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On 27 May 1776, the Scottish immigrant John Robertson Brand, sometimes known as John Brandt, was awarded a silver medal by the Royal Norwegian Scientific Society in the church of the fishing village of Hustad, south of the Trondheim Fjord in central Norway. Though below the Arctic Circle, Hustad lays slightly off the 63rd parallel north, which otherwise runs through Canada’s Nunavut and Yukon Territories, the Davis Strait, and the deep Russian tundra, far, far north of the traditional latitudes of Enlightenment. And yet, stepping into the small wooden church’s aisle on that spring day to deliver a speech marking the occasion, District Governor Even Hammer of Romsdal (1732-1800) summoned a language of reform, improvement, industriousness, civic virtue, public happiness, jealousy of trade, and political economy, that would have resonated deeply and widely across the European world, a language indebted to wider international currents but resolutely inflected by local conditions in what he appropriately called ‘our cold North’. Few cases better justify the great Turinese historian Franco Venturi’s admonition, a few

---

1 Rolv Petter Amdam first introduced me to Even Hammer, and I would like to express my gratitude to him, to Mads Langnes at Romsdalsmuseet in Molde for going well beyond the call of duty in facilitating my work on this intriguing figure, and, particularly, to Marit Sjelmo for jovial research assistance and Robert Fredona for invaluable suggestions. I am furthermore grateful to Ann Thomson and Richard Whatmore for the kind invitation to discuss the article at the European University Institute in Florence, and to Alexandra Chadwick, Rory Cox, Franz Leander Fillafer, and Konrad M. Lawson for comments. The usual caveats apply.
days before his death, to ‘the young and the less young’ to remember ‘always that local roots and the great ideas that break the skies of Europe can never be separated’.³

So how were the two related in the case of District Governor Hammer? What cursory scholarship exists on him, including even the Norwegian Biographical Dictionary, argues resolutely but with little evidence that ‘French Physiocracy’ was the ‘starting point’ for his work, and that he was essentially a peripheral recipient of François Quesnay’s doctrines expounding _laissez-faire_, large-scale landowning, and the exclusive power of agriculture to create wealth.⁴ Hammer may have been a figure of the Enlightenment, in short, but hardly more than a dim reflection at the utmost periphery of the movement. Only Rolv Petter Amdam has suggested that scholars may have exaggerated the influence of Physiocracy in Norway in general and on Hammer in particular, and what follows builds on his observation to provide a more nuanced portrayal of Hammer’s world and of his vision as a means of integrating Norway’s experience into our understanding of the internationalization of political economy in the eighteenth century and, more broadly, into the European Enlightenment.⁵ For not only does a closer reading of Hammer’s work reveal a far more complex engagement with political economy than has hitherto been acknowledged, it can also serve as a beachhead from which we may better assess the Norwegian Enlightenment as such, which remains a woefully neglected yet fertile field for

---


further studies. More importantly, I will use the case of Even Hammer’s political economy and how it developed at the northern extreme of the European Enlightenment to suggest that intellectual historians would benefit from considering the reception and appropriation of ideas not merely in relation to shifting cultural, economic, and political contexts, but also to more fundamental environmental and geological conditions. 


Figure 1: Anonymous Portrait of Even Hammer, Domkirkeodd, Hamar, Norway
Before some fastidious reader hastens to note that Norway was merely part of ‘Denmark-Norway’ during the long eighteenth century, as so many rush to proclaim that there was no ‘Italy’ before the peninsula’s belated national unification during the Risorgimento (pace a widespread tradition of cultural and geographical identity stretching back at least to Petrarch), it may be necessary to correct some popular misapprehensions regarding what sort of community the name ‘Norway’ represented at the time. The country’s name derived from Norðrvegr, known already in the eighteenth century as the Old Norse term for the ‘way to the North’. Historically, numerous kingdoms of varying degrees of political unity had emerged along the eastern coasts of the North Sea between Skagerrak and the Barents Sea during the first millennium CE, but the area only emerged on the European scene in the Viking Age, often bracketed by the first raid on the Northumbrian abbey of Lindisfarne in 793 and the 1066 Battle of Stamford Bridge. During this period, Scandinavian Vikings explored European and Atlantic waterways through trade, cultural encounters, and warfare, going as far as Greenland, Newfoundland, and Uzbekistan. Raids like that on Lindisfarne, during which hallowed grounds were desecrated and monks murdered or taken into slavery, long colored perceptions of Vikings, but a more nuanced view has recently emerged in scholarship appreciating their intensive commercial operations throughout Western Eurasia and the North Atlantic.

The petty kingdoms of Norway were, however, united already following the 872 CE Battle of Hafrsfjord, at which, as the Icelandic Saga-weaver and statesman Snorri Sturluson put it, Harald Fairhair ‘unified’ Norway by force. The country was forcefully

---

9 See for example Andrew Swinton, *Travels into Norway, Denmark, and Russia, in the Years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791*, London: Robinson, 1792, p. 39.
Christianized following the death of Olav the Holy at the Battle of Stiklestad in 1030, and its King Håkon V implemented lasting institutional changes such as abolishing an aristocracy and hamstringing regional warlords in 1308. A division of political powers was in place at an early date, and, like Iceland, the country never experienced ‘feudalism’. Norway was particularly hard struck by Svartedauen, or the Black Death, which decimated the population by sixty percent between 1348 and 1350 and caused a national trauma that still resonates in the popular imagination. The weakened polity subsequently entered the so-called Kalmar Union that brought together the Kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in a personal union from 1397 to 1523. Once Sweden seceded from the union with the rise of Gustav Vasa, Norwegians sought to follow suit, but rebellions throughout the country failed and Norway remained in a personal union with Denmark—the resulting unity called the ‘Twin-Kingdoms’ and later referred to by the playwright Henrik Ibsen as the ‘400-Year Night’—until the turmoil of the Napoleonic Wars. Norwegian revolutionaries adopted their own entirely independent constitution on 17 May 1814, but, as the Norns would have it, liberty proved evanescent, with Swedish troops invading later the same year and inaugurating a new personal union that would end only in 1905. Throughout the eighteenth century, then, Norway was an ostensibly independent Kingdom in a legislative union with the more powerful ‘Composite Monarchy’ Denmark, and an


uneasy part of the so-called Oldenburg Empire.\textsuperscript{17} And, as scholarship from the past few decades has come to emphasize, feelings of independent Norwegian identity were widespread and growing throughout the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, the relationship between Norway and Denmark was not entirely unlike those of Scotland and England following the Union of 1707 or, for that matter, of the Kingdom of Naples and the Spanish Empire, both cases understood, as John Robertson has demonstrated, to be of ‘Kingdoms governed as Provinces’.\textsuperscript{19} As easy as it is to draw such political comparisons, though, Norway has largely resisted integration into the larger ambit of premodern European historiography precisely because of its remarkable difference, both real and perceived.

