



European
University
Institute

ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

EUI Working Papers

RSCAS 2011/13

ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

BRINGING THE DIPLOMAT BACK IN
ELEMENTS OF A NEW HISTORICAL RESEARCH AGENDA

Karen Gram-Skjoldager

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE
ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

*Bringing the Diplomat Back in
Elements of a New Historical Research Agenda*

KAREN GRAM-SKJOLDAGER

This text may be downloaded only for personal research purposes. Additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copies or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s), editor(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the working paper, or other series, the year and the publisher.

ISSN 1028-3625

© 2011 Karen Gram-Skjoldager

Printed in Italy, February 2011

European University Institute

Badia Fiesolana

I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)

Italy

www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Publications/

www.eui.eu

cadmus.eui.eu

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies (RSCAS), directed by Stefano Bartolini since September 2006, is home to a large post-doctoral programme. Created in 1992, it aims to develop inter-disciplinary and comparative research and to promote work on the major issues facing the process of integration and European society.

The Centre hosts major research programmes and projects, and a range of working groups and ad hoc initiatives. The research agenda is organised around a set of core themes and is continuously evolving, reflecting the changing agenda of European integration and the expanding membership of the European Union.

Details of this and the other research of the Centre can be found on:

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Research/>

Research publications take the form of Working Papers, Policy Papers, Distinguished Lectures and books. Most of these are also available on the RSCAS website:

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Publications/>

The EUI and the RSCAS are not responsible for the opinion expressed by the author(s).

Abstract

In the 20th century and since 1945 in particular the institution of diplomacy has changed. While traditional bilateral diplomatic relations have expanded rapidly as a consequence of decolonisation, other developments have challenged the very nature of existing diplomatic practices. The overall aim of this paper is to reflect on how, from a historical starting point, one can grapple with the changes diplomacy has undergone in an increasingly interconnected and institutionally integrated world. It argues that in order to do so it is necessary to bring the historical study of diplomacy into dialogue with recent transnational perspectives and to draw inspiration from the political and social sciences. It tentatively attempts to develop such a new historical approach and it conducts a pilot study into how increased regional European economic cooperation in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to reshaping diplomatic roles and patterns of actions in the Danish Foreign Service.

Keywords

Diplomacy, European integration, transnationalism, institutional roles, Denmark

I. INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy has been a feature of human society as long as separate human collectives have seen the need to establish relations with each other while maintaining their independence. In its modern form diplomacy is closely related to, and a constitutive element of, the Westphalian state order. The spread of the resident ambassador, the creation of foreign ministries specialising in the handling of international relations and the codification of diplomatic protocol are all formal expressions that a shared framework of principles, rules and organised patterns of behaviour emerged, which enabled sovereign states to communicate and interact in a predictable and organised manner.¹

In the 20th century and since 1945 in particular, this system has come under strain. While traditional bilateral diplomatic relations have expanded rapidly as a consequence of decolonisation, other developments have challenged the very nature of existing diplomatic practices. The increasingly dense network of economic, political, and cultural relations cutting across national boundaries and the emergence of new, ‘para-diplomatic actors’ such as national bureaucratic units, NGOs, and international businesses engaging directly or indirectly with international authorities and state actors is one dimension of this development. The expansion and intensification of multilateral modes of diplomatic cooperation is another. The result has been a broadened diplomatic habitat and a transformed role and function for the ‘classical’ diplomat related to the Foreign Service.²

However, we still know very little about how this key institution of international society, and the people inhabiting it, has changed. This is not due to any lack of theoretical interest. The two decades after the Cold War have seen a virtual boom in research on diplomacy in International Relations (IR). However, IR theorists working on diplomacy have generally taken an interest in the *longue durée* of the institution of diplomacy and confined their use of historical literature to macro-historical outlines of the development of modern diplomacy.³ To no notable extent have they engaged in hands-on empirical historical research to test their theories. Historians on their part have not taken the same interest in diplomacy. Based primarily in the neo-realist research paradigm they have, with a few important exceptions, treated diplomacy either as an instrument of national policy with no independent quality or significance of its own or they have written self-contained institutional histories of individual diplomatic services.⁴ Against this backdrop, political scientists have with some right criticised the history of diplomacy for being atheoretical and for having failed to forge any strong links with political science theory.⁵

The overall aim of this paper is to reflect on how, from a historical starting point, one can grapple with the changes diplomacy and the diplomatic role has undergone in an increasingly interconnected and institutionally integrated world. Diplomacy here is perceived in its most narrow sense as the institution which developed within the Westphalian state system and which found formal expression in the organisations of foreign ministries – it is, to quote Jozef Bátora perceived ‘the organizational field’

¹ For a general introduction to the development of modern diplomacy, see: Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorne: *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (London 1995).

