of the region or hoping to influence this by referring to the region’s history is relevant to the notion of using Spitsbergen texts for lobbying purposes. The focus of a number of historical texts published during this period seems, however, to have been more intent on detailing past national achievements than explicitly relating these to their country’s claim to the future sovereignty of Spitsbergen. Nathorst, Hulth and De Geer’s “Swedish Explorations in Spitzbergen” texts in *Ymer*, published in the same year as Bernardini’s article, represent a politically strategic compilation that is overall more historical than forward-looking in its focus.

Two other French texts addressing the Spitsbergen Question, but not connected to Charles Rabot’s pro-Norwegian publications, were René Waultrin’s article of 1908 and Camille Piccioni’s article of 1909, both published in the *Revue générale de droit international public*.54 Piccioni’s 1891 doctoral thesis at the Faculty of Law in Paris had focused on Roman law and perpetual neutrality in international law55 and the author continued to follow these threads in his exposition of the (potential) international organization of Spitsbergen. References to territories perceived as equivalent to Spitsbergen, or comparable in some way, ranged from Samoa to Andorra. Piccioni’s objective approach to the subject-matter of his article and his focus on Roman law both bear comparison with J.E.G. de Montmorency’s article.

Other French texts in this section comprise three articles published in *La Géographie* in 1912 about Spitsbergen in diplomatic history by Norwegian lawyer and politician Arnold Ræstad. The articles were published in the aftermath of the Spitsbergen meeting held in Kristiania in January 1912 and presented Norwegian sovereignty claims to a French readership – and to an international audience beyond Scandinavia: these, too, were cited in the reference section of the 1920 UK Foreign Office Spitsbergen handbook (Fig. 2). Ræstad was scrupulously attentive to details relating to every European country associated with Spitsbergen’s history; he was also laying down arguments in favour of a Norwegian sovereignty claim that Rabot and Hoel were able to make good use of seven years later.

Other British texts featured in this section are somewhat miscellaneous. Like de Montmorency’s article, an anonymous summary of “British interests in Spitsbergen” in *The Geographical Journal* was published in the aftermath of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. This four-page summary of political developments urged the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to “[proclaim] the sovereignty of Great Britain over the islands, or over that part of them to which, since its annexation in the seventeenth century, we hold an historical claim superior to that of any other

54 Previous articles in the same journal by René Waultrin (1875-1972) included an article on Scandinavian neutrality (1904), an article about the last Swedish enclave in Germany (1905), and an article about the neutrality of the Aland Islands, an archipelago in the Baltic Sea at the entrance to the Gulf of Bothnia between Sweden and Finland (1907).

“British interests” were thus revealed to be territorial in intention, not simply reflecting national commercial interests in the region. Conway’s lecture, “The political status of Spitsbergen”, was published in the same journal ten months later, after his election as a Member of Parliament. Much of Conway’s presentation discussed minutiae of seventeenth-century Spitsbergen history (following the same narrative track as No man’s land). His argument of the British claim to sovereignty was weak, relying on his statement that “the only country which at any time for a long series of years consistently claimed and actually occupied any considerable part of Spitsbergen was Great Britain” (op. cit.: 90). The written account of the lecture included contributions from Herbert Ponting, W.S. Bruce and others in the subsequent discussion; it did not persuade the British Government to pursue a sovereignty claim for Spitsbergen.

An article by Rudmose Brown in the American Geographical Review was strategically placed from an international perspective, but similarly ineffectual in its outcome: his endorsement of the British claim to Spitsbergen was weak, offering even-handed consideration of Norwegian rights in the region and primarily concerned with offering American readers objective information about Spitsbergen’s discovery, exploration and industrial history, and how to avoid what Rudmose Brown termed “a state of anarchy” by means of “an equitable settlement ... at the peace conference” (op. cit.: 319, 321).

Articles in Swedish and in Russian by Finnish diplomat and politician Karl Gustaf Idman about Spitsbergen’s future organization and projects regarding the future organization of Spitsbergen, were published in 1916. In the light of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (see above), proposals expressed by this author would have been perceived negatively by the Allies at the Peace Conference, had they even been aware of them.

