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Scandinavians and the League of Nations Secretariat, 1919-1946

Abstract: This article reintroduces the Scandinavian perspective on interwar internationalism by mapping and analysing the Scandinavian staff in the League Secretariat. Combining quantitative and qualitative sources, the article explores how the Scandinavian members of staff were viewed by and situated in the institutional topography of the League Secretariat; how they were related to and positioned towards the national foreign policy establishment; and what the postwar trajectories of the Scandinavian League staff looked like. With these perspectives, the article offers three key insights: First, the interplay between the League Secretariat and the foreign policy strategies pursued by the Scandinavians, was highly productive, and the international issues that different Scandinavian countries engaged with through the League staff was substantially determined by the institutional set-up of the League. Second, we note clear differences in terms of strategy and commitment between the three countries’ Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs). Third, the careers of the Scandinavians working in the Secretariat show a clear continuity of Scandinavian internationalism across the Second World War. The experience, prestige and networks gained from working in the League Secretariat often translated into key positions in postwar IOs or within the new multilateral parts of the MFAs.
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Introduction

It is conventional wisdom that the Scandinavian states are among the oldest and staunchest supporters of international cooperation and international organizations (IOs). E. Shepard Jones pointed this out already in his seminal work on The Scandinavian States and the League of Nations in 1939. Shepard Jones made the point that the Scandinavian countries were characterized by a certain aloofness from European power politics, which allowed them to work actively, impartially and persistently to strengthen the League’s organizational capacity, international law, arbitration and disarmament. This view has since been echoed by other writers and is still with us today as IR scientists conceptualize Scandinavia as an ‘island of peace’ and the Scandinavian states as ‘international norm entrepreneurs’ in IOs.

However, even if this point has been made at a general level, the Scandinavian countries’ relations with the League of Nations, and later the UN, are still underexplored. On the one hand,
historiography on the League of Nations has for many years focused on the position and function of
the organization in relation to great power politics and contemporary transnational history
approaches still tend to favour Anglo-American, French and German contextualizations. In
keeping with this tradition, recent studies of the League’s employees have focused on the
Secretariat or on British and Italian members of staff. On the other hand, Scandinavian
historians have only very recently taken an interest in the Scandinavian countries’ relations with the
League of Nations. Interpreted either as a naïve, idealist foreign policy strategy or a calculated,
strategic way of boosting sovereignty and international prestige, League of Nations policies were
for many years given a marginal role in the national foreign policy histories of the three
Scandinavian countries. This has changed over the last decade as studies of Norway’s and
Denmark’s policies towards the League have appeared and scholarly interest in internationalism in
Scandinavia been growing as part of a broader emergence of studies on international organizations
conducted in and from the perspective of smaller states. However, Scandinavian explorations of
internationalist politics have until now been rather removed from the recent and more global
exploration of internationalism and with Norbert Götz as a notable, recent exception, historians
in Scandinavia have usually stopped short of combining insights from the various national foreign
policy studies to characterize Scandinavia as a collective international actor in relation to the
League.

It is the aim of this article to connect these different historiographical trends and reintroduce
the collective Scandinavian perspective in relation to the League by mapping and analysing the
Scandinavian staff in the organization. We believe that studying the Scandinavian League staff is
particularly apt to shed new light on the relationship between the Scandinavian states and this first
major international organization for two reasons. First, the Scandinavian members of staff
constituted an important group of political and cultural brokers who presented Scandinavia’s public
image to the organization and brought back information and ideas from the League. Second, and
perhaps more importantly, it allows us to break with the methodological nationalism that has
characterized most Scandinavian foreign policy historiography.

More specifically, this article assumes that the Scandinavian League staff offers a very
potent analytical prism to explore how the Scandinavian states were viewed from the first
international, multilateral hub and how they perceived themselves and their relationships with the
League, thus teasing out both key similarities and important differences. By shining a light on the
Scandinavian League staff from this perspective, the article taps into a broader shift in the study of
IOs that increasingly use these multilateral bodies as analytical entry points to explore international
politics in new ways. By looking at the Scandinavian members of staff we are able to see how
national and regional qualities were viewed and assessed from an international institutional perspective and how ‘Scandinavia’ was operationalized as a concept and currency by these international actors as well as national foreign policy makers. Moreover, by exploring early Scandinavian foreign policy engagement with IOs, we see that the Danish, Swedish and Norwegian officials within the Secretariat played an important part in socializing the MFAs to multilateral practices. The article thus clearly displays the fruitfulness of further studies that investigate the multilateralization of Scandinavian foreign services across the Second World War.

In order to explore the Scandinavian staffing question in the League, the article is structured in four parts. First, we offer a brief outline of the Scandinavian policies towards the League in the interwar period. In the second section, we explore how the Scandinavian members of staff were viewed by and situated in the institutional topography of the League Secretariat. In the third section, we explore how the Scandinavians working in the Secretariat were related to and positioned towards the national foreign policy establishment and other political and professional milieus and networks to determine the gatekeeping mechanisms through which they were allowed into the Secretariat and what their presence in the Secretariat tells us about similarities and differences in Norwegian, Swedish and Danish foreign policy strategies. In the fourth and final section, we sketch the postwar trajectories of the Scandinavian League staff, considering how the professional experience as League officials helped shape what was often prominent careers as diplomats or international civil servants.