² Jan Melissen: “Introduction”, in Jan Melissen (ed.): *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice* (London and Houndsmill, Basingstoke 1999), pp.xiv-xxiii.

³ The works that are most often referred to are three works by British political scientists and historians: R.P. Barston: *Modern Diplomacy*, London and New York: Longman, 1988; Geoffrey Berridge: *Diplomacy. Theory and Practice*, London: Prentice Hall, 1995 (2nd edition 2002, 3rd edition 2005); Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorne: *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*, London: Routledge, 1995.

⁴ This scholarship is presented in section III of this paper.

⁵ Richard Langhorne: “On Diplomacy”, *Political Studies Review*, vol.6, no.1, 2008, pp.54-62, here p.56; Christer Jönsson and Martin Hall: *Essence of Diplomacy* (London: Palgrave 2005) p.7.

made up of foreign services.⁶ ‘Diplomat’, likewise, refers to bureaucrats working in national foreign services and who are perceived by many as the quintessential national state representative in international politics.⁷ In other words, what the paper wants to explore is how the changes in the international policy environment laid out above have shaped the role orientations and patterns of actions of one of the most classical characters in modern international politics.

It will argue that in order to do this, it is necessary to bring the study of diplomacy into dialogue with the recent transnational – or global governance – perspectives, which have gained a central position within both IR and history and which have been key in identifying the changes that the international political system has undergone during the 20th century. In order to develop this argument it will proceed in the following way: First, it will briefly outline the dominant ways in which diplomacy has been depicted within International Relations (IR) and history. Second, it will introduce a number of studies within both disciplines which have broken away from these standard interpretations and in some cases linked the study of diplomacy to transnational developments and structures. Against this background, the third main section of the paper suggests one possible approach to analysing how the changes in the policy environment pointed out above have reshaped diplomatic patterns of actions and role orientations. Drawing on theories and methodologies from political science and sociology it hopes to devise a strategy which allows for a more systematic exploration of this theme. In a final section the paper will present an example of how this approach may be applied, conducting a pilot study into how increased regional European economic cooperation in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to reshaping diplomatic roles and patterns of actions in the Danish Foreign Service.

In sum the paper attempts to let a key state representative back into the international historical narrative while moving beyond the often instrumental and static view of this historical agent held by much mainstream international history. Diplomats speak in the name of state power and mediate relations where power differentials are often articulated and always implied.⁸ They are, in this sense, important creatures in international history. Figuring out ways of pinning them down analytically in an increasingly dense and integrated policy environment is the main aim of this paper. In doing so the paper also hums in with two broader developments within transnational political history. Transnational historical scholarship has tended to view transnational and nation state representatives as complementary categories and left the intergovernmental actors out of their narratives. However, recently there have been some tendencies towards merging the two perspectives. It is this tendency which this paper wants to develop in the case of the diplomats. Also, there has been a strong tendency in transnational historiography to read political functionality into the existence of transnational political networks, and to infer causality to the mere existence of a ‘network’.⁹ This paper forms part of an emerging research agenda which attempts to shift the focus from the purely political-functional and consider also the underlying social structures, which formed part of the international and European integration processes.

⁶ Jozef Bátora: “Does the European Union Transform the Institution of Diplomacy?”, *Cliengendal Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no.87, 2003, p.20. Diplomacy as defined here has a strong legal dimension. Thus a robust body of customary international law providing diplomatic agents with privileges and immunities under local criminal and civil law developed from the late 16th century. It was codified and clarified in the multilateral Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961 (Berridge 2005 pp.115-19)

⁷ It is important to note that this is a more narrow definition than the one used by most American authors, who use the terms foreign policy and diplomacy interchangeably (One prominent example being Henry Kissinger: *Diplomacy* (New York 1994). For a European example of this broad conception of diplomacy, see: Jean-Baptiste Duroselle: *Histoire diplomatique de 1919 à nos jours*, Paris: Dalloz, 1953).