Spitsbergen commerce publications


1912/Nov. Rudmose Brown, R.N. “The commercial development of Spitsbergen.” The Scottish Geographical Magazine Vol. XXVIII:

Fig. 6. Spitsbergen commerce publications.

Texts are listed in date order of publication; the text cited by Singh is marked with an asterisk.

Although anonymous, the article has a strong association with Conway, including an appendix listing thirteen references to No man’s land.

It is difficult to trace the influence of Spitsbergen texts on the workings of the Peace Conference, particularly those published in any language other than English or French, but the scale of information (not necessarily published) gleaned in compiling the UK Foreign Office’s Spitsbergen handbook (Fig. 2) is worth noting. “From the political standpoint it may be of interest to note that a short time ago a Russian consular officer proposed planting a small colony of Lapps and Samoyedes on Spitsbergen, but his proposal was not favourably considered by the Russian authorities, and the matter has been entirely dropped” (op. cit.: 48).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No date</td>
<td>*Anonymous</td>
<td>“Spitsbergen’s mineral wealth: its vital importance to British trade and industry by a member of the 1918 expedition.” London: Empire Printing Company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texts discussed here bear the closest relation to the Statement sections concerned with industrial companies, commerce, exports and workers employed on Spitsbergen (pièces justificatives nos. 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8). During the period when these texts were being published, mineral interests on Spitsbergen centred on the actual and potential exploitation of mineral resources including coal, iron ore, oil shale and gypsum (rock phosphate) (Speak 1982: 28-31). By the end of the Great War, international commercial interests included the involvement of The Arctic Coal Company (USA), Store Norske Spitsbergen Kulkompani A/S (Norway), The Northern Exploration Company Ltd. and The Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate (Britain), as well as Russian, Swedish and Dutch actors. The Dutch “Lashipa” (history of large scale resource exploitation in polar areas) research programme relates to economic history since the days of whaling on Spitsbergen, incorporating geo-

---

58 The Dutch “Lashipa” (history of large scale resource exploitation in polar areas) research programme relates to economic history since the days of whaling on Spitsbergen, incorporating geo-
surrounding Spitsbergen, but mineral extraction is the primary commercial activity discussed in the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts.

The origin of Spitsbergen’s mineral wealth: its vital importance to British trade and industry, by a member of the 1918 expedition and its citation by Singh as a Spitsbergen Literature Lobby text are perplexing. There could be a typing error in Singh’s dissertation (1980, Chapter VII, endnote 2: 223) and the title of this undated work may refer to the Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate’s expedition to Spitsbergen of 1919. Peter Speak’s comprehensive dissertation on the history of The Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate (1982) does not list the work, nor do COPAC or BIBSYS Ask. Nor does the title seem to refer to the activities of the Northern Exploration Company, whose other texts were self-published. This is another text that may have been brought to Singh’s attention – and perhaps originally the attention of the American diplomats in Paris – through the ongoing championing of Scottish Spitsbergen interests by W.S. Bruce and/or Rudmose Brown.

Four of the other twelve texts relating to Spitsbergen commercial issues were concerned with Swedish perceptions of coal-mining, the coal region, coal deposits and coal requirements; three were written by scientific authors Gunnar Andersson and Gerard De Geer, and published in Ymer between 1906 and 1918. Other articles about Spitsbergen commercial issues aimed at a relatively informed general readership appeared in academic/scientific articles across Europe: in The Scottish Geographical Magazine (November 1912), Zeitschrift für praktische Geologie (1917), The Geographical Journal (April 1918), La Géographie (in 1918, at the end of Rabot’s tenure as editor), Geological Magazine (December 1918), La Nature (September 1919) and an article by Gerard De Geer published in English in Geografiska annaler (1919).

Two articles deviated from this scientific presentation of Spitsbergen’s commercial potential and resemble the article on Spitsbergen commerce cited by Singh (Fig. 6). One anonymously celebrated “the British flag hoisted at Spitsbergen: a land of extraordinary wealth in coal and iron” and was published in The Sphere about six weeks before W.S. Bruce’s article in the same paper (cited by Singh –

---

economics, technological history, ecology, archaeology, labour history and Arctic geopolitics.