Indeed, early modern historians may find much in Norway’s part that resonates with wider historiographical tropes in the European world, albeit taken—perhaps naturally given Norway’s location and climate—to extremes. The Salem witch trials, for example, remain frightful for, at the then westernmost extreme of the European world, ending in the horrible killing of twenty people, mostly by hanging, between February 1692 and May 1693.\textsuperscript{20} Yet this paled in comparison to what occurred on the edge of the arctic Barents Sea in contemporary Vardø, Finnmark, Europe’s northernmost and easternmost town at the time (east even of St. Petersburg and Istanbul). Out of a population of 3,000 in all of Finnmark at the time, 91 people—77 women and 14 men, the latter mostly Saami—were executed, often by burning, in Vardø in the early to mid-seventeenth century, with no less than 18 during the harsh winter-months of 1662-3 (and three more tortured to death). Some


of the local fishing-villages saw their entire female populations executed during these periodic crazes. The causes of this were many, but scholars have focused on the region’s extreme isolation, its relentlessly cold eternal night for several months each year, unforgiving climate, the unfamiliar rituals of the local Saami, and need for reckoning in the face of so many deaths at sea. So engrained were these witch trials in Norwegian culture that the Doma mountain near Vardø still is known as ‘Hell’s Gateway’.21

This was admittedly an unusual case, at the most extreme edge of an extreme land, but it serves to underscore the fact that, though Norway very much was part of Europe, it was also different. And it should not be surprising that travelers’ depictions of Norway were universally unforgiving in the early modern period, emphasizing the land’s rawness and alterity with regards to continental Europe, to the point where Ludvig Holberg, the ‘Voltaire of the North’, could report that people abroad thought Norwegians were ‘werewolves’, a situation that explicitly both angered Even Hammer and inspired his work on national improvement. Curiously, many of these early accounts mirrored the negative views offered by Grand Tourists visiting Southern Italy, a place also thought to be less civilized than the rest of Europe. But where Naples at least had the dubious honor of being

---

known as a ‘Paradise inhabited by Devils’, eighteenth-century Norway was at best a wilderness inhabited by primitives.\textsuperscript{23} The merchant and author Nathaniel William Wraxall, for one, who seemingly never visited the Northern parts of the Oldenburg Empire in person, ridiculed the Danes,

they can boast, ‘tis true, a vast extent of dominion; but of what importance are the barren and almost uninhabited mountains of Norway and Lapland, stretching to the pole; or the plains of Iceland, where the inhabitants are yet, and will probably ever remain, in the most profound barbarism?\textsuperscript{24}

Norwegians themselves, Wraxall observed, though he himself fell for one in Copenhagen, were ‘\textit{wrapt in all the horrors of a polar winter’}. Remaining therefore ‘unpolished in their manners, and still retaining the vestiges of Gothic ignorance, they present not many charms to tempt the traveler’.\textsuperscript{25} Not everyone agreed, of course, but even later, more positive depictions were hardly less discriminatory. The Scottish minister and historian William Thompson began his accounts by stating that

\begin{quote}
The Norwegians are a fine race of men, of a free and generous spirit, and watch over their liberties with unremitting vigilance. Many ages have elapsed since they have settled quietly at home, and ceased to disturb the liberties of others.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

But then went on to explain how ‘the Norwegians are exceedingly fond of dancing’ and ‘continually trotting to the sound of a violin’ in spite of the fact that ‘their music is without melody, and their playing without art’. Not only that, but, much like stereotypical Southern Italians, they were of ‘a lively disposition’ and ‘quick and violent in their passions,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Nathaniel William Wraxall, \textit{A Tour Through some of the Northern Parts of Europe, Particularly Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Petersburgh, in a Series of Letters}, 3 vols., Dublin: J. Denkin and J. Beatty, [1776], vol. I, p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Wraxall, \textit{A Tour Through some of the Northern Parts of Europe}, vol. I, p. 3, 11-16. Emphasis added.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Andrew Swinton [William Thompson], \textit{Travels into Norway, Denmark, and Russia, in the Years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791}, London: Robinson, 1792, pp. 46-47.
\end{itemize}
especially when intoxicated’.\textsuperscript{27} Yet, as a territory, it was clear to Thompson that ‘Nature has done much for Norway’, and that it represented ‘by far the most valuable part’ of the Danish Empire.\textsuperscript{28} That said, the absence of a feudal past profoundly influenced living conditions in the Norwegian countryside compared to its ‘Twin Kingdom’ to the South.\textsuperscript{29} As historian, priest, and frequent tutor to Grand Tourists William Coxe put it in the best-selling accounts of his travels to Norway, ‘as the peasants of that Kingdom are free, the forces are levied in a different manner from those of Denmark’.\textsuperscript{30}

Travelers also noted what historical demographers have since fully established, namely that Norway was extremely sparsely populated, with most people living in few towns and cities, the most famous at the time being Hanseatic Bergen, with around 14,000 inhabitants, the mining metropolis of Kongsberg, with 8,000, and the cathedral city of Trondheim with 7,000.\textsuperscript{31} There were, of course, good geological and ecological reasons for this. For though the length of Norway is heated by the Gulf Stream, rendering what otherwise would have been an arctic climate temperate, less than 3\% of it consists in arable land. The country’s geography is serrated and mountainous (in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries increasingly designated ‘sublime’\textsuperscript{32}), with deep forests and plentiful rivers, its history shaped by a unique geological environment. So overpowering has ‘nature’ been in the country’s human history that Norwegian anthropologists still see it as ‘more important than culture’ to this day.\textsuperscript{33} Norway’s historically small population resulted also from its largely infertile soil and bedrocks of granite and gneiss, with more nutritious