⁸ Iver B. Neumann: “Diplomats and Diplomacy: An Anthropological View”, *Unpublished Dissertation*, University of Oslo 2008 p.11.

⁹ For some examples, see Webster, Andrew 2005, “The Transnational Dream: Politicians, Diplomats and Soldiers in the League of Nations’ Pursuit of International Disarmament, 1920-1938”, *Contemporary European History*, 14, 4, 493-518 and Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Morten Rasmussen: *The History of the European Union. Origins of a Trans- and Supranational Polity 1950-72* (Oxon/New York 2009).

II. DIPLOMACY IN IR

During the tense years of the Cold War diplomacy was rarely an object of theoretical interest in IR.¹⁰ However, during the last two decades diplomacy has gained a new theoretical prominence. This shift is closely related to the revival of the English School as an intellectual project, which has challenged key assumptions of the realist paradigm that dominated IR during the Cold War.

A state based theory realism perceives states as self interested actors and diplomacy as a tool of state policy rather than a central, constitutive element of the international system. Neorealism, despite its focus on systemic-level theorising, has not changed this. Looking at how certain attributes and variables of the states – and by extension their relative power – vary, the neo-realist focus has been on how these factors explain state behaviour and system-level outcomes. In this context it is the state units that interpret the environment they find themselves in in order to choose appropriate behaviour and the socialising force – acknowledged by Kenneth Waltz for instance – is the unit itself and not a processual relation or institution between states.¹¹

By contrast, the English School approach to diplomacy holds strong normative assumptions about the political and moral quality of this institution. It is based on the assumption that international relations represent a 'society of states' despite the condition of international anarchy. It emphasises the non-deterministic nature of anarchy and argues that an international society of states can be detected in the ideas underlying key institutions regulating inter-state relations such as the balance of power, great powers, international law, war, sovereignty and diplomacy. Like realist theories, the English School attributes a prominent theoretical status to the state, but unlike them it does not assume states to be independent choice-making individuals. Taking a relational and processual approach it focuses instead on how these units are continuously produced through international institutions – among which is diplomacy.¹² To quote James Der Derian. Diplomacy is seen as “...the formal means by which the self-identity of the sovereign state is constituted and articulated through external relations with other states”.¹³

The English School's reappraisal of the moral quality and political importance of diplomacy has made it the mainstay of a large and diverse literature on the subject. A central feature of this literature is the focus on diplomats' double mandate as representatives of both nation states and international society. Scholars within the English School have presented diplomacy as a 'third culture' in which diplomats on the one hand function as boundary-maintainers that uphold the discourse dividing politics into domestic and foreign spheres while on the other hand constituting “a locus for mediation between political entities with diverse cultures”.¹⁴ Themes such as diplomatic state recognition practices and the role of the *corps diplomatique* in managing mutually beneficial relations and reproducing the basic principles that underpin inter-state relations figure centrally in this literature.¹⁵

¹⁰ Jönsson and Hall 2005 pp.15-8.

¹¹ Barry Buzan, C. Jones and R. Little: *The Logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism*, New York: Columbia University Presse, 1993, p.40, cf. Jönsson and Hall 2005 p.17.

¹² Jönsson and Hall 2005 pp.19-20; Neumann 2002.

¹³ James Der Derian. “Diplomacy”, in Joel Krieger and William A. Joseph (eds.): *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp.244-66, here p.244.

¹⁴ Iver B. Neumann: “Diplomats and Diplomacy: An Anthropological View”, *Unpublished Dissertation*, University of Oslo 2008 p.130. Neumann has written an influential, often cited working paper on the English School and diplomacy: Iver B. Neumann: “The English School on Diplomacy”, *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no.79, 2002.

Neumann's conceptualisation of diplomacy is inspired by earlier writers in the English School tradition, see in particular: Adam Watson: *Diplomacy: The Dialogue between States* (London: Methuen 1982) and James Der Derian: *On Diplomacy. A Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford, 1987); Jönsson and Hall 2005.