59 Speak, Peter. 1982. The Scottish Spitsbergen Syndicate. Submission to Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, for the degree of Master of Philosophy in Polar Studies.

60 COPAC (http://copac.ac.uk/) is an online resource discovery tool based at the University of Manchester that enables researchers and information professionals to search the catalogues of over seventy libraries at once, including the UK national libraries, University libraries, and specialist libraries. BIBSYS Ask is the online library database of BIBSYS, a national library system for Norwegian research and specialist libraries, a public administrative agency answerable to the Ministry of Education and Research and administratively organized as a unit of NTNU (the Norwegian University of Science and Technology).

61 Gunnar Andersson (1865-1928) was a botanist on the Swedish scientific expedition to Spitsbergen led by A.G. Nathorst in 1898; in 1899 he succeeded Nathorst as editor of Ymer, a post he then held until his death 30 years later.

62 La Géographie was published approx. once a year during the Great War, instead of monthly, and Rabot’s continued emphasis on Spitsbergen events became even more apparent at this time (cf. Jones 2012).

see Fig. 2). The other text was a self-publication by the Northern Exploration Company about Spitsbergen, *The gate to the northern markets of Europe* and included photographs by Herbert G. Ponting, official photographer of Scott’s last expedition to the Antarctic.

**Time-scale, location and language of publication**

The publication of Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts cited by Singh extends from 1913-1914 (Bruce, Fig. 2) through July 1915 (Rudmose Brown, Fig. 2) to Lansing’s article published in October 1917 (Fig. 5). Together with de Montmorency’s article published in April 1918 (Fig. 5), these texts voice opinions concerning the sovereignty of Spitsbergen held prior to the end of the war. The other texts appeared after the Armistice: at the very end of 1918; during the early part of 1919, while it was being decided whether Spitsbergen sovereignty was a matter to be addressed by the Peace Conference or not; during the second half of 1919, when the Spitsbergen Question was being deliberated by the Spitsbergen Commission; and on into the following year, with the official signing of the Spitsbergen Treaty in February 1920. These texts were published in London, Paris, Amsterdam/The Hague, Washington D.C. and New York.

Additional strategic Spitsbergen texts discussed in this section were made available to a general readership between 1906 and 1919; they were published in Berlin, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Helsingfors, Kristiania, Leiden, London, New York, Paris, St. Petersburg/Petrograd and Stockholm, in French, English, Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, Russian and Dutch. Most of the texts sought to influence public opinion about which country should obtain sovereignty over Spitsbergen, and some of the texts published during the early part of 1919 clearly sought to influence official opinion as well. Later texts (Rabot’s article in the American *Geographical Review* and Rudmose Brown’s 319-page book, Fig. 2) almost certainly suffered from delays in being printed and read more strongly if they are perceived as texts in which the author seeks to reconcile the reader to the future political and commercial benefits of a political decision already made.

The Spitsbergen texts cited by Singh are mostly in English, aside from two in French, thus they were all published in the two official languages of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. This may reflect Singh’s own linguistic preferences, and/or those of the American diplomats concerned with the Spitsbergen Commission – including Secretary of State Robert Lansing and United States representative Fred K. Nielsen. The *Geographical Journal* translated and abridged articles by A.G. Nathorst and Gerard De Geer and published these in the 1890s; as mentioned earlier, Scandinavian (primarily Norwegian) Spitsbergen scientists had their articles translated into French by Charles Rabot for publication in *La Géographie*. All the translated texts referenced in this article were into either English or French.