\textsuperscript{27} [Thompson], \textit{Travels into Norway}, pp. 52-53.
\textsuperscript{28} [Thompson], \textit{Travels into Norway}, pp. 37-38.
\textsuperscript{29} See, for example, Hammer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{31} See on this theme also Ståle Dyrvik, Knut Mykland, and Jan Oldervoll, \textit{The Demographic Crises in Norway in the 17th and 18th Centuries}, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1976; Paul Bairoc’h, Jean Batou, and Pierre Chèvre, \textit{La population des villes européennes de 8000 à 1850}, Geneva: Droz, 1988, p. 52.
Cambro-Silurian pockets featuring marine clay deposits from retreating glaciers at the end of the last ice age corresponding to the most populous areas around the current-day Oslo Fjord, Stavanger, Bergen, and Trondheim. The same extensive but focused Permian volcanic activity producing these soils elsewhere pushed large concentrations of mineral wealth to the surface, most importantly for the early modern period silver, gold, iron, and copper.34 Indeed, the mines of Kongsberg (silver) and Røros (copper) both began operations in the early seventeenth century and quickly achieved Europe-wide fame.35 And though Norwegians subsequently exported large amounts of cast metal, they were known across Europe to depend on foreign manufactures.36 Generally though, the country had an outsized export sector throughout the period, with 20-30% of output destined for foreign markets.37 Norway’s economic profile during this period, in other words, resulted from its unique geological and ecological niche, characterized not only by minerals but also by timber—which helped build the navies of Europe—and of course fish and marine mammals, staples on European markets since at least the twelfth century.38

Indeed, in a work that later became famous for offering the world’s first detailed description of the Kraken, or giant squid, and for ‘launching the sea serpent to stardom’, the Danish professor, political economist, and Bishop of Bergen Erik Pontoppidan (1698-1764) proudly assembled a compendious laundry list of marine and mineral resources in his 1752-3 *Det første Forsøg paa Norges Naturlige Historie*, or *First Attempt at Norway’s Natural History*, which was quickly translated into both German and English. And, coincidentally, the coast near Hustad and Romsdal, where Hammer worked, was where the majority of sightings of sea serpents occurred in the early modern and modern periods. His adoptive country, Pontoppidan noted, ‘surpassed most countries, and not only in dead elements, such as metals… but also with regards to animals, birds, and fish, and particularly the last, of which scarcely any part of the universe affords such a diversity and abundance’. So much that, in a passage that later would become prophetic, he foresaw the eventual utilization even of offshore petroleum resources:

In addition to its Saltiness, one of the North Sea’s curious characteristics is its Fatness [Fadme]…. it is probable that, in the Sea like on Land, springs or currents of Petroleum [Petroleo], Naphtha, Sulphur, Pitoal fat, and other bituminous and oil-like juices may arise.

---


I have previously noted the long historiography engaging with what Lucien Febvre once called the relationship between ‘History and the Soil’, emphasizing the influence of environmental factors on intellectual history.\(^{43}\) Similarly, the accounts of travelers and Pontoppidan’s description alike suggest how Norway’s landscape and the nature of its resources may have influenced the reception and appropriation of the emerging European

---

discipline of political economy at the time, for though an exquisitely rural and peripheral region of Europe in the early modern period, it was, as the case of Even Hammer will make abundantly clear, still very far from François Quesnay’s reveries of the ‘Agricultural Kingdom’ of France, which enjoyed more than ten times the arable land of its Northern counterpart.  

**Even Hammer**

Hammer himself was born to a Parish priest near Ringsaker, south of Lillehammer, in 1732. He began studies in Christiania, now Oslo, in 1752, where he subsequently taught in the period 1756-68, having earned his degree in Copenhagen in 1758. Leaving his teaching career behind, he embarked on a Grand Tour at his own expense, traveling for periods of study in Oxford, Cambridge, Leiden, Göttingen, and Paris. Upon his return to Norway, he took advantage of the period of press freedom inaugurated by Johann Friedrich Struensee, the German physician who became de facto regent of Denmark-Norway 1771-1772 because of the madness of King Christian VII, to publish a polemical treatise entitled *Philonorvagi: Velmente Tanker, til veltænkende medborgere*, or *Pro Norway: Well-Intentioned Thoughts for Well-Thinking Fellow Citizens*. Struensee himself took notice, helping Hammer embark on a career in Norwegian governmental administration, including in the role of secretary to his newly established and short-lived Norwegian Rentekammer, or Treasury. Struensee’s radical reforms alienated large parts of the Danish political elite, however, and particularly so the powerful historian, Secretary to the Royal Court, and future Prime Minister Ove Høegh-Guldberg, who would lead a conspiracy leading to Struensee’s execution in 1772. Hammer himself became involved in the Struensee affair when Høegh-Guldberg ‘smelled separatist tendencies’ in the *Philonorvagi*, which was almost patently an attack on Høegh-Guldberg, who went frequently by the pseudonym

---


46 See, on Guldberg and Struensee, Reinert, *Translating Empire*, p. 246.
‘Philodanus’.47 Hammer outlived the Norwegian Exchequer and survived the political fallout of the coup, however, eventually becoming District Governor of Romsdal following the fall of Struensee in 1773. For the remainder of his career, Hammer would be broadly engaged in contemporary efforts for the social and economic improvement of Norway, becoming a member of learned and practical societies as well as initiating such measures as spearheading the Norwegian enclosure movement, establishing a fund supporting the families of people lost at sea and sending a farmer from Tresfjord, in Romsdal, to teach the inhabitants of the Faroe Islands, historically part of the Kingdom of Norway, how to plough.48 And, though seldom mentioned for more than a few words, Hammer has been considered one of the great pre-Independence Norwegian patriots since the early nineteenth century.49

Strikingly though, in light of this deep-seated patriotism, Hammer’s intellectual horizons were remarkably international, not merely geographically but also temporally.50 Seamlessly, he invoked places and examples from across the European world in his writings, from Boston and Philadelphia in the West to Riga and St. Petersburg in the East, from Coimbra, Portugal to Jelgava, Lithuania, and, though an admittedly crude measure,

---


49 Hammer’s Philonorvagi has long been a mainstay of scholarship on the origins of Norwegian nationalism, though it seldom has received much more than a mention. See Henrik Wergeland, ‘Norges Konstitutions Historie [1841-43]’, in id, Samlede Skrifter: Trykt og Utrykt, eds. Herman Jæger, Didrik Arup Seip, Halvdan Koht and Einar Høigård, Christiania/Oslo: Steenske Forlag, 1918-1940, vol. IV-4, 172-398, p. 195; Edvard Holm, Nogle Hovedtræk af trykkefrihedstidens Historie 1770-1773, Copenhagen: J.H. Schultz, 1885, p. 149n; Lunden, Norsk grålysing, pp. 117, 123.

counting the place-names mentioned in Hammer’s *Philonorvagi* reveals a vivid mental map. For a booklet that often turns to concrete local conditions and reforms, it is interesting that he mentions Lisbon (2) and Oxford (2) as often as he does Toten (2) and Hedmarken (2), near the central Norwegian lake of Mjøsa, in the body of his text, but perhaps more peculiarly he mentions Denmark (13) only slightly more often than he does Holland (11), and both less so than England (14). Considering the places of publication he mentions in his bibliography, Copenhagen (2) is eclipsed by Paris (4), London (9), and above-all the book-capital of the Germanic world, Leipzig (22). Yet, though Hammer engaged with the entirety of the European world, including Spain and Italy, his emphasis, not entirely surprisingly given his context, lay squarely on the experiences of its septentrional parts, from North America through Great Britain and Northern Europe to Russia.