¹⁵ See in particular: Paul Sharp: “Who Needs Diplomats? The Problem of Diplomatic Representation”, *International Journal*, vol.52, no.4, 1997, pp.609-34; Sharp 1999; Paul Sharp and Geoffrey Wisemann (eds.): *The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007

One example of this approach, which relates to Europe, is a study by Mai'a K. Davis Cross which has explored the European diplomatic corps as a transnational epistemic community using as one of as a key example the role of the COREPER-diplomats in the brokering of the Treaty of Maastricht.¹⁶

In pointing to these cooperative, mediating aspects of diplomacy, the English School has to some extent brought the deeply rooted diplomatic self understanding back onto the research agenda. Twentieth century classics in of diplomats' writings such as Ernest Satow's *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (1917) and Sir Harold Nicolson's *Diplomacy* (1939) as well as many diplomats' memoirs are generally characterised by what Paul Sharp has named a practical, or unreflective, cosmopolitanism. While firmly believing in the sovereign state system and in diplomats as representatives of the sovereign states and their interests, diplomats have often simultaneously argued – or implicitly assumed – that they function as a steadying, positive influence in international politics curbing the impulses of politicians and public opinions attempting to push national self interest too far.¹⁷

With the setting up of 'diplomatic studies' programmes at universities and other research institutions across Europe and the USA after the Cold War¹⁸ the IR and diplomats' perspectives have been brought closer together and created a new research field based in a fundamentally positive evaluation of the role and significance of diplomacy. Within this context a new academically oriented type of diplomats' writings on diplomacy has also emerged which tends to emphasise the positive moral assumptions about diplomacy. One example of this genre is the book *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relations* (2007) by the German former ambassador and professor of law and diplomacy, Wilfried Bolewski. He boldly states that "Through its flexibility and adaptability diplomacy will emerge as an instrument for this universal good in the 21st century."¹⁹

While scholars relating to the English School have managed to bring to our attention dimensions of diplomacy that have previously escaped scholarly scrutiny it is therefore also apparent that it stands the risk of idealising the diplomatic profession, overemphasising its exclusive and distinct character and overvaluing the relationships among diplomats at the expense of their interactions with the growing number of state and non-state actors inhabiting the diplomatic realm.

III. DIPLOMACY IN HISTORY

In history, developments in the scholarship on diplomacy since the Cold War have been very different. During the Cold War historiography was under the influence of the same theoretical influences as IR and exhibited the same modest interest in diplomacy. During this period many, not least American, scholars took a keen interest in diplomacy understood in its broadest – American – sense as *foreign policy* and the role and contributions of statesmen and diplomats to foreign policy processes and key international political decisions.²⁰ However, they did not explore how changing framework conditions in the form of an increasingly integrated international and national policy environment changed the norms, rules and roles of diplomacy. To the extent that the topic of diplomacy was studied it was in the form of institutional histories of the different national foreign services which rarely spoke to each

¹⁶ Mai'a K. Davis Cross: *The European Diplomatic Community. Diplomats and International Cooperation from Westphalia to Maastricht* (Basingstoke/New York 2007) pp. 139-78; see also Jönsson and Hall who consider the information networks that has developed among member state diplomatic services in the EU (Jönsson and Hall pp.160-1)

¹⁷ Sharp 1999 pp.624-9.

¹⁸ Sharp 1999 p.44-5. One prominent example of this development is the interdisciplinary *Hague Journal of Diplomacy* which includes pieces focusing on the practical aspects of the diplomatic experience written by diplomats (<http://www.brill.nl/hjd> (accessed 9 May 2010)).

¹⁹ Wilfried Bolewski: *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relations* (Berlin and Heidelberg 2007), p.26. For a similar example, see Charles Chatterjee: *International Law and Diplomacy* (London 2007).

²⁰ For one prominent example of this scholarship, see: John Lewis Gaddis: *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*, Oxford University Press 1982.