The article is based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative sources. The starting point of our analysis of the Secretariat is the so-called LONSEA-database that holds information on the nationality, age, gender, job rank and institutional affiliation of all the c. 4000 people employed in the Secretariat from 1919 to 1946. By breaking down and visualizing this information, we have been able to establish an overview of the Scandinavian presence in the Secretariat, its development over time and key similarities and differences among the Scandinavian states and between the Scandinavian group and other national groups within the Secretariat. While this quantitative mapping provides the background and context for our analysis, the mainstay of the article is based on archival documents from the League and the three Scandinavian Foreign Ministries. From the League of Nations, we draw on two types of material: the personnel files of the Secretariat, containing information on the hiring, promotions and evaluations of each employee in the organization, and the proceedings from the Appointments Committee (AC), an internal executive committee under the leadership of the Secretary-General which discussed and made decisions in all matters of importance relating to the recruitment and promotion of League staff. The international institutional perspective that emerges from these sources has been balanced and supplemented with
files on the League Secretariat and League employees in all three Scandinavian Foreign Ministries as well as a small selection of private papers from Scandinavian League employees.17

The League of Nations in Scandinavian Foreign Policy

During the First World War, the Scandinavian countries had been neutral. For this reason, they were not part of the Paris Peace Conference negotiations. Nonetheless, they, and other ex-neutral states, were invited to become founding members of the League of Nations. All three governments accepted the invitation. The League in many ways represented a continuation of the pre-war Scandinavian efforts to promote liberal internationalist ideas and practices such as arbitration, cultural cooperation and the proliferation of free trade. With the League, the Scandinavian states found a new arena for promoting a legally regulated international system more hospitable to small and vulnerable states such as themselves.

However, seen from a neutral perspective, the League was not without its problems. The exclusion of Germany from the organization was highly problematic as it would place the Scandinavian states at the frontier of any future conflicts between the League and Germany. Likewise, the Scandinavian foreign policy elites were highly sceptical of the international sanctions introduced in the Covenant, which obliged all members to apply economic and military sanctions against any state in breach of the Covenant – even if that state was not a member of the League.

For this reason, League membership met some opposition during the ratification process. In Norway, the Norwegian Labour Party criticized the League for merely being a continuation of the wartime Entente, a criticism which was shared by Swedish conservatives, who had strong sympathies for Germany.18 The Danish Parliament, by contrast, voted unanimously in favour of joining the League. This was in large part due the cession of Northern Schleswig from Germany to Denmark, a matter that had been settled as part of the Versailles Treaty and that placed Danish policy makers under a strong moral obligation to support the organization set up to guard the new territorial status quo. Nonetheless, among the three Scandinavian states, Denmark was most apprehensive of League membership. Denmark was the smallest and geopolitically most vulnerable Scandinavian country, situated deep within the German sphere of influence. Getting entangled in the many disputes that played out in the League could have critical consequences for Danish security, possibly even survival. For this reason, Danish foreign policy makers pursued a more cautious and reactive approach to the League than Norway and Sweden, something that was often
obscured by the coordination of Scandinavian foreign policy strategies and an outside perception of Scandinavia as a unitary bloc in Geneva.19

The creation of the League of Nations meant that the Scandinavian states had to develop new forms of diplomatic representation. Apart from traditional diplomatic presence in Geneva through their embassies, the Scandinavian countries were represented at the political level in the League Council20 and at the yearly League Assemblies with delegations that included political heavyweights from parliament, prominent internationalists and women’s rights activists.21 However, the form of representation associated with the Secretariat is peculiar due to the ambiguous double mandate bestowed on the international civil servants: on the one hand, they were assumed to be neutral bureaucrats, loyal to the League, and, on the other, they served as symbolic and actual representations of the prestige, power and political influence of their state of origin.22 For this reason, the question of national representation in the Secretariat is an interesting prism through which to explore issues of state identity, sovereignty and international prestige among the Scandinavian states in European inter-war politics.

**Scandinavians in the League Secretariat**

Under the guidance of the first Secretary-General of the League of Nations, Sir Eric Drummond, the Secretariat was organized along functional lines, with so-called Sections covering specific topics – such as health, disarmament, and information – and Directors heading each Section. Above this, one found the Under-Secretaries-General, representing the major powers and having a rather ambassadorial role within the Secretariat. There were three categories of Sections: Those pertaining to general issues concerning the whole of the Secretariat and League (such as the Information Section and the Legal Section); those dealing with new regimes of sovereignty governance (such as the Mandates Section and the Minorities Section); and those engaged in technical matters (such as the Health Section and Social Questions and Opium Traffic Section). To this came the Sections and Services dealing with the internal administration of the Secretariat itself.23 The fact that the League Secretariat was structured along specific functionally limited subjects, opened up particular administrative spaces for Scandinavians, and thus shaped the direction of Scandinavian interwar internationalism.

In this article, we focus on the Scandinavians in the Secretariat who held the rank of Members of Section (or a similar status) – that is League officials often with academic training who held posts with independent administrative responsibility similar to diplomats of national foreign
services. In doing so, we study 26 (21 male, 5 female) of the 51 Scandinavians (32 male, 19 female) who worked in the League. Looking at these positions, we study the prestigious mid-range echelons of the Secretariat where national competition for staff positions was most fierce. The Great Powers had monopolized the top posts, such as Secretary-General, Deputy- and Under-Secretary Generals, while the lower grade clerical and menial work was dominated by British, French and especially Swiss (local) staff.

Let us first consider the Scandinavian presence in the League Secretariat from a *temporal-quantitative* perspective, i.e. how many Scandinavians worked in the Secretariat and how this changed over time. Being founding members of the League of Nations, the Scandinavians were represented in the Secretariat for the duration of its existence and were centrally placed already during the first years of building up the administration. The first Scandinavian hired, at the close of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, was the Norwegian diplomat Erik Colban, who became the first Director of the Administrative and Minorities Section (1920-27), and later Director of the Disarmament Section (1927-30). Colban was soon accompanied in the Administrative and Minorities Section, by the Dane Helmer Rosting. In addition to Colban and Rosting, two Swedes joined in 1920: Åke Hammarskjöld (Legal Section) and Per Jacobsson (Economic and Financial Section). By 1923, the Scandinavians had eight members, including one Director, representing almost 10 per cent of this type of officials. Thus, the Scandinavians were comparatively well represented within the Secretariat at an early stage and they kept a relatively even presence, in absolute numbers, throughout the inter-war years. At the end of the 1930s, the number of Scandinavians even rose and peaked with 10 higher officials in 1939 (cf. figure 1).
However, if we look at the relative Scandinavian presence in the Secretariat, a somewhat different picture emerges. The number of Scandinavians remained relatively stable both as the Secretariat doubled its size from 1923 to 1931 and when it declined and the number of League staff was reduced from 1931 onwards (figure 2). The Scandinavian share of staff, therefore, fluctuated quite substantially (figure 3).
relative representation of Scandinavians in the Leagues Secretariat.