Similarly, though the Copenhagen-based Genevan historian Paul Henri Mallet had already published his well-received *Northern Antiquities*, including early translations of the *Prose Edda*, and the accounts of Snorri Sturluson—‘the Herodotus of the north’—circulated widely throughout Europe, Hammer’s historical imagination did not highlight some proud Viking heritage. The real rediscovery (or invention) of a Viking past would of course only truly gain speed with the advent of National Romanticism and a series of major archaeological excavations in the second half of the nineteenth century, the most important of which were the Borre graves in the 1850s, the Tune Ship in the 1860s, and the better preserved Gokstad and Oseberg Ships only in the 1880s and early 1900s.

---

respectively.\textsuperscript{52} Still, it is worth emphasizing that the specific historical and mythical references in Hammer’s \textit{Philonorvagi} beyond the early modern period were resolutely Classical or Biblical in nature (though, given his context, it would be tempting to read crypto-pagan intentions in his otherwise neutral references to God as ‘the All-Wise’, a traditional attribute of divinity in the Judeo-Christian tradition but also the archetypal term for the principal Norse deity Odin).\textsuperscript{53} His readers were therefore offered examples not merely of Dutch and British policy, or of German mining handbooks, but also of the ‘Platonic Republic’ and the civic lessons of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{54} In more general terms, however, Hammer frequently appealed, without specificity, to the existence of immemorial Norwegian traditions, to the country’s venerable internal ‘allegiance’ and ‘freedom’, and to the common memory of a happier past.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Philonorvagi}

Undaunted, Hammer made the most of Struensee’s reforms, the title page proudly proclaiming the date of publication to be ‘Trykke-Frihedens første Aar’, or ‘the First Year of Press Freedom’. And he opened head on with a discussion of the meaning of ‘true Patriotism’, addressing his ‘worthy fellow citizens’ and drawing on the pugnacious work on the subject by the Frankfurt jurist and publicist Friedrich Karl von Moser, finding its meaning in an active ‘love of fatherland’ for the purposes of the ‘improvement of the state’.\textsuperscript{56} Praising Struensee’s reforms explicitly, he thanked the King for following ‘the

\textsuperscript{53} Hammer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, p. 104
\textsuperscript{54} Hammer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, pp. 104-105, 109
\textsuperscript{55} Hammer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, p. 102 and passim; id., \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, p. 25 and passim.
example of other Enlightened Nations’ by allowing the citizenry to ‘dare to think and write freely without any slavish Fear’, overcoming its ‘slavish way of thinking’ to embrace a ‘Freedom, within the bounds of reason’.\(^{57}\) This had been a ‘happy Era for these Kingdoms, and particularly so for Norway, because a tired People has been given free and unhindered Access to the Throne’ after ‘for a long while having been a Step-Child’, its proud people suffering.\(^{58}\) Norway, after all, ‘supplied by God and by Nature with so many Sources of Wealth and Blessings’, would have been wealthy and flourishing, had, Hammer summoned a contemporary European trope, its ‘jealous sister’ Denmark not ‘wanted everything’ and brought it ‘to its knees’.\(^{59}\) As he concluded his book, Norway desperately had to find a way to ‘maintain some sort of balance with other Kingdoms, and to not simply become a victim of their advantages’.\(^{60}\)

Principally, Hammer argued, Norwegians had to invest more in their young and encourage them to leave to study abroad, ‘to England, Holland, France, and other places, to learn the languages of these countries and to learn about trade and its relevant sciences [handelen og de dertil hørende Videnskaber]’.\(^{61}\) Thus exposed to the world, very much as he himself had been, they could return to Norway, ‘which by Nature has been richly endowed with Forests, Cliffs, Mountains, and Dales, Seas and Lakes’. Given the wealth of its natural resources, Hammer maintained, Norway could become ‘the happiest Country in the World’, but only if ‘its Inhabitants are taught effectively to enoble raw materials, and draw from them all possible utility and advantage’.\(^{62}\) Indeed, ‘Norway should more than any other Kingdom be the true planting-place for the sciences of nature, mountains, and trade, for mathematics, mechanics, botany, and oeconomy’, assisted not merely by its natural riches but, here flaunting a patriotism that crossed into chauvinism, also by ‘our Nation’s [Nations] inborn mechanical genius’.\(^{63}\) This, in turn, necessitated the


\(^{62}\) Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, p. 11.

establishment of trade schools, institutions of learning, public libraries, a program of traveling public lectures, ‘and even a university’ to educate the citizenry.64

‘Do not the Scots have far less of a distance to travel to Oxford and Cambridge than we have to Copenhagen?’ Hammer asked rhetorically, ‘and yet they have 4 universities… But where do we find such a public State here?’ In these ‘enlightened Times’ all monopolies were ‘insults to the State’, so why not that held by the University of Copenhagen over all science in Denmark-Norway?65 With Struensee’s reforms, the time was finally nigh to set things right.

Should, by Natural Law, one Child injure another, particularly when both have the right to the love of the same father? Yet this happens to this day. One has seen it, endured it and kept quiet, because nobody has dared speak up [tage Bladet fra Munden].66

Large parts of Hammer’s Philonorvagi were subsequently devoted to the point of establishing new educational institutions in Norway and fostering what he called ‘de Nordiske Muser’, ‘the Nordic Muses’ and finally overcoming the negative stereotypes of Norway flourishing in Europe.67 The second point was to improve Norway’s ‘Landhuusholdnings-maade’, that is its approach to the economy of the country, by encouraging its ‘industriousness’ and, building on his previous theme, establish a ‘Oeconomie-Collegium’ or Economic Council to encourage and facilitate the material improvement of the country.68 And it seemed obvious to Hammer that such a council should be constituted by ‘reasonable patriots’ of Norway, since ‘nothing is more natural, than that natives must have both better Knowledge about the nature of a Fatherland, and greater Love and Care for its Welfare than strangers’.69 Political economy was thus a complicated field, and Hammer echoed a widespread idea when he argued that