other and which were largely unrelated to broader foreign and domestic political developments.²¹ In history too however, the interest in diplomacy has been growing over the last 20 years. But this interest has been of a very different nature from the one within IR. Rather than being focused on the cooperative, mediating aspects of diplomacy and the joint experience of an increasingly integrated national and international policy environment, historiography of diplomacy has continued to be largely nationally compartmentalised. The focus has been on how important national experiences of 20th century international politics reflected on diplomacy; historical works on diplomacy have therefore generally been diverging rather converging. To name a few central examples, German historians have focused their studies on the role of German diplomats and the German Foreign Ministry in the Third Reich and in the transformation from the Third Reich to the Federal Republic.²² In Great Britain it is the British decline from a world power to a European middle-power that has been the centre of attention for much of the historiography on diplomacy.²³ In France, a rich scholarship on diplomacy has developed which is of an altogether different nature. Here the subject of diplomacy was put on the historical agenda already in the 1950s and already then a fairly sophisticated understanding of it developed. In 1954 René Renouvin and Jean-Baptiste Duroselle published their *Introduction à l'histoire des Relations internationales*, which was inspired by l'Ecole des Annales and propagated a broader and more complex form of international history than the classical recounting of interstate high politics. On the one hand they wished to include the 'forces profondes' that shaped international relations such as demographic and economic conditions and collective mentalities such as national and pacifist sentiments. On the other hand they insisted on the importance of events, on placing the individual at the centre of the historical process and on the importance of political history. It was Duroselle in particular who developed this second part of their new international research agenda. In his part of *Introduction à l'histoire des Relations internationales*, "L'homme d'état", he dealt with the decision making individuals, their social background, their ideas and resources; with how they were influenced by structural forces and how they were in turn capable of modifying and bending these forces.²⁴ Since then, in the words of Robert Frank, a 'durosellienne' tendency has developed in French international history writing which has explored the foreign policy decision making process, the administrative organisation of foreign policy making and the individuals involved in this process.²⁵

²¹ Klaus Kjølens et. al.: *Den danske udenrigstjeneste 1770-1970*, vol. 1-2, (Copenhagen 1970); H.G. Sasse: *Hundert Jahre Auswärtiges Amt 1870-1970* (Bonn 1870-1970); Jean Baillou (ed.): *Les affaires étrangères et le corps diplomatique français*, vol. 2, 1870-1980 (Paris 1984); Roger Bulle (ed.): *The Foreign Office, 1782-1982*, (Frederick 1984); Vincenzo Pellegrini: *L'amministrazione centrale dall'Unità alla Repubblica. La strutture e i dirigenti, vol.1: Il Ministero degli Affari Esteri* (Bologna 1992); Bert van der Zwan, Bob de Graaff, Duco Hellema (eds.): *De Nederlandse ministers van buitenlandse zaken in de twintigste eeuw* (Den Haag, 1999); Zara Steiner (ed.): *The Times Survey of Foreign Ministries of the World* (London 1982).

²² Eckart Conze, Norbert Frei, Peter Hayes, and Moshe Zimmermann: "Das Amt und die Vergangenheit. Deutsche Diplomaten im Dritten Reich und in der Bundesrepublik", Karl Blessing Verlag, 2010. For similar work on Italy and Austria, see: Bruna Bagnato: "Le cas du ministère des Affaires étrangères italien après la Deuxième Guerre mondiale", in: Élisabeth du Réau (ed.): *Europe des élites? Europe des peuples? La construction de l'espace européen, 1945-1960* (Paris, 1998) pp.77-92; Rudolf Agstner, Gertrude Enderle-Burcel and Michaela Follner: *Biografisches Handbuch der Diplomaten des Höheren Auswärtigen Dienstes 1918-1959. Österreichs Diplomaten zwischen Kaiser und Kreisky* (Wien, 2009)

²³ John W. Young: *Twentieth Century Diplomacy: A Case Study of British Practice 1963-76* (Cambridge, 2008) p.2.

²⁴ For introductions to the French history of international relations, see: Georges-Henri Soutou: "Die französische Schule der Geschichte internationaler Beziehungen", in Wilfried Loth and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.): *Internationale Geschichte. Themen – Ergebnisse – Aussichten*, München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2000, pp.31-44, here in particular p.39. and Robert Frank: "Penser historiquement les relations internationales", *Annuaire français de relations internationales*, 2003, 4, pp.42-65, here in particular pp.42-9.

²⁵ For examples of this approach, see: Jean-Baptiste Duroselle: *Histoire diplomatique de 1919 à nos jours*, Paris: Dalloz, 1953 (published in eleven editions from 1953 to 1993); Jean Doise et Maurice Vaisse: *Politique étrangère de la France: diplomatique et outil militaire, 1871-1991*, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1987; Rainer Hudemann and Georges-Henri Soutou (eds.): *Eliten in Deutschland und Frankreich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Strukturen und Beziehungen / Elites en France et en Allemagne aux XIXème et XXème siècles: structures et relations*, vol. 1, München: Oldenbourg, 1994, see in

However, this literature also has strong realist traits, claiming the primacy of national interest and taking a basically conflictual view of international politics.²⁶ Thus it did not at any fundamental level challenge the overall theoretical trends of Cold War historiography.