The declining proportion of Scandinavian staff in the 1920s was a reflection of an increasing internationalization of the Secretariat. Many South American, Baltic and Eastern European Member States were poorly represented in the early Secretariat and new states joined the League, most notably Germany (1926) which got 15 Members of Sections, half of them in the first two years of membership. It is less obvious why the Scandinavian presence remained stable during the 1930s and increased during the Second World War; seen in relative terms, Scandinavian representation doubled from 5 per cent in 1931 to more than 10 per cent from 1940 onwards. We shall return to this question later.

Another way to characterize the Scandinavian presence in the Secretariat is to ask where the Scandinavians were within the Secretariat. Here, the general patterns and traits are relatively striking. First, Scandinavians were distinctly underrepresented in the three general sections of the Secretariat, i.e. the Legal, Political and Information Sections. The Political Section, which was the diplomatic flagship of the Secretariat, was the territory of the great powers: It was under French and Japanese leadership in its first 13 years of existence and the French, British, Italian and Japanese made up half of the sections personnel (cf. figure 4). During its 26 years of existence, only one Scandinavian worked as a higher official there: the Dane Ludwig de Krabbe, who became the head of section in 1933 (more on Krabbe below).
Likewise, in the Legal Section Åke Hammarskjöld (Sweden) served as the lone Scandinavian Member of Section and for merely two years (1920-1922). The Information Section was the biggest section of the League Secretariat, fluctuating between 12 and 20 higher officials between 1921 and 1940. Strikingly, it had only one Scandinavian amongst its higher staff, the abovementioned Ludwig de Krabbe, from 1921 to 1930.

The under-representation of Scandinavia in the general sections was balanced by a strong and consistent over-representation of Scandinavians in a handful of specialized sections. Thus, there was a robust Danish-Norwegian representation in sections that dealt with the new, complicated regimes of sovereignty and rights, such as Mandates and Minorities, where Great- and Continental Powers had conflicting interests. The most striking example is the Administrative and Minorities Section (Figure 5), where there were two or even three (1931-33) higher officials from Scandinavia between 1920 and 1936, out of a total of four to nine. Even more important, the Minorities Section was headed almost exclusively by a Danish-Norwegian leadership; in the formative years between 1919 and 1927 by Norwegian Erik Colban, and between 1934 and 1936 by Helmer Rosting. He was followed by his compatriot Peter Christian Skov (1936-1937) while the last director was Rasmus Skylstad (1938-1942) again a Norwegian.
Likewise, the small Mandates Section – between three to five higher officials – was also thoroughly Danish-Norwegian, a Dane or Norwegian holding one of the positions in the entire period. Between 1923 and 1930, this was Finn Tage Blichfeldt Friis (Danish) and from 1931 Peter Martin Anker (Norwegian). He held this position until 1939, when the section became part of the Department of General Affairs, as the League scaled down its commitments with the outbreak of war. After the outbreak of the war, he remained the only official in charge of mandates issues.\\[31\\]

The Swedish higher officials set themselves apart from Danish and Norwegian staff as they were centred around the Economic and Financial Section and the Social Questions and Opium Traffic Section. The Economic and Financial Section was by 1921 the second largest section of the Secretariat. As shown in Figure 6, there were two or three Swedes working in the Economic Sections from 1921 onwards – and hardly any Swedes anywhere else in the Secretariat; as Colban complained when Folke Hilgerdt was appointed to the Economic Section in 1927 ‘all the Swedes in the Secretariat were in the Economic Section’, calling for a Swede in one of the more political sections, to ‘undertake liaison work with his Government’.\\[32\\]
While this did not happen, during the 1930s, the Swedish presence expanded to the Social Questions and Opium Traffic Section as the Swede Erik Einan Ekstrand became the Director of the Section in 1931 – a post he held until 1946. Two years earlier, in 1929, Bertil Arne Renborg had joined the section, starting as a member of section and advancing to become its chief in 1939.

In sum, we see a clear under-representation of Scandinavian staff in the General Services, a clear over-representation in the Specialized Services, and a clear distinction within the Specialized Services between Danes and Norwegians in the politically charged sovereignty governance sections (Mandates and Minorities) and the Swedes in the Economic and Social sections.
The strong Scandinavian presence in these sections also goes a long way to explain the prominent Scandinavian role in the Secretariat after the outbreak of the Second World War hinted to above (cf. also Figure 7); whereas many of the general services, where the Scandinavians were underrepresented, dwindled into obscurity relatively quickly after the outbreak of the war, the specialized services declined less rapidly, even if they merged into a new ‘departmental’ structure in 1939/1940. Particularly the Economic and Financial Section, moving to Princeton during the war, would retain its size and prestige.

**Scandinavia Articulated**

Why was the Scandinavian presence distributed in this distinct fashion? We answer this by adding a discursive prism – based on a structured reading of minutes of the Appointments Committee (AC) – in order to consider the connotations, values and assumptions associated with ‘Scandinavia’ among the Secretariat leadership. Apart from its default meaning – referring to the countries of Sweden, Denmark and Norway – ‘Scandinavia’ was often imbued with four interconnected meanings.

*Scandinavia meant small European power.* This was perhaps the most commonly evoked meaning of Scandinavia. For example, when the AC sought to find a new Member of the Health Section in June 1922, the Secretary-General wanted ‘to appoint a Scandinavian or someone of a nationality other than French, British or Polish’, i.e. the major Western and Central European members. In this definition, Scandinavia was often mentioned together with the Netherlands, Finland or Austria, for it was not *any*, but a European, and mainly a Western European, small power that was in demand. Thus, when, in August 1922, the choice was between a Scandinavian and a South American candidate to the Minorities Section, both good candidates from disinterested countries, a weighty argument was that ‘a man of non-European nationality would not be likely to understand the minorities question or be conversant with them’.