64 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 13.
66 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 15.
67 Hammer, Philonorvagi, pp. 21-22.
69 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 25.
the rules and basic things that must pave the way for good economic laws in a country must by necessity be grounded in its climate and nature, and additionally, as far as possible, in alignment with its inhabitants’ homes and ways of thinking. Therefore, what suits Denmark does not always suit Norway… And much like what heals one human can be poison to another, so a law that is good for one country can hurt another.\textsuperscript{70}

‘economic plans’ and ‘the sciences relating to the economy’ alike had to be tailored to local conditions, and much was at stake in ‘directing the economy of an important country like Norway’. Particularly, Norwegians should be allowed to decide on their own economic fortunes, and as Christian V had given Denmark and Norway different law books, why could they not have different economic systems?\textsuperscript{71} Returning to his earlier Scottish comparison, he could not but emphasize the happier condition of his brethren across the North Sea, for ‘Scotland is in relation to London roughly the same, as Norway is to Copenhagen, but I nowhere learn that they fetch their economic laws from there’.\textsuperscript{72} Only a truly national policy grounded in local knowledge and experience could allow ‘Norway to rise again from its fallen condition’.\textsuperscript{73}

But his was far from a call for simple nativism, as he maintained, on the basis of his own experiences on the Grand Tour, that national welfare could only happen through the emulation of successful foreign ‘examples’, and particularly so from looking at the ‘English enthusiasm’ for ‘improvement’.\textsuperscript{74} Not only that, but he suggested the establishment of scholarships for students to travel abroad, like he had, to learn ‘the sciences relating to the economy and to forestry’, one of the most important disciplines for


\textsuperscript{72} Hamer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, p. 27. On the contemporary idiom of giving and receiving laws as a metaphor of economic domination, see Reinert, \textit{Translating Empire}.

\textsuperscript{73} Hamer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{74} Hamer, \textit{Philonorvagi}, pp. 35, 49-50, and \textit{passim}.
Norwegian improvement. Informed by foreign ideas but knowledgeable enough about local conditions to implement them, a Norwegian economic council could thus establish ‘prizes’ for improvements and to encourage ‘a skilled agriculturalist, a diligent farmer, a laborious manufacturer, and industrious carpenter, or someone who may have invented a new branch of commerce or made useful proposals for the development of our fisheries’ to ensure that ‘our neighbors don’t take the hats off us’.76

Public education, in short, lay at the very core of Hammer’s political economy, and he wrote at length about the necessity of ‘public libraries’ to familiarize countrymen with ‘what has been written about the sciences relating to the economy and trade’. He even went as far as offering a long bibliography of economic works meriting inclusion in such public libraries based on his readings abroad. It is a remarkable list, particularly for a supposed ‘Physiocrat’ like Hammer; it included no less than 60 distinct works or series, originating in Austria, Denmark, England, France, the Germanies, Ireland, Italy, Scotland, Sweden, and Switzerland, the vast majority of them historiographically unknown treatises on forestry, husbandry, mining, and political economy ranging from Johann Jacob Moser’s Cameralist Bibliothec to James Wheeler’s 1747 Modern Druid. In the final category entitled ‘Writings Relating to trade’, containing what today might fall under the rubrics of ‘history of economic analysis’ or ‘history of political economy’, Hammer opened, out of alphabetical order, with the German translation of Papal banker Girolamo Belloni’s best-selling Del commercio, or On Commerce, followed by Johan Joachim Becher’s quintessentially Cameralist Politischer Discours as well as the dictionaries of Jacques Savary and Malachy Postlethwayt, Jean-François Melon’s Essay politique sur le Commerce, or Political Essay on Commerce, and the German translation of François Véron

75 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 68, on forestry see also pp. 60-66.
76 Hammer, Philonorvagi, pp. 30-31.
77 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 35.
Duverger de Forbonnais’s *Elemens du commerce, or Elements of Commerce*, all decidedly on the pragmatic side of the contemporary spectrum of economic thought.79

Throughout, Hammer demonstrated a keen awareness of the importance of translations in the field of political economy and the need to differentiate between various editions, here and there even suggesting to his readers one rather than others.80 But with the exception of a fleeting reference to the *Memoirs* of the Economic Society of Bern, to which Quesnay’s disciple the Marquis de Mirabeau contributed an article, it is striking that none of the works in Hammer’s suggested bibliography for the improvement of Norway demonstrated the vaguest Physiocratic impetus.81 Instead, Hammer’s reading list of political economy reflected works that were successful from a book-historical perspective rather than those deemed canonical by later economists, ranging from universal best sellers like Belloni and Postlethwayt to those coming out of the circle of political economists

---


80 Eg. Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, p. 44. On the importance of translation for early modern political economy, see Reinert, *Translating Empire*.

gathered around the French Intendant of Commerce Jacques Claude Marie Vincent de Gournay in the mid 1750s and the plethora of Cameralist works published in the German-speaking world. Together, in the zodiac of eighteenth-century political economy, these works point everywhere but to the constellation of Physiocracy, suggesting instead the need for pragmatic administration in every economic sphere if not, more pointedly, for polities to succeed in ruthless and ‘jealous’ international economic competition through forceful interventions to industrialize and ‘give laws’ to foreigners.

But this is not to say he necessarily was entirely unfamiliar with Physiocratic arguments. Following his bibliography, the Philonorvagi set out to explain the importance of improving Norway’s agriculture, forestry, and mining as well as its ‘manufactures and factories’, in a passage touching upon questions that may have reflected familiarity with Quesnay’s project. He noted, for example, that

our now fashionable [nymodens] Patriots are not very much in favor of factories. Free trade, it is said, will be the rise of Denmark. There may have been a time, when it had been advantageous, if factories had never been established, at least in Copenhagen. Yes! Perhaps nowhere in Denmark; as that Nation which, a certain writer argues, allows raw materials to enter the Kingdom from outside, in order to bring them to perfection domestically and does not ennoble its own products, has not yet learned its economic ABCs. But now that we have them, we should not throw millions after millions, but rather, with the bee, suck honey even from the tiniest flowers.