To sum up, recent scholarship on diplomacy has been characterised by a complementary pattern in which IR has written the common international macro-history of the institution of diplomacy, while historians have written its multiple national histories. In both political science and history however, these dominant framings of diplomacy have been challenged and in both cases these challenges have in part been linked to the emerging transnational perspective on international history and politics. It is also within this context that this research project finds its starting point.

IV. IR MEETS HISTORY – CONVERGING PERSPECTIVES ON DIPLOMACY

While some IR scholars and historians have taken a growing interest in diplomacy since the Cold War, the main trend in both disciplines has pulled towards the transnational or the global governance perspective. Here transnationalism and the study of intergovernmental actors have often been juxtaposed. Thus, in relation to diplomacy, IR global governance approaches have argued that this institution is becoming increasingly irrelevant to contemporary political needs. The technological developments and the complex interdependence that characterises the globalised world have blurred the national-international divide and made diplomacy a gradually less important dimension of an intricate pattern of transnational interactions around a multiplicity of actors.²⁷ Consequently, to the extent that this scholarship has been concerned with diplomacy it has focused on the development of an alternative diplomacy among NGOs and other transnational actors considered to increase the prospect of an international order transcending the state system.²⁸ Similar trends may be discerned in history.²⁹

In the highly integrated European area this approach has taken on a distinct form with the Europeanisation literature. In the face of the new integration dynamics brought about by the Single European Act and the Treaty of Maastricht, public policy researchers have explored the growing transnationalisation and regionalisation of decision-making in Europe – and in doing so have tended to look past the foreign services.³⁰ The same may be said for the historical literature where Wolfram Kaiser's re-conceptualisation of the EC/EU as a transnational political society and supranational political system has highlighted the importance of informal transnational networks in the EC/EU

(Contd.) _____

particular the piece by Georges-Henri Soutou on French and German diplomatic elites: "Les elites diplomatiques françaises et allemandes au XXème siècle", pp.303-14. Laurence Badel and Stanislas Jeannesson (eds.): *Diplomaties en renouvellement. Actes de la journée d'études du 3 octobre 2008 à l'Université Paris-I Panthéon-Sorbonne*, Paris: Les Cahiers IRICE, 2009. Currently, the young French historian Matthieu Osmont is working on a PhD thesis on *Les diplomates français et l'Allemagne (1955-1990)* (http://centre-histoire.sciences-po.fr/fichiers_pdf/fiches_doctorants/OSMONTMATTHIEU.pdf (accessed 19 June 2010))

²⁶ Soutou 2000 p.31-2.

²⁷ Paul Sharp: "For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations", *International Studies Review*, vol.1, no.1, 1999, pp.33-57, here pp.43-4; Brian Hocking: "Foreign Ministries: Redefining the Gatekeeper Role", in Brian Hocking (ed.): *Foreign Ministries. Change and Adaptation* (Basingstoke/New York 1999) pp.1-15, here pp.4-5; Andrew F. Cooper, Brian Hocking and William Maley: "Diplomacy and Global Governance: Locating Patterns of (Dis)Connection", in: Andrew F. Cooper, Brian Hocking and William Maley(eds.): *Global Governance and Diplomacy. Worlds Apart?*(Basingstoke/New York 2008), pp.1-14, here pp.2-3.

²⁸ Hocking in Melissen 1999, p.24.

²⁹ For a general introduction to transnational history, see: Kiran K. Patel: "Überlegungen zu einer transnationale Geschichte", *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, vo.52, 2004, pp.626-45.

³⁰ For an overview of this literature, see Simon Hix and Claus Goetz: "Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems", in Klaus Goetz and Simon Hix (eds.): *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems* (2001), pp.1-26.

political system and the emergence of European public spheres.³¹ It is evident that the identification of the emerging transnational political opportunity structures in relation to the increasingly integrated international and European political systems forms an important historically founded challenge to the traditional, and still dominant, national framing of political history.