---

64 Lansing’s article expanded on notes made as early as 1911.
65 It should be noted that US foreign policy regarding the Spitsbergen Question was the central focus of Singh’s 1980 dissertation. Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts were cited on a somewhat arbitrary basis: they may have been referenced in US state papers or in other archival sources, but there is no evidence to date to confirm this hypothesis. I have not been able to trace Elen C. Singh and it seems that she may have died in 2003.
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Part 3. Afterwards: texts published in the light of Norwegian sovereignty

The analysis of Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts in this article has not included a separate study of texts with a scientific focus, since these were rarely used for lobbying purposes and were instead incorporated in one of the other subject matter categories. Following the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question, when the Spitsbergen Treaty granting Norway sovereignty over the region was signed in Paris on 9 February 1920, science re-emerged as the focus in its own right of many subsequently-published Spitsbergen texts. The final section of this article focuses on texts – many of them written by Norwegian authors of earlier, strategic Spitsbergen texts – published in the light of Spitsbergen sovereignty, mostly in scientific journals; selected equivalent texts by authors of other nations are then presented in comparison. This coverage is not comprehensive, of course: there was an outpouring of publications in the Norwegian media in general, in 1920 and again in 1925, when the Lov om Svalbard (Svalbard Law) was passed, establishing Norwegian sovereignty of the archipelago. All the texts discussed in Part 3 have been selected on the basis that they convey in some way an echo or remaining trace of strategy in their subject matter.

Selected Norwegian texts published in the light of Spitsbergen sovereignty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


*Naturen* (Bergen Museum’s bimonthly general science journal) published nine Spitsbergen articles in the wake of Norwegian sovereignty. Contributors included Isachsen and Hoel; Werner Werenskiold (no longer working behind the scenes); Fridtjof Nansen (better known in polar terms for his Greenland and Arctic Ocean expeditions); Norwegian Meteorological Institute Director B.J. Birkeland (no previous Spitsbergen connection); Editor-in-Chief of *Naturen* Jens Holmboe (wrote a one-page text on “ripe crowberries from Spitsbergen”, published in 1910); and geologist Olaf Holtedahl and botanist Hanna Resvoll-Holmsen (participants in Spitsbergen expeditions whose earlier scientific publications had not been strategic in any sense). Topics ranged from the region’s history, cartography and the economic significance of its mineral deposits to its climate, geology and botany. Holmboe’s article on “The Swedish research travellers to Spitsbergen” was magnanimous in triumph, acknowledging Sweden’s scientific pedigree in the region. Another 1920 Spitsbergen text was *En ferd til Spitsbergen*: the scientific findings of Fridtjof Nansen’s oceanographic expedition to Spitsbergen in 1912 (published in English for an international readership back in 1915) finally appeared in Norwegian as a contribution to Spitsbergen literature at home. DNGSA’s 1919-1921 edition, with its sole focus on Greenland, included a 60-page article about Norwegian hunters’ voyages to Greenland by Gunnar Isachsen, his gaze already fixed on the territorial precedent of other Norwegian Arctic exploits.

**Spitsbergen texts published outside Norway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

66 Original title: “De svenske forskningsfærder til Spitsbergen.”
67 Nansen, Fridtjof. 1915. *Spitsbergen waters : oceanographic observations during the cruise of the "Ytselemoy" to Spitsbergen in 1912.* Christiania: Jacob Dybwad.
68 Isachsen’s ambition illustrates the geopolitical expansionist line of lobbying and policy-making in Norway at the time, discussed in Drivenes (2004a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[“The resolution of the Spitsbergen Question.”] Petermanns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1921   | Andersson, Gunnar. Alfred Gabriel Nathorst obituary. Ymer Vol. 41 No. 1: 47-55,
| 1921   | Samuelsson, Carl. “Till frågan om vinderosion i arktiska trakter med       |
|         | särskild hänsyn till de å Spetsbergen rådande förhållanden.”               |
|         | Ymer’s obituary for A.G. Nathorst, who died on 20 January 1921 aged 70,      |
|         | referred to his participation in expeditions to Spitsbergen since 1870.     |

The published texts cited here offer some idea of the ‘normal’ pattern of publication with regard to geographical journal articles and associated publications from late 1919 onwards, a pattern that had previously been interrupted by the Kristiania conferences on Spitsbergen, the Great War and the urgency of debating and resolving the Spitsbergen Question. One exception to this post-war pattern was *La Géographie*, which did not publish any articles about the polar regions at this time.69