Was this somehow a Physiocratically-inspired argument? Perhaps, though the only work Hammer quotes in the entire section is the now entirely unknown anonymously published 1757 pamphlet Ringe Tanker om Landvaesenet, Tarvelighed, og nyttige Fabriker, samt deres virkninger på staten or Small Thoughts regarding Agriculture, Tawdriness, and Useful Factories, as well as their Effects on the State, by the practically inclined Norwegian Professor of ‘Economics’ at the University of Copenhagen Ole Stockfleth Pihl, a longtime

---

82 On Gournay’s circle, see among others the essays in Loïc Charles, Frédéric Lefebvre, and Christine Théré (eds.), Le cercle de Vincent de Gournay: savoirs économiques et pratiques administratives en France au milieu du XVIIIe siècle, Paris: INED, 2011 and Reinert, Translating Empire, pp. 142-152 and passim.
83 See, on the prevalence of this tradition in contemporary Europe, Reinert, Translating Empire.
84 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 74
protégé of Pontoppidan.85 Pre-dating Quesnay’s writings, Pihl had written in favor of agricultural improvements and against the importation of foreign luxuries but, crucially, also at length about the necessity of working domestic raw materials, particularly in Norway.

If [a merchant] brings out the country’s money or goods, and brings back useless things, one can rightly compare him to a doctor, who gives his patients poison instead of a cure; this because he enriches himself and foreigners, but makes his own countrymen excessive, lazy, and poor, while he instead should live off foreigners, and be a means for enriching his fellow-citizens and make them industrious.86

Pihl could foresee a time for luxuries, once a country’s population was large and wealthy and its agriculture, mines, fisheries, and manufactures fully developed, but, he concluded, ‘odds are this will never happen to a country before the world ends [Verdens Undergang]’. His argument was not that manufactures were not useful to a country, but that ‘useful’ factories should work existing domestic products where they existed rather than relying on imports.87

In any case, Hammer continued, ‘it is a different matter with Norway, which itself has raw materials’, as opposed to Denmark which largely lacked them, and if it had no ‘factories’ it was ‘not Nature’s fault’ but a question of Danish policies. Indeed, Hammer had no doubts that ‘manufactures would be advantageous’ in Norway, not merely economically but also in terms of morality and justice.88 Given ‘the majority and most important of Norway’s raw products are bred in the intestines of the Earth’, and through the ‘sweat’ of ‘thousands’ is ‘born in underground factories’, it was only right that the resultant wealth should be enjoyed by Norwegians rather than ‘shared with neighbours and

86 Pihl, Ringe Tanker, p. 15, 17-18.
87 Pihl, Ringe Tanker, p. 19.
88 Hammer, Philonorvagi, pp. 75-76.
strangers’. In any case it was ‘underground fire’ that ensured Norway’s ‘sources of welfare and blessings’, and Hammer spent far longer discussing the various mineral resources and what might be done with them than he did agriculture or even forestry, from gold and silver through copper and iron to marble and lead, and consistently argued that the country should refine these materials for export as finished goods rather than as raw materials benefitting Danish, Dutch, and Swedish manufactures. And why, he added, could Norwegian marble not compete with that of Italy on European markets? A similar approach informed Hammer’s concluding section on Norway’s vast fisheries, in which he bewailed that his country had allowed its maritime resources to become ‘the source of Holland’s trade and wealth’, even its ‘gold mine’.

Norway had depended on foreigners for too long, and particularly on ‘Danish Manufactures’, allowing others to benefit from its natural wealth at its own expense. A state without trade, he assured his readers, was like a ‘body without a soul; trade gives a State life, sets all its parts in motion and secures the Kingdom strength and respect’. It was, in short, time for Norway to step out of Denmark’s shadow by means of political economy, and Hammer concluded by returning to his book’s beginning, with a lengthy meditation on the nature of patriotism and, with explicit references to Roman republican paragons of ‘virtue’, to the importance of an informed and empowered citizenry dedicated to the improvement of its fatherland. Much like Italian authors at the time found succor in the virtue of emulation and the ability of latecomers to evaluate the policies of more advanced countries, so Pihl had argued that

Though Denmark and Norway are among the last of Europe’s peoples in many economic matters… they can expect to get things right more easily and more quickly than others, because of their form of government, their products, and that advantage they have in the form of knowledge regarding the happy and failed attempts of other nations.

---

89 Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, p. 76.
90 Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, pp. 76-89
93 Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, pp. 93, 100.
Hammer’s project built on the very same foundations; his Philonorvagi drew on contemporary European currents of political economy—though distinctly not on Physiocracy—and adapted them to Norway’s unique conditions in order to suggest the means by which it might ‘improve’ on the various aspects of its economy and claim its rightful place not merely as an equal Kingdom in the union with Denmark but in the international system as such. And his vision of economic regeneration and eventually greatness depended squarely on galvanizing the civic virtue and national pride of the Norwegian ‘folk’.

**Opplysnin**

These were, not surprisingly, the same themes to which Hammer returned in his speech on the Church floor at Hustad with which we began, though, and in spite of the end of press freedom, with greater emphasis. For John Brandt was precisely the sort of patriot Hammer had longed for, embodying the ‘civic virtue [borgerlige Dyd]’ that alone could raise Norway from its knees.  

He drew on the same historical exemplars as the Philonorvagi, from England and Holland to Caesar and Frederick V, who had dedicated himself to the ‘rise of science, the arts, trade, manufactures, agriculture, fisheries, and forestry’ to ensure Norway’s ‘welfare’, and of course to Norway’s ‘old’ traditions.  Yet, and though censorship was back in force, he went even further than he had before, now emphasizing the native right, through which we and others, who are under the Danish Scepter, have become a people of our own [et Folk for sig selv], and who as children of a common father have been ensured all possible child-rights. This immortal memorial to a wise, mild and merciful government, by which his Majesty has shown to open himself the shortest and safest pathway to the people’s hearts; this so long longed for means of encouraging our hidden talents, this trusting letter of insurance for current and coming generations, should unceasingly remind us of what advantages we enjoy compared to other peoples who still must share bread and happiness with people of no rights.

---

Institutions like the Royal Norwegian Scientific Society of Trondheim had finally ‘contributed to the encouragement of industriousness and science’ throughout the land, as well as to ‘a more enlightened way of thinking [oplyst Tankemaade], even in the Kingdom’s most distant regions’. For aside from ‘God’s blessing, as well as Kingly and Princely rewards… there are probably no stronger measures for recasting peoples and countries, than such societies and well-deployed prizes’ like the one he was bestowing Brandt.99

Nature had, Hammer reiterated his Philonorvagi, done its part for Norway, but ‘the countryman becomes useless, unless he lays an industrious hand on the plough’, and the same was true of the miner, drawing on the earth’s ‘hidden treasures’, not to mention with regards to the ‘bottomless source of wealth’ represented by the ocean, which the fisherman had to ‘dare to sail at war with the roaring element, to catch the whale and the sturgeon, the cod and the ling, the halibut and the porpoise’ and ‘other species of fish’.100 ‘Workmanship and enterprise’ were, indeed, at the very core of Hammer’s social, economic, and political vision for Norway, and ‘the holiest, most necessary and beneficial duty in civic life’:

from the King, who wields the scepter, to the Peasant, who wields the plough-whip, they are all bound by work, each according to his calling, in his order, and in his own way; some with their heads, others with their hands; these for the State, others for the necessities of life; each and every one for common happiness.101