Recently studies in history as well as in IR have attempted to bring these perspectives together with the study of ‘classical’ national actors such as statesmen, parliamentarians, diplomats and bureaucrats. Historical research on the League of Nations as well as on the EC/EU holds examples of studies of national political representatives and of how their involvement in transnational groups and networks relating to these organisations has shaped their roles, interest perceptions and patterns of action.³² One key example of this is the 2005 special issue of *Contemporary European History* on transnationalism and the League of Nations. The issue focuses on the political, economic and financial communities in the organisation. And it does so because, as Patricia Clavin points out, these communities are at the heart of both nation states and international organisations and therefore “provide the opportunity to explore the value of the transnational approach in relation to what is frequently seen as its opposite, the nation-state.”³³

In relation to the EU/EU Kiran K. Patel has recently embedded a classical subject of European political and diplomatic history, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), in its broader cultural and societal as well as transnational and international contexts in *Europäisierung wider Willen: die Bundesrepublik Deutschland in der Agrarintegration der EWG, 1955-1973* (2009). Further, several studies coming from France have dealt with how European cooperation has affected the French central administration. A couple of pieces have dealt with Quai d’Orsay in this perspective³⁴ and recently an edited volume was published by Laurence Badel, Stanislas Jeannesson and N. Piers Ludlow’s which takes a comparative historical view on how European cooperation has affected European national administrations, *Les administrations nationales et la construction européenne. Une approche historique (1919-1975)* (2005). One of the pieces in the volume also transcends the comparative setup of the volume. Thus, in his contribution to the volume, N. Piers Ludlow has studied the creation and role of the COREPER,³⁵ pre-empting in central regards Mai’a K. Davis Cross’s view of diplomacy as a transnational epistemic community; Ludlow argues that this Brussels-based body of national diplomats did not only serve to counterbalance and increase member state control over the European Commission; the permanent representatives also served as vital communication channels, mediators and ‘trouble shooters’ with a shared *esprit de corps* in the

³¹ For the most recent formulation of these viewpoints, see: Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Morten Rasmussen: *The History of the European Union. Origins of a Trans- and Supranational Polity 1950-72* (Oxon/New York 2009).

³² Haakon Andreas Ikonou: *Den indre kjerne. Europaekspertene i Utenriksdepartementet i perioden 1960-1963*, unpublished MA thesis University of Oslo 2010; Ann-Christina L. Knudsen and Morten Rasmussen: “A European Political System in the Making 1958-1970. The Relevance of Emerging Committee Structures”, *Journal of European Integration History*, 14, 1, 2008 pp. 51-68; Christine Manigand: *Les Français au service de la Société des Nations*. Bern: PIE-Peter Lang, 2004; Andrew Webster “The Transnational Dream: Politicians, Diplomats and Soldiers in the League of Nations’ Pursuit of International Disarmament, 1920-1938”, *Contemporary European History*, 14, 4, 2005, pp. 493-518.

³³ Patricia Clavin: “Defining Transnationalism”, *Contemporary European History*, vol. 14, no.4, 2005, pp.421-39, here p.423.

³⁴ Ghislain Sayer: “Le Quai d’Orsay et la construction de la Petite Europe: l’avènement de la Communauté économique européenne, 1955-1957”, *Relations internationales*, no. 101, 2000, pp.89-105; Raphaële Ulrich-Pier: “Antifédéralistes et fédéraliste: le Quai d’Orsay face à la construction européenne” in: Michel Catala (ed.): *Cinquante ans après la déclaration Schuman. Histoire de la construction européenne*, Nantes 2001, pp.103-118.

³⁵ N. Piers Ludlow: “Mieux que six ambassadeurs. L’émergence du COREPER durant les premières années de la CEE”, in Laurence Badel, Stanislas Jeannesson and N. Piers Ludlow(eds.): *Les administrations nationales et la construction européenne. Une approche historique (1919-1975)*, Bruxelles 2005.

relationships that mediated between the Commission and member states as well as among member states.³⁶