Another variation, which drew on some of the same connotations, was that *Scandinavia meant ex-neutral countries.* This interpretation became more prevalent with the entry of Germany in the League in 1926. The German member of the AC consistently recommended officials from countries that were neutral or non-aligned during the Great War. In 1928, when the Secretariat was looking for a replacement for Colban as Director of the Minorities Section, Secretary-General Drummond, after having had several qualified candidates blocked by the German member of the AC for not being disinterested, complained that ‘he had for some time felt that there was a danger
of the idea gaining ground that appointments to Directorships should be limited to candidates from ex-neutral countries’.\(^{35}\) Germany’s emphasis on ‘ex-neutrals’ would affect several appointments, not least the all-important appointment of the Director for the Disarmament Section in 1930, prior to the World Disarmament Conference. The Secretary-General himself – sensitive to German attitudes – remarked \textit{a priori} that the ‘choice was very limited as no Great Powers could be appointed, nor a national from a country which was especially associated with one of the Great Powers’.\(^{36}\) The German Foreign Ministry stated explicitly that they wanted a Scandinavian as ‘\textit{wir bei einem Skandinavier als Angehörigen eines im Weltkrieg neutralen Landes auf grösstmögliche Unparteilichkeit rechnen}’.\(^{37}\) As Norway was already well-represented and Denmark wanted to stay aloof, the AC was flooded with Swedish candidates, put forward by Germany, Denmark and Sweden.\(^{38}\) In the end, the choice fell on the long-serving Greek League official Thanassis Aghnides, a candidate Germany was not inclined to unilaterally block as Greece ‘\textit{ja auch nur gezwungen worden, uns den Krieg zu erklären}’, according to Under Secretary-General Albert Dufour-Féronce.\(^{39}\)

Yet another interpretation of ‘Scandinavian’ was \textit{non-colonial and non-mandatory European power}. On the one hand, this quality made Scandinavian officials possible ‘balancing’ members in the Mandates Section, with no vested interests in colonial or mandatory matters. In this context, it played no role that Denmark held supremacy over Greenland; what mattered in Geneva was that the Scandinavian states were not mandatory powers and that they played no role in any potential conflicts between the Great Powers and their global empires.\(^{40}\) However, \textit{non-colonial and non-mandatory} could just as easily be construed as lacking in experience. This was most apparent when the Italian Vito Catastini\(^{41}\), Member of the Mandates Section, argued that the Dane Finn T. B. Friis should be transferred away from the Section on the grounds that ‘\textit{the Section should be permanently filled only by candidates having enjoyed effective experience in colonial administration}’.\(^{42}\) At that point, the first Director of the Mandates Section, the Swiss William Rappard\(^{43}\), himself from a non-colonial and non-mandatory European power, did not see ‘colonial experience’ as a necessity.\(^{44}\) Thus, both versions of \textit{non-colonial} and \textit{non-mandatory} existed within the Secretariat from the early years.\(^{45}\)

Last, all these combined, in various ways, with the wide-spread opinion that being ‘Scandinavian’, meant coming from countries with a \textit{developed administrative culture and possessing sufficient language skills}. When the AC was looking for a replacement for Rappard as Head of the Mandates Section, Drummond and Rappard both emphasized the importance of the person in question being ‘thoroughly conversant with English’. Given that it could not be a national of the Mandatory powers, Rappard argued, the choice among English-speaking nationalities was
limited to Canada and Ireland, while it could be possible to find suitable and capable candidates among Scandinavians or Americans. Likewise, when looking for an administratively skilled person for the top post in the Secretariat’s registry, the Secretary-General held that only candidates of English or French nationality would have sufficient linguistic and administrative skills. If he had to look outside the two countries, he thought ‘the best candidates’ could be ‘found in Scandinavia, Holland and Belgium’.46

The blend of these qualities made Scandinavians particularly suited for politically contested Sections where the Great Powers were in fundamental disagreement and goes a long way to explain the strong Norwegian and Danish presence in the Minorities, Mandates and Disarmament Section. At a more fundamental level, it also highlights how the Scandinavian presence in the League Secretariat was shaped by institutional pressures and perceptions of their political and professional qualities in Geneva.

The discursive pattern laid out above also helps explain the Scandinavian absence in the general services. Since ‘everyone’ had to be represented in the Secretariat to some degree, and Scandinavians were seen as qualified and well-suited for the tricky and politicized jobs in the Mandates, Minorities and Disarmament Section, there was little room for Scandinavian presence in other parts of the Secretariat. This pattern was probably amplified by a certain path dependency: once an official of a specific nationality had taken up a position in the Secretariat, it increased the likelihood that it would remain in the hands of the same Member State, not only because a particular nationality was considered particularly suited for that job but also because once the ‘right’ national composition of a politically contested section was found, the Secretary-General wanted to avoid undoing it.

**The League Secretariat in Scandinavia – patterns of recruitment and promotions**

**Official diplomacy and Scandinavian League of Nations staff**

The Scandinavians who came to work for the League were recruited in many different ways, through various kinds of networks and based on diverse professional skills and experiences. However, a certain pattern does stand out and it reveals that even if Scandinavians were viewed as a homogenous group in Geneva, the three Scandinavian states approached the issue of staffing quite differently.
The most important difference that we note is the level and kind of Foreign Ministry involvement in appointments. In this regard, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs was particularly involved and created a loop where all Norwegian higher officials in the Secretariat came from the MFA and re-joined it following their Geneva-days.

Being a young ministry, membership of the League confronted the Norwegian MFA with many principled questions of procedure. After the entry of Erik Colban into the Secretariat in 1919 recruitment procedures found their shape between him and the Secretary General of the MFA August Esmarch. From 1923 onwards, recruitment strategies were streamlined through the MFA as upon Colban’s request, Esmarch prepared lists of suitable candidates for posts in the Secretariat distributed to all ministries while the MFA promised temporary leave without loss of seniority to stimulate recruitment. The MFA sent relatively young men in the midst of their careers and on their way up, signaling that positions within the Secretariat was highly prioritized.