Not only was ‘enterprise the mother of welfare’, it lay at the polity’s core.102 If anything, the republican themes that were merely hinted at in Philonorvagi became explicit in his speech, when, addressing his ‘honorable fellow citizens’, Hammer emphasized ‘the most honorable Sacrifice we then can offer our Fatherland, the country, in which we live and enjoy the State’s protection, as citizens, and not like unfree and serf-born slaves, is an

99 Hammer, Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn..., pp. 11-12. See also Even Hammer to Lorenz Wittrup, 16 April 1773, Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskap, Trondheim, Norway, VS III j.nr. 1773-01-16.
100 Hammer, Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn..., p. 13.
honest soul and an active life in fulfilling our duties’.\textsuperscript{103} The key was for individuals to truly patriotic and therefore ‘useful to the public without being forced to’, which would have been a condition good only for ‘slaves’, and John Brandt was nothing less than a symbol of Hammer’s political economy.\textsuperscript{104}

Turning to address Brandt in the Church,

you have transformed the rotting and collapsing houses of Brevig into neat and orderly, yes even stylish buildings, and singlehandedly transformed its rocky lands and its many and wide marshes into fertile fields and meadows, and even enclosed them with handsome and durable fences.\textsuperscript{105}

Not only that, for Brandt had been ‘the first, to have planted and bred a notable quantity of Potatos in these parts, given them out to your neighbours, and taught them to know and use this nourishing host’, taking Hammer’s Cameralist ideal of ‘planting’ more literally than most.\textsuperscript{106} Brandt embodied ‘improvement’ and the pursuit of ‘economic applications’, leading by ‘example’ rather than ‘jealousy’ to promote ‘useful arts and sciences’, ‘the improvement of households and of the earth’, and, of course, ‘love of fatherland’; through him, in short, the ‘old Norwegian allegiance and courage was again brought to life’.\textsuperscript{107} For, as Hammer passionately argued in the rhetorical crescendo by which he ended his speech,

Love of Fatherland leads to love of humanity! Love of humanity to honesty; honesty to happiness in trade and commerce \textsuperscript{handel og vandel}! To renew the ancient allegiance and courage, and ensure that we and our furthest descendants always must think and act, live and die like upright patriots, and true Norwegians!!!\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{103} Hammer, \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, p. 14. The literature on European republicanism is of course immense, but see, for a manifesto, Quentin Skinner, \textit{Liberty before Liberalism}, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997 and, for its diverse European manifestations, Van Gelderen and Skinner (eds.), \textit{Republicanism}.

\textsuperscript{104} Hammer, \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{105} Hammer, \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, p. 15.


\textsuperscript{107} Hammer, \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, pp. 15-20.

\textsuperscript{108} Hammer, \textit{Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn...}, p. 25.
We do not know what became of Brandt, but Hammer continued his work as District Governor until his death in 1800, during the Napoleonic Wars that ultimately would lead to his beloved Norway’s independence from Denmark. Like many reformers of his age, he invested the majority of his time and energy in practical work rather than theoretical pursuits, and he was an exemplary participant of Venturi’s Enlightenment.109 Indeed, practicing what he preached, Hammer left behind a library of 570 volumes, and in his will bequeathed the considerable sum of 30 Riksdaler to The Royal Norwegian Scientific Society in Trondheim, of which he long had been a member, and Romsdal’s Society for Practical Land-Economy [Practiske Landhuusholdningsselskab], which he had helped found, for the purchase of ‘useful books’.110

Undoubtedly, the system to which he contributed set the stage for Norway’s subsequent economic development in the nineteenth century. Already in the opening decades of that century, most travelers agreed that Norwegians were better off than other Scandinavians, and particularly so ‘the lower orders’, which, as the British naturalist and mineralogist Edward Daniel Clarke noted in his accounts from a visit to rural Trøndelag, near where Hammer had been based, appeared ‘to live as well as in England’.111 As Ragnhild Hutchison has demonstrated, Norway embarked on gradual economic transformations and a yeoman ‘pluri-active way to the market economy’ that, though slower than those taken by some other countries, proved to be a “‘softer way” to acclimatise to the new structures of the domestic, European and world economy’ in the late eighteenth century.112 The mountainous terrain that so long had hindered its development in the agricultural periods of mankind’s economic development rapidly became extraordinarily valuable with the technology of the Industrial Revolution, when Norway’s cheap access to energy in the form of uniquely abundant hydropower facilitated rapid industrialization based on its abundant natural resources.113 With time, even Pontoppidan’s ‘springs or

110 See will in Molde byfogd, skifteprotokoll 1786-1800, fol. 286v and following, Statsarkivet i Trondheim, Trondheim, Norway.
112 Hutchison, In the Doorway to Development, p. 221.
113 Kristine Bruland, British Technology and European Industrialization: The Norwegian Textile Industry in the Mid-Nineteenth Century, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. The Angus Maddison Project suggests that there indeed was significant comparative growth in Norway around the middle of the nineteenth
currents of Petroleum’ in the North Sea would be harnessed, helping the country to become, as Hammer had hoped, the world’s happiest.\footnote{114}

Given the intensity and the passionate fervor of his patriotism, it might be more appropriate to consider Hammer a veritable nationalist of the sort that would so characterize Europe in subsequent centuries, though a remarkably early one in the history of Norway.\footnote{115} Indeed, the Philonorvagi may very well be one of the first robust statements of modern Norwegian nationalism. And though he precociously justified his endeavour by recourse to the cosmopolitan ideal, soon more famously expounded by the likes of the Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the Count of Saint-Simon, Giuseppe Mazzini, and Jules Michelet that ‘Love of Fatherland leads to love of humanity!’, nationalism a mere stepping stone to cosmopolis, Hammer seemed to care rather more about the former than the latter.\footnote{116} The word ‘Nation’, after all, derives from the Latin ‘\textit{natio}’, or birth. And his beloved ‘fatherland’ is the equivalent of the Latinate ‘\textit{patria}’, which again is a shorthand for the longer phrase ‘\textit{terra patria}’, translated as ‘\textit{paternal land}’, and from which the term for patriotism derives. Furthermore, \textit{patria} was often connected to the \textit{res publica}, the ‘\textit{land of the fathers}’ with ‘\textit{the public thing}’, which we have to come to think of as politics. Cicero, century, though the country only diverged dramatically from the rest of Europe with oil revenues coming online around 1980. See historical projections of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in The Maddison-Project, \url{http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/maddison-project/home.htm}, 2013 version, on which see Jutta Bolt and Jan Luiten van Zanden (2014), ‘The Maddison Project: Collaborative Research on Historical National Accounts’, \textit{The Economic History Review}, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 627–651, as well as Angus Maddison, \textit{Countours of the World Economy, 1-2030 AD}, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 379.