Ymer’s obituary for A.G. Nathorst, who died on 20 January 1921 aged 70, referred to his participation in expeditions to Spitsbergen since 1870. Scientific coverage of the region was otherwise ‘business as usual’, with an article about wind erosion on Spitsbergen. De Geer had written a rather more reflective piece for *Det nye Nord* about Spitsbergen and the Swedish people, published in October 1919,

---

69 Four European geographical journals – DNGSA (Kristiania), *The Geographical Journal* (London), *La Géographie* (Paris) and *Ymer* (Stockholm) – published 326 Spitsbergen items (including articles, news items, correspondence, book reviews and literature listings) over a 14-year period from 1906 to 1918. A roughly equivalent number were published elsewhere as books, pamphlets, articles in geographical journals published in other countries and articles in other scientific journals. These journal items are listed in my *Spitsbergen Bibliographical Database* (not yet published). A fifth national geographical journal, *Dr. A. Petermanns Mitteilungen aus Justus Perthes’ geographischer Anstalt* [Dr. A. Petermann’s Communications from Justus Perthes’ Geographical Institution] (hereafter *Petermanns Mitteilungen*), published monthly in Gotha, was internationally the most comprehensive and significant geographical journal published in Europe prior to the Great War. Because of the non-strategic stance of the journal’s Spitsbergen coverage, however, articles from *Petermanns Mitteilungen* do not feature in this article (apart from the text cited in Part 3 Fig. 8). These statistics may help to put into perspective the proportion of texts that may be categorized as strategic Spitsbergen texts, relative to the entire canon of texts during this period. The apparent lessening of these European geographical journals’ generally influential status during the immediate post-war period may be explained by the fact that they were published on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis – sometimes less often, in wartime and immediately after: not fast enough to publish Spitsbergen texts as a reaction to or an attempt to influence political events between late 1918 and early 1920.
as a decision was being made regarding Spitsbergen sovereignty. Perhaps in the light of this, his article focused on past Swedish achievements in the region, aiming for a spirit of reconciliation and sense of future potential, emphasizing Spitsbergen’s association with “Scandinavia”, rather than any one country.

A Geographical Journal news item published in November 1919, “Unrecorded early voyages to Spitsbergen”, seemed to ‘let go’ of the pursuit of Spitsbergen sovereignty in similar fashion. Focusing on a recent published research by Wieder (Figs. 5 & 6), it was undoubtedly contributed by Conway (who else would cite 17th-century Dutch explorer Joris Carolus?), reverting to a more objective perception of early Spitsbergen history. Two years later, with typical British diplomacy, at an RGS lecture attended by the Norwegian Ambassador and subsequently reported in The Geographical Journal in March 1922, Scottish polar geologist James Wordie disputed that Svalbard – the new Norwegian place-name for Spitsbergen – could be attributed to the region at all and asserted a claim for Jan Mayen Island instead: “that Svalbard, despite the weak evidence, is still generally claimed as being Spitsbergen finds a ready explanation in the desire at present shown by Norway to establish an historical as well as a geographical claim to that group” (GJ 59: 181). Around that time, the same journal carried an obituary written by Rudmose Brown for his mentor W.S. Bruce, who had died on 28 October 1921 “at the early age of fifty-four, after a long illness due to strain and overwork in recent years” (GJ 58: 468).

Fred K. Nielsen’s70 article about the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question, published in early 1920 in The American Journal of International Law, mirrored Robert Lansing’s presentation of this topic in the same journal three years before (Fig. 5). Hermann Rüdiger71 summarized the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question in an internationally objective and forward-looking fashion in late 1920 in Petermanns Mitteilungen; this was the only coverage of the Spitsbergen Question in a geographical journal that had been highly respected internationally prior to the Great War.