Having Norwegian diplomats serve in the Secretariat for a limited time was a way of boosting the MFA’s competences, internationalizing its personnel, and ensuring mutual understanding. A letter from Norwegian Member of the Minorities and then Social Questions Section Hans Christian Berg to Drummond from 1928 is revealing in this respect: Noting that he soon had to return to the Norwegian MFA, he asked to be transferred to a new section that dealt with ‘questions of a political character’, such as Minorities or Mandates. ‘The wider and more varied my experience in League work would be’, Berg reasoned, ‘the better I should become equipped for my future work, and this might perhaps ultimately be of use to the League itself.’

What is also remarkable, compared to the other Scandinavian countries, is the force with which the Norwegian Government pushed their official Norwegian candidates. Rasmus Skylstad’s name, for example, was put to the Secretariat not only by Mr. Masen, the Norwegian Permanent Delegate, but also in personal letters from Foreign Minister Halvdan Koht and Norwegian President of the Parliament, and chairman of the League Assembly’s Supervisory Commission, C. J. Hambro. All three made clear that this was a concerted effort to remedy the fact that ‘Norway was quite inadequately represented on the staff of the Secretariat’. We see the same pattern with Peter M. Anker, as Prime Minister Mowinckel made a personal plea to Drummond to take Anker on board.

The Swedish government took a very different approach. While being active on a political level in the League, exemplified by the early attempt to get one of the non-permanent seats in the League Council, the Swedish MFA hesitated to push candidates into the Secretariat. Only four of the ten Swedish officials who worked for the Secretariat had a Foreign Office background and Swedish recruitments were more a result of connections between the League Secretariat and the individual candidates than any coherent strategy on the Swedish government’s part. As pointed out
above, the League met substantial political scepticism in Swedish conservative and agrarian milieus and the recruitment of the first Swedish member of the Secretariat, Åke Hammarskjöld, reflected this initial distrust and hesitation.

In July 1919, Colban suggested Hammarskjöld – a ‘more than ordinarily intelligent […] man’ – as a candidate for the Legal Section. Hammarskjöld, son of the wartime Swedish Prime Minister Hjalmar Hammarskjöld, was Secretary to the Swedish legation in Washington at the time. To draw him in, Director of the Legal Section, Joost van Hamel, offered him a place on the Advisory Board for the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ). Colban was in full support, adding that it was ‘highly recommendable, to interest Sweden in the League’. However, Hammarskjöld hesitated, making it clear that he could not leave the diplomatic service unless the ‘question of Sweden entering League [was] settled’ and that he did not wish to enter the service of the international organisation, if Sweden’s ‘negative attitude’ would prevail. At this point, Drummond offered Hammarskjöld the prestigious task of planning the establishment of the PCIJ. While the Swedish Parliament had not yet voted on membership – they would do so in March 1920 – Hammarskjöld found this ‘new offer so advantageous from the Swedish viewpoint’ that it was impossible to refuse. One month later, he joined the Secretariat. Hammarskjöld thus joined the League, not because the Swedish MFA wanted him to go, but because the Secretariat wanted him to come and because of his own personal judgment.

The passive attitude of the Swedish MFA towards the Secretariat continued throughout the inter-war period. Only once, in 1929, did it present an official Swedish candidate, when Bertil Renborg, a mid-range MFA official, was proposed for the Social Questions Section. Renborg was appointed as a Member of Section after what we could call a Norwegian pattern, being very much an official candidate, equipped with letters of recommendation from the MFA supplemented with a personal letter to the Head of Section from the Minister in Berne. When, two years later, Erik Ekstrand was appointed Director in the same section, this happened despite of rather than because of the MFA. Ekstrand was an Uppsala graduate who had joined the MFA in 1907. In 1923, he was appointed member of the Commission Mixte of the Greco-Turkish population exchange, before he was sent, against his wish, to Buenos Aires as Swedish Minister. Hearing that Colban had left the Minorities Section to become director of the Disarmament Section, Ekstrand made a bold move. Via the British ambassador to Berlin, an old acquaintance of his, Ekstrand angled for the position of Director of the Minorities Section in 1927. Though interested, Drummond was put off by the fact that Ekstrand had no other recommendation and that he had not submitted an official application. Drummond was, however, keen to strengthen the ties between the League and Sweden with another appointment. The situation grew more
complicated, when Drummond learned that Ekstrand had only recently been appointed to Buenos Aires, and that the Swedish Government expected him to stay for a while. Meanwhile, Ekstrand received a severe reprimand from the Swedish MFA, for going behind their backs. While the Directorship of the Minorities Section was eventually given to a Spaniard, Drummond informed Ekstrand that he had put him on the list of the candidates for the Directorship of the Disarmament Section thus signaling that he was among those eligible for Directorships. When Dame Rachel Crowdy’s contract as Chief of the Social Questions and Opium Traffic Section in 1931 was not prolonged, Ekstrand got the post.

It is unclear why the Swedish governments took such a passive and disinterested stance towards the staffing of the Secretariat. Given that Sweden pursued a bold and active line on important political matters in the League, the hesitation probably cannot be explained with neutralist concerns and reservations. It is more likely that the Swedish government concentrated its efforts in the League at the political level and considered the administrative politics of the Secretariat of secondary importance. This stands in marked contrast to Denmark where fear of compromising neutrality was a defining feature in the MFA’s handling of the bureaucratic politics of the Secretariat.

On the face of it, Denmark’s official interactions with the Secretariat looked similar to that of the Swedish MFA; the links between the ministry and the Secretariat were sporadic and the MFA played a marginal role as a facilitator of recruitments: only two of the six Danes in the Secretariat in the 1920s had MFA backgrounds and none of them had been promoted for their jobs by the MFA. The two former diplomats were Ludwig de Krabbe who joined the Secretariat in 1920 as a Member of the Information Section and Finn T.B. Friis, a political economist who joined the Secretariat in 1923, working first in the Mandates- (1923-30) then Disarmament Section (1930-1940).

The Danish foreign policy establishment’s disinterest in the Secretariat continued throughout the 1920s. In the fall of 1925, the League Council discussed the appointment of a new High Commissioner to Danzig and it was agreed that the High Commissioner should come from a neutral country. Feelers had therefore been put out to the Danish government, who, however, responded negatively. As the Danish Ambassador to Bern summed up the Danish position:

I fail to see how filling politically charged posts created through the Versailles Treaty with Danes would serve our interests[…] Quite the opposite: I believe that it is in our best interest to stay away from these posts and that we should not under any circumstances take any initiatives.