\footnote{115} For a lengthy attempt to disentangle ‘patriotism’ and ‘nationalism’, see Viroli, \textit{For Love of Country}. On the problems of beginning accounts of ‘nationalism’ only in the nineteenth century, see Hont, ‘Jealousy of Trade’, p. 137 and, on the intrinsic historical relationship between patriotism and nationalism, Hont, ‘Permanent Crisis’, pp. 510-511.

for one, whom Hammer mentioned explicitly, linked *patria* to the liberty and laws of a specific political community. Seemingly, a true ancestral polity was one in which inhabitants were invested and which became their civic world, a basic idea resurrected repeatedly in the Renaissance and early modern periods. Hammer’s form of nationalism was, in effect, rather thick, ranging across the realms of the cultural (what Jean-Jacques Rousseau referred to as ‘national character’ in a draft of his 1765 *Plan for a Constitution for Corsica*), the political, the demographic, and even the landscape itself.\(^{117}\) Hammer’s insistence on the natural ‘genius’ of the Norwegian ‘folk’, on its timeless traditions, active political independence, and unique climate, not to mention his obsession with the mountains, dales, and coasts that made up his ‘nation’, was paramount in his work, a love of fatherland which he wished to promulgate and galvanize through widespread popular educational reforms not unlike those identified by Benedict Anderson as being at the core of later and more famous nation-building processes.\(^{118}\) If one accepts the contemporary equation of virtue with patriotism rendered famous by the likes of Voltaire and Robespierre in the eighteenth century, Hammer was part and parcel of the moment.\(^{119}\)

Yet, compared to the growing nationalism of contemporary Britain, which, as Linda Colley has emphasized, channeled popular patriotic fervor into a decidedly imperialist form, Hammer’s form of independence through improvement was explicitly introspective; looting and pillaging, however broadly conceived, were not on his list.\(^{120}\) Where, for example, the core of British political economy at the time had revolved around importing raw materials and exporting manufactured goods, Hammer was adamant that ‘Norway’ should work ‘its own raw materials’, parenthetically and tellingly adding that ‘with those of others it should not engage’.\(^{121}\) It is difficult to see what, precisely, was ever ‘Physiocratic’ about Hammer’s nationalist political economy, if by Physiocracy one does not merely mean ‘cared about economic matters during the eighteenth century, including agriculture’. After all, he mentioned no Physiocratic works at all in the lengthy

---

121 Hammer, *Philonorvagi*, p. 75. On this aspect of contemporary British political economy, see Reinert, *Translating Empire*, particularly Chapter II.
bibliography he included in his Philonorvagi, and never invoked any distinctly Physiocratic themes, whether regarding the need for large-scale agriculture, legal despotism, a single tax, or the sterility of manufactures. His passionate plea, in its introduction, to ‘ennoble’ Norway’s ‘raw Materials, and gain from that every possible Utility and Advantage’, not to mention his praise of its traditional yeoman farmers, should, if anything, immediately suggest a radically different theoretical and practical framework—and one that would superbly come to fruition in the subsequent century.122

But this is hardly the only time Physiocracy has been projected where it does not belong, equated somehow, in the academic imagination, with Enlightenment economic thought tout court.123 Hammer’s case, in short, offers yet another example of how radically we need to rethink the rich origins of political economy in Enlightenment Europe, and the ever-narrower role Physiocracy can be seen to have played in it.124 More importantly, Hammer’s political economy suggests the need for intellectual historians to show a greater awareness not merely of the context of ideas but also of their broader ecology. For, without inviting environmental determinism, it remains that there were eminently ‘natural’ reasons why latifundian Physiocracy failed to gain traction in places like Norway or for that matter Genoa, which not merely politically and economically but also geologically, geographically, and climatologically simply were not suited for it. And, needless to say, such ecological mindfulness is crucial for what has come to be known as international intellectual history, which, after all, by necessity deals with processes of transmission, reception, and appropriation across what often turn out to be dramatically changing climates and physical landscapes.125

Brian Dolan has recently argued that British travelers to Norway during the eighteenth century observed what he calls an ‘alternative Enlightenment’ in which ‘the state’ played an important role. So Norway is once again, in Dolan’s take, different and far from Europe’s interior. But, in light of recent scholarship, this observation seems rather to

122 Hammer, Philonorvagi, p. 11.
align the region with, than to differentiate it from, the reigning rhythms of European thought and practice. In other words, the observers were surely right about the role of the state, but this, and not Physiocracy, lay at the very core of Enlightenment political economy.\textsuperscript{126} If one really has to apply a label to Hammer’s project, that of ‘Cameralism’ (or even the neologism of ‘Coastal Cameralism’ given its eclectic emphasis on mining but also maritime resources, networks, and itineraries) would be far more appropriate given his administrative vocation, his dual interest in the high realms of theory on the one hand and the practical world of worldly melioration in small states on the other, and of course his openness both to explicitly Cameralist primers on natural resource management and to Italian, French, and English works on the significance of international trade in high value-added goods. As such, Hammer’s work testifies to the influence of Cameralism ‘beyond’, as Ernst Lluch once put it, ‘the Germanic World’, as well as to its ability to make itself relevant for different intellectual but also environmental contexts.\textsuperscript{127} Ultimately, however, Hammer’s world offers new and fruitful perspectives on the richness of the European Enlightenment and the way in which common themes—regarding improvement, public happiness, jealousy of trade, civic virtue, political unions and inter-state relations, even burgeoning nationalism—were emulated and inflected by local conditions, even, as he himself proudly put it, in ‘our cold North’.\textsuperscript{128}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{126}Brian Dolan, Exploring European Frontiers: British Travellers in the Age of Enlightenment, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000, pp. 68-70. The literature underpinning this historiographical shift is immense, but see, for the key case of Britain, among others John Brewer, The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988 and Steven Pincus, 1688: The First Modern Revolution, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009. For further references see also Reinert, Translating Empire.\textsuperscript{126}


\textsuperscript{128}Hammer, Vinskibeligheds høye Fornødenhed og ærefulde Løn..., p. 12.\textsuperscript{128}