The final text cited here appeared 15 years later. Rabot’s Spitsbergen: escale polaire [polar destination] (1935) has the appearance of a beautifully-produced vanity publication.72 The book’s subtitle, “exploration et tourisme 1194-1934”, has a round-number feel to it, and the publication date of 1935 coincided with Charles Rabot attaining his eightieth year. The chapters of this self-styled tour guide to the region (travel tips included) cover “Spitsbergen as the crow flies”, “At the heart of

---

70 Nielsen (1879-1963) was a Danish-American lawyer, diplomatic official and football coach, who served in the United States army in 1918 and afterwards represented the US at the Paris Peace Conference, before being appointed Solicitor of the US State Department in June 1920.

71 German geologist Dr. Hermann Rüdiger (1889-1946) had been a member of the ill-fated German Spitsbergen expedition of 1912-1913, led by Herbert Schröder-Stranz, in which eight men lost their lives.

72 One copy of the book was auctioned in aid of the French seamen’s charity La Société des Œuvres de Mer, founded in 1894. A further 120 numbered copies were individually inscribed: “exemplaire no. 6” to “Docent Adolf Hoel” and “exemplaire no. 22 to “Norges Svalbard- og Ishav-undersøkelser”. (Adolf Hoel founded Norges Svalbard- og Ishav- undersøkelser [NSIU] [Norway’s Svalbard and Arctic Ocean Surveys, the forerunner of the present-day Norwegian Polar Institute] in 1928 and was its director for seventeen years. Both copies of Rabot’s 1935 publication referred to here are held by the Norwegian Polar Institute Library.) Two hundred less sumptuous numbered copies were also printed.
Spitsbergen”, “The climate and life”, “Svalbard’s history” and “At the North Pole” (including Amundsen’s airship expedition in 1925). The book is lavishly illustrated with maps, prints and photographs; the historical section is similar to the appearance of Conway’s No man’s land (Fig. 3) and has a consistently strong Norwegian focus; the luxurious look and feel of this volume is reminiscent of Wieder’s 1919 presentation of the Dutch discovery and mapping of Spitsbergen (Fig. 4).

Conclusions
In international diplomatic terms, Spitsbergen sovereignty was a very minor issue in 1919: Margaret MacMillan’s exhaustive survey of the Paris Peace Conference and its achievements on a global scale does not contain a single reference to the region in any context. There is no doubt, however, that the Spitsbergen Question was a major issue for those who wrote about it. No conclusive proof exists to date that any points of view expressed in Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts affected official or public opinion regarding the resolution of the Spitsbergen Question in 1919, but the subject-matter and presentation of many of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts analysed in this article broadly coincided with the textual content of the pièces justificatives in the Statement submitted by the Norwegian Government to the Peace Conference. If the hypothesis that the Statement was a blueprint for success in Spitsbergen sovereignty publication terms is correct, then other texts should have exerted similar influence upon national or international views. Certainly, judging by their energetic publication activity, most of the lobbying authors were convinced of their capacity for influencing events: books and articles referenced in this article served as publication units, were brandished like defensive weapons, and Spitsbergen bibliographies often seem to have been compiled to serve the purpose of literary sandbags. In somewhat self-fulfilling fashion, Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts provided the means to enhance the status of scientists, politicians, writers and editors who already possessed the necessary status to write them in the first place, and since this status was maintained in spite of a relative lack of pure scientific information incorporated in Spitsbergen lobbying texts, a text written by a Spitsbergen scientist was often accredited to an ‘expert’, rather than illustrating his particular ‘expertise’.

The Spitsbergen Literature Lobby’s reliance on the strength of individuals and/or the combined efforts of groups of authors is a complex issue: the consistent strength of Charles Rabot as a writer, editor, translator and authorial collaborator contrasts with the intermittent strength of Sir William Martin Conway as a writer, historian and politician. There was an ongoing, strategic ambiguity and fluidity of authorship right across the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby that was apparent on several levels. Conway wrote both acknowledged and anonymous texts published in the RGS’s Geographical Journal; the mentor/spokesman relationship between W.S. Bruce and Rudmose Brown amplified and prolonged Bruce’s ability to lobby