Clearly, the tricky and politized jobs that the Secretariat considered the Scandinavians particularly
well suited for, could also be seen as a foreign policy liability, as was the case for Denmark. Eventually, the Dutch head of the Legal Section, van Hamel, took the position in Danzig. This, however, created a new job opening requiring Danish attention as van Hamel left his position as Director of the League’s Legal Section open. In line with its preoccupation with the political work in the League, the Swedish government considered promoting the prominent former Swedish Social Democratic Foreign Minister and legal scholar Östen Undén for the position. This the Danish government warmly supported. Over the next four months, Swedish and Danish diplomats worked closely together to promote Undén’s candidature in London and Geneva. Drummond did not, however harbour particularly friendly feelings for Undén. As Danish Ambassador to Berlin, Herluf Zahle pointed out, ‘Swedish independence and dogmatism has not always been appreciated in Geneva, a place rich with compromise.’ This lead the Swedish government to change tact and go for a ‘Scandinavian’ candidate instead. Even then, having the possibility of getting a Dane at the highest level in the Secretariat presented to them, the Danish MFA remained uninterested.

However, the Danish attitude started to change in 1929 when Peter Munch became Foreign Minister in a Social Democratic/social liberal coalition government that held power until 1940. Munch was a staunch liberal internationalist who had been involved in transnational peace activities since the early 1900s. His appointment coincided with German and Italian attempts at getting the Secretariat under tighter national control, which sparked a new and positive awareness about the importance of getting ‘neutral’, competent people into the Secretariat. Munch’s scope for activism was further enhanced by the fact that the League’s diminishing prestige from the early 1930s created new types of job openings for candidates from smaller countries as other, more prominent member states left or took diminishing interest in the League.

A clear indication of the Danish change in attitude was the MFA’s active promotion of Helmer Rosting, the Danish Secretariat official mentioned earlier, to make him Chief of the Minorities Section in 1930. The transformation was complete, when in 1932 Rosting, again backed by the MFA, was appointed High Commissioner to Danzig, the post that the MFA would not touch five years earlier. The MFAs support of Danish staff continued when Rosting, who had become Director of the Minority Section in 1935, was let go in 1936 after he had proved to be rather incompetent at this job. Munch now swiftly intervened to have him replaced by the Danish diplomat Peter Skov, who headed the Section from 1936 to 1937. Munch’s active handling of the crisis marked the highpoint of Danish involvement in the League Secretariat – and it was driven by the personal activism of Munch.
Economic networks - Sweden

The Scandinavian MFAs were not the only gateways to the League. When the economist Per Jacobsson was recruited to the Secretariat in 1920, it marked the start of a distinct Swedish recruitment pattern, where staff was drawn into the Economic and Financial Section through particular Swedish academic networks.

Jacobsson himself was hired via one of the many economic conferences the League organized during the early 1920s. Searching for economic assistants for the preparation of the 1920 Economic Conference in Brussels, the Director of the Economic and Financial Section had asked Gustav Cassel,79 Professor of economy at Stockholm University, if he could recommend suitable candidates. This way, Jacobsson was appointed for a period of three months, which in 1921 turned into a five years contract with the Secretariat.80 Together with the British economist Alexander Loveday, Jacobsson became one of the most prominent Members of Section until he left in 1928 to become the Director of the newly formed Swedish ‘Economic Defence Commission’.81

Jacobsson was soon followed by another Swedish economist, Ansgar Rosenborg, who joined the Secretariat in 1921. Rosenborg, like Jacobsson, was a graduate from Uppsala University. He had worked for the Royal Swedish Board of Trade. As opposed to the high-flying Jacobsson, Rosenborg, a diligent bureaucrat, severed all ties with his former employer in Sweden in order to get a lifetime contract with the League and remained there longer than any other Swedish official.82

The economic section was later populated by more Swedes: In 1927, the statistician Folke Hilgerdt joined the ranks83 and during the 1930s, Bertil Ohlin and Bengt Helger, were hired as economic experts, while John Lindberg was transferred from the ILO to the Financial Section and Economic Intelligence Service.84 The strong Swedish presence in the economic sections is underlined by the fact, that three of the Swedish employees, Rosenborg, Hilgerdt and Lindberg, crossed the Atlantic to continue the work of the Economic Section in Princeton during the Second World War and later went to work for the UN.85

The Swedish economists’ network also reached into Denmark as Jacobsson in 1922 toured Scandinavia for talent to work on the Secretariat’s all-important model for the allocation of League expenses. Here he came across Christian Olsen who worked in the Danish Ministry of Finance as Head of Statistics of Finance86 whom he wanted for the job. Olsen was granted permission by the Ministry to join the League for a year from 1923 to 1924.87 However, here too the early Danish lack of enthusiasm for the Secretariat shone through as Olsen was only allowed to stay on for an additional six months to finish his work88 after the Danish Ambassador to Bern, Oldenburg, had
pointed out that turning down the Secretariat’s request to extend his contract would leave a ‘decidedly unfavourable’ impression in Geneva.\textsuperscript{89}

**Humanitarianism and technical expertise – Denmark and Sweden**

In Denmark, there was no parallel to the Swedish economic network. Danish League officials who were not recruited through the MFA, instead gained access to the Secretariat through their humanitarian and technical expertise. The most prominent example of this is Helmer Rosting, mentioned above. Rosting had worked in prison camps in France during and immediately after the war, first for the YMCA, then for the Danish Red Cross.\textsuperscript{90} He joined the Secretariat as the first Dane in 1920\textsuperscript{91} after having secured the support of French political leader and peace activist Léon Bourgeois.\textsuperscript{92} In 1921, another Dane with a background in the Red Cross, Knud Stouman, joined the Secretariat. A statistician by training, Stouman had worked for the International Red Cross during the First World War before becoming Head of Department for *Statistiques sanitaires in the Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix Rouge* in Geneva. In 1921, he was appointed a Member of the League’s Health Section.\textsuperscript{93}