73 Original titles of the book and its chapters: Spitsbergen, escale polaire. Exploration et tourisme 1194-1934; Le Spitsberg à vol d’oiseau; Au cœur du Spitsberg; Le climat et la vie; Historique du Svalbard; Au Pôle Nord; Conseil pratiques.
on behalf of Scottish interests. Their literary and political closeness and reciprocity echo the even stronger publication ties that existed between Rabot, Isachsen, Hoel and Werenskiold. The apparently strategic – and successful – ambiguity of unattributed ‘expert’ authorship on the part of the Norwegian scientists and Rabot included a combined effort by Isachsen, Hoel, Rabot and Werenskiold, resulting in the publication of Rabot’s article in the American Geographical Review (Fig. 2); Hoel, Werenskiold and Rabot’s compilation of Spitsbergen bibliography proofs in Norwegian and English (Fig. 3); and the presumed collaboration between Rabot and Hoel article for the latter’s article in France-Scandinavie (Fig. 5). Even more ambiguously, the limited circulation of the Norwegian Government’s Statement (Part 1) and Norwegian bibliographic compilations existing only in proof form (Fig. 3) further demonstrate that public readership was not always prioritized by these authors.

The texts cited by Elen C. Singh and those referenced in the British Foreign Office handbook on Spitsbergen (Fig. 2) indicate rather random awareness of available Spitsbergen texts. Singh does not explain what determined her own selection, but I believe it illustrates very clearly the effectiveness of text circulation by an author of his own works, even especially those published in lesser-known sources. How else could Singh conceivably have known about such recherché texts as W.S. Bruce’s articles in The Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society and The Sphere (Fig. 2)? The extent to which Singh may have been influenced by the contents of relevant US government archives is not confirmed either, but it is very likely that the documents they contained broadly determined her choice of Spitsbergen texts. If this hypothesis is also correct, Singh’s selection of Spitsbergen texts would illustrate which authors were assiduous in distributing their publications; which publications that were received were felt to be worth keeping; and perhaps the linguistic limitations and bias – towards English and French – of those who read the texts at the time. (This would also confirm Norway’s crucial linguistic link with French as an international, diplomatic language, established through the association of Rabot and La Géographie).

This article is a small act of homage to Elen C. Singh, whose concept of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby imbues behind-the-scenes activity, intent on resolving Spitsbergen sovereignty in favour of one particular nation and/or securing the commercial interests of several nations, with a form of international complexity that had not been expressed before, and which has been subsequently further explored in other secondary sources cited in this article. An expansion of the genre from 13 strategic Spitsbergen texts to over 50 publications, dominated by the recurrent contribution of a small group of international authors, seeks to illustrate the influence that the status of these individuals accorded to their published works and the perceived status enhancement that such publications were thought to confer on their authors’ Spitsbergen-related activity.

75 There is a side issue here that cannot be resolved: the potential, but unrealized, significance of A.G. Nathorst and W.S. Bruce’s involvement in the later stages of the lobbying process, inhibited by their ill-health and subsequent demise.
Summary
The Spitsbergen (Svalbard) Question became an international political issue regarding the terra nullius status of the Arctic region in the light of growing commercial enterprise undertaken from 1898 onwards. The Spitsbergen Commission set up by the Peace Conference in Paris to resolve this question in the aftermath of the Great War awarded sovereignty to Norway. Elen C. Singh’s concept of the Spitsbergen Literature Lobby illustrates behind-the-scenes activity intent on resolving Spitsbergen sovereignty in favour of one particular nation, and/or securing the commercial interests of several nations. Documents analysed in this article include the initial Norwegian Government submission to the Peace Conference and the contemporaneous diary of one of its main compilers; Spitsbergen Literature Lobby texts cited by Singh, and other strategic texts published 1906-1919; and selected Spitsbergen texts published in the light of Norwegian sovereignty. Subject matter comprised Spitsbergen summaries, history (including Spitsbergen bibliographies), cartography, legal/political issues and commercial issues. The specific and general influence of the lobby and the expertise of its constituent authors is examined, as are their individual and collaborative literary efforts, as well as the rationale behind the selection of strategic texts and a summary of their time-scale, location and language of publication.
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