Entirely unrelated to either the MFA or the Red Cross gateway, two Danish women also made their way to Geneva. They did so thanks to their technical skills in statistics and accounting. The first of the two, Gabriele Rohde, had an education in language, statistics and fashion design. In 1926, she had taken up a job as a statistical clerk at the Danish National Serum Institute\textsuperscript{94} and in 1928, she became a temporary assistant in the League’s Health Section at the recommendation of the Institute’s Director, Thorvald Madsen.\textsuperscript{95} Landing a permanent position as senior assistant in its pensions fund in 1931, Rohde became one of the League’s leading actuarial capacities and was promoted to member of section in 1939.\textsuperscript{96} The other Danish woman to make it to the level of member of section was Karen Petersen. Petersen held a degree in translation and interpretation (English) from the University of Copenhagen. In 1936, she joined the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation\textsuperscript{97} and her on-the-job-training in statistics and economics here landed her a job in the Secretariat in 1938 as temporary mathematical clerk in the staff pensions fund. After working on a series of short-term contracts, she was promoted to Member of Section in 1943.

Though article 7 of the Covenant was supposed to ensure equal access to all positions within the Secretariat for women and men, a complex set of circumstances (such as established social norms; lacking education; limited prior experience and mechanisms to withhold promotions) saw women – across nationalities – systematically underrepresented in higher positions within the League.\textsuperscript{98} The only other Scandinavian women to hold a prominent position in the Secretariat was
the Swedish Essy Key-Rasmussen who had joined the organization already in 1921 and had a long career in the Transport & Communication Section, where she stayed for 18 years.99

**Invisible networks – Denmark, Norway, Sweden**

As we have seen, recruitments for the Secretariat did not follow one consistent pattern across Scandinavia. In Norway, producing and promoting candidates for the Secretariat was an integral and highly prioritized part of national foreign policy from the early 1920s. In Denmark, this only gradually became the case, as Peter Munch became Foreign Minister in 1929. The Swedish Foreign Ministry, on its part, remained largely reactive with the Secretariat (prioritizing, it seems, a more political presence), as Swedish officials in Geneva were either pulled into the organisation by the Secretariats’ efforts or recruited through academic networks.

However, the above mapping of the individual recruitments into the Secretariat does not catch the full complexity of the environments and networks that shaped and facilitated the Scandinavian presence in the Secretariat. To mention one, important dimension: While official Danish diplomacy in the 1920s was largely uninterested in Danish presence in the Secretariat, a strong internationalist foreign policy milieu, including some of the Danish League officials had already formed around Peter Munch. Munch was active in promoting the League of Nations, international cooperation and disarmament already in the 1920s, and in 1926 he, together with the historian Aage Friis, founded the Institute for History and National Economy [*Institutet for Historie og Samfunnsøkonomi*] promoting evidence-based international policy formation and serving as a hub for disseminating information about the League in Denmark.100 Aage Friis was the father of Finn Friis, and had been Krabbe’s superior as head of the Foreign Ministry Press Office during the war. Between the wars, both Friis and Krabbe were associated with the institute101 along with Georg Cohn, the head of the MFA’s League of Nations Section, who published work on collective security supported by the institute.102 What we see, therefore, is a small but dense social liberal network formed around the Institute that reached across diplomacy and politics and included prominent Danish League officials.

Norway too, had its internationalist networks underpinning its League officials. While the four diplomats who joined the League Secretariat, and those who supported them in their candidacy, indicates a strong, centralized diplomatic mandate,103 they belonged to a broader Norwegian internationalist community. Prominent figures in this network included Christian L. Lange (Secretary of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1909-1933), Frede Castberg (The MFA’s permanent international law consultant, 1922-1960s), Arne Ording (consultant and in-house
historian to Foreign Minister Trygve Lie and Halvard Lange), Halfdan Koht (Labour Party Foreign Minister, 1935-41) and Edvard Hambro (international jurist, diplomat, Conservative parliamentarian, and son of C. J. Hambro), who were all part of the foreign policy elite and had close ties to the Nobel Institute and other institutions. These Norwegian internationalists saw the League as a means to ‘professionalize’ Norwegian foreign policy and tied the MFA and the League together by being present in both institutions and cooperating closely with the Norwegian League officials.104

Significantly, these milieus were relatively detached from the Foreign Service in Sweden, relatively closely connected to the Foreign Service in Denmark (through Peter Munch), and extremely closely connected to the Foreign Service in Norway.105 The Norwegian academic-foreign policy networks, therefore, reinforce the patterns found with the Norwegian core employees of the League Secretariat. The expert-driven foreign policy that they pursued within and around the MFA was formulated ‘as a national plan’ with the League at the centre as the foundation of a new world order.106

This, again, points us towards an even more subtle influence on Denmark, Norway and Sweden’s, dealings with Geneva: the Rockefeller Foundation. Rockefeller was one of the Institute for History and National Economy’s main sponsors107 and incidentally also funded the Danish Serum Institute108 where Gabriele Rohde got the training that made her a relevant candidate for the League’s Health Section – as well as parts of the activities in the Statistical Department in the Ministry of Finance, where Olsen gained expertise on national budgets.109 Rockefeller also supported the establishment of Kommittén för utrikespolitisk upplysning, which eventually created The Foreign Policy Institute in Sweden, and Norsk (samordnings)komité for internasjonale studier, involving much of the Nobel Institute clique, and seeking the establishment of a Norwegian Institute of the same sort. The Rockefeller Foundation contributed “massive sums to European science in the interwar period, not least to international studies”, and the Scandinavian institutions were part of a much broader investment pattern in liberal sciences and institutions underpinning the League order.110

The afterlife of the Scandinavians in the League Secretariat

Though there were clear differences in the way the different Scandinavian governments engaged with the League Secretariat, there is a very consistent pattern when we look at the career trajectories of the Scandinavians that worked in the Secretariat in the postwar years. Most of them became part
of the multilateral post-Second World War scene either inside the new IOs or within the Scandinavian MFAs.

The Norwegian League officials’ experiences were foundational for at least two aspects of Norwegian postwar internationalism: representation in multilateral fora and restructuring of the foreign service, and there is no doubt that the expertise and networks gained through the League days were deemed extremely valuable in the postwar years. After serving as Ambassador to London during the Second World War, Colban headed the Norwegian delegation preparing the creation of the United Nations and was delegated to its first General Assembly. Between 1948 and 1950, Colban represented the UN Secretary-General in the negotiations between India and Pakistan over the disputed Kashmir region. Berg was stationed in Moscow immediately after the war, before becoming the Norwegian envoy to the UN in New York from 1949. Anker started working in the UN from 1946 onwards as Assistant Director in the Division of Trusteeship before returning to the MFA in 1948, while remaining a special advisor for the Norwegian delegation to the UN. He would stay with the foreign service for the remainder of his professional career, finishing as Ambassador to Egypt (1966-73). Skylstad offered his services to the Norwegian government-in-exile in London, where he became a close collaborator of Trygve Lie during the war (who, underlining how Scandinavians could fill tricky and politicized positions in international administrations, would go on to be the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, only to be followed by the Swede Dag Hammarskjöld). After the end of the war, Skylstad returned to Switzerland and represented Norway at the liquidation of the League of Nations. In 1948, he became Secretary-General of the MFA before ending his career as Ambassador to Paris from 1958 onwards. As Secretary-General in the crucial postwar years, Skylstad played a pivotal role in professionalizing, diversifying and internationalizing the Foreign Service, particularly in relation to the many new international organizations created.

The majority of the Swedish economic experts went on to work in other IOs following the Second World War. Jacobsson came to head the IMF, while Rosenborg, Lindberg, Hilgerdt and Key-Rasmussen all continued their careers in UN organisations. The same holds true for Ekstrand. During the Second World War, Ekstrand went back to Sweden to work for the unofficial Swedish Commission for the assistance of Finland in the War. After the war, he became member of the UN’s Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, a position he held until 1957. Renborg published a study on ‘International Drug Control’ on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment in 1944 but found it difficult to land a position. Åke Hammarskjöld died in 1937, while serving as first Registrar of the PCIJ. Only Oscar Thorsing made a career in the Swedish Foreign office, becoming head of the Press service and later Ambassador in Canada.
while MFA-recruit Torsten Gihl left the international political scene completely to become Professor in history at the University of Stockholm. While in Norway, former League officials were an integral part of the Norwegian postwar foreign policy elite, Swedish international officials were less directly connected to the Swedish MFA. Though this remains to be explored, it might be a reflection of the distinction between generalist and technocratic international civil servants.

The Danes tended towards reintegration into the national political orbit though in much less prominent roles than their Norwegian counterparts. The two Danes who worked for the League in brief stints - Christian Olsen and Peter Skov - simply returned to their previous jobs in the central administration. Two others: Rosting, who was let go in 1936 and Krabbe who was made redundant after the major economic cutbacks in the Secretariat in March 1939, were both, through the personal intervention of Munch, offered positions in the Foreign Service. When Friis was let go in May 1940, he initially struggled to establish his post-League career. as the Danish diplomatic service had collapsed into a state of emergency after the German occupation of Denmark. However, his international experience did pay off in the postwar years, when he became a consultant on the UN to the MFA, attending all UN Assemblies from 1948 to 1957 and working for the humanitarian NGO Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke and later the Quaker’s international efforts in various capacities.

The two Danish members of staff who benefitted most clearly from their League careers were perhaps the two women, Gabriele Rohde and Karen Petersen. Both stayed on in the League during the war. Rohde was transferred to the League’s London Office, became active in the political wing of the Danish resistance movement in London, and served as a financial advisor to Danish diplomat Henrik Kauffmann during negotiations about the creation of UNRRA. A highly sought after public speaker in the UK and US and a candidate for positions in several international organizations, including Carnegie, Rohde’s career is a clear reminder how the League opened up new social and political horizons to women. Due to a fatal accident in 1946, Rohde never came to realize these opportunities, but Karen Petersen continued her international career and went to work for the UN in New York after the war.

In sum, important aspects of the patterns produced during the interwar years were reproduced in the postwar years. Norwegian presence in the UN was remarkably strong, and closely connected to the MFA. Swedish presence in the UN, and the IMF and other IOs, were equally strong, but shaped very much by the economic internationalism of the interwar years and further removed from the Swedish MFA. The Danish pattern, as in the interwar years, remains less clear-cut, though there is, also here, a clear tendency of international experience in the interwar period translating into postwar careers in – or in relation to – IOs.
Conclusion

This article has offered four arguments: The first, general, observation is that the interplay between the functional and institutional set-up, practices and priorities of the League Secretariat, and the foreign policy strategies pursued by the Scandinavians, was highly productive and constitutive. Second, exploring the productive space ‘between’ the two, we find that Swedish, Danish and Norwegian participation in the League Secretariat and international engagement was shaped in very distinct ways by the Secretariat itself. More precisely, what kind of international issues the different Scandinavian countries engaged with was substantially determined by the institutional set-up of the League. Third, exploring how the different MFAs engaged with the League Secretariat, we note clear differences between the three countries both in terms of strategy and commitment. While the Norwegian MFA pursued a stringent and coordinated internationalist policy, for instance, the Danish MFA kept the Secretariat at arms-length. All three arguments highlight the potential for further studies of multilateralization of Scandinavian MFAs connecting the inter- and postwar years. Fourth, the careers of the Scandinavians working in the Secretariat show a clear continuity of Scandinavian internationalism across the Second World War, and that the experience, prestige and networks gained from working in the League Secretariat often translated into key positions in postwar IOs or within the new multilateral parts of the MFAs. On a methodological level, moreover, the article has demonstrated how moving beyond the national stratification and viewpoint of most Scandinavian foreign policy studies and using a multilateral organization like the League as an analytical entry point, generates important new insights: about the mutually constitutive nature of international and regional conceptualizations of Scandinavia; about structural similarities and differences in foreign policy aims and strategies; and about the transnational networks and institutions that underpin and connect Scandinavia’s interactions with its international surroundings.

_____________________
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