Parallel to this, political science has seen the emergence of a literature focusing specifically on how the changing international policy environment, which the transnational turn has pinpointed, has affected the role of diplomats. Thus a strand of scholarship has emerged, which has presented views quite similar to the English School concerning the political importance of diplomacy while combining this with perspectives from the global governance and Europeanisation literature. A number of scholars headed by British political scientist Brian Hocking have placed their analytical focus on the interactions between the traditional diplomatic actors and other actors operating in the diplomatic environment. Arguing that Foreign Ministries have lost their traditional gatekeeping role as primary points of interface between the domestic and the international environment this literature contends that diplomats have gained an alternative and equally important role; they have become 'boundary spanners' mediating and managing relations between the growing number of bureaucratic and non-governmental actors that have become involved in the production and administration of international policy.³⁷ This, so it is argued, is particularly the case for the European diplomatic arena due not only to the density of intra-European relations in general but also to two specific responsibilities of the Foreign Ministries in relation to the EC/EU: the coordination of sectoral ministries' affairs with the EC/EU and member state participation in the common European foreign and security policy.³⁸ Likewise Anne-Marie Slaughter in *A New World Order* (2004) has pointed out how 'the executive' in foreign affairs has become increasingly complex and differentiated and focused attention on the development of executive transnational networks which exchange information, coordinate policy, collect and distribute best practices etc.. Stressing the pioneering nature of EU in this regard, Slaughter has pointed out how these networks are themselves an organizational form of global governance.

Running parallel to these developments, French political and social science researchers have recently explored the new multilateral forms of diplomacy³⁹ as well as the changing role of diplomats as negotiators in an increasingly complex international environment.⁴⁰

It is these recent developments in history and political science that form the background of the present research project. However, I intend to shift the focus somewhat away from the one presented by Hocking's and pick up on a point made by Clavin when she states that transnationalism "is first and foremost about people":⁴¹ rather than focusing only on how the changing modes of international interactions have changed diplomacy in political-functional terms I wish to include the underlying social structures, which also formed part of the international and European integration processes.

³⁶ Ludlow also published a revised edition of his article on the COREPER in Kaiser's latest book publication: N. Piers Ludlow: "The European Commission and the Rise of Coreper: A Controlled Experiment" in: Kaiser, Leucht and Rasmussen 2009, pp.189-205.

³⁷ Brian Hocking: *Localizing Foreign Policy: Non Central Governments and Multilayered Diplomacy*, London: Macmillan, 1993; Hocking 1999; recently these researchers have engaged in a conversation with proponents of the global governance perspective: Cooper, Hocking and Maley 2008. For an exchange of views between Sharp and Hocking, see Sharp 1997 and Brian Hocking: "The end(s) of diplomacy", *International Journal*, vol. 53, no.1, 1997, pp.169-72.

³⁸ Hocking and Spence 2002 (see in particular Brian Hocking: "Introduction: Gatekeepers and Boundary-Spanners – Thinking about Foreign Ministries in the European Union" p.2); Brian Hocking and David Spence: "Towards a European Diplomatic System?", *Clingendael Discussion Paper in Diplomacy*, no. 98, 2005; Jozef Batora and Brian Hocking: "Bilateral Diplomacy in the European Union", Towards 'post-modern' Patterns?", *Clingendael Discussion Paper in Diplomacy*, no. 111, 2008; Jozef Batora: "Does the European Union Transform the Institution of Diplomacy?", *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no.87, 2003 (also published as "Does the European Union Transform the Institution of Diplomacy?" *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 12, no.1, 2005, pp 44-66);

³⁹ Bertrand Badie, Guillaume Devin (eds.): *Le multilatéralisme: nouvelles formes de l'action internationale*, Paris: La Découverte, 2007.

⁴⁰ Samy Cohen: *Les diplomates: négociier dans un monde chaotique*, Paris: Autrement, 2002.

⁴¹ Clavin 2005 p.422.

Drawing on the Weberian tradition for studying the professionalization of bureaucrats and politicians⁴² it is the aim to work out ways in which to explore how an increasingly integrated and transnationalised policy environment has shaped diplomatic patterns of action and role orientations.

V. APPROACHING THE DIPLOMAT⁴³

Seeking to explore the changing patterns of action and role orientations among diplomats involves addressing a problem in mainstream international political history which is rarely touched upon: that the preconditions for conducting foreign policy are continuously changing with possible consequences for the involved actors' beliefs and behaviour without these questions being addressed by the political historian. Based in neo-realist assumptions, mainstream international political history has aimed to understand and explain political events and decision making processes while seldom paying attention to the changes in the social structures and patterns of action in the political world which have slowly affected actors' role orientations. There has been in this historiography a tendency to attribute 'importance' to the actors involved in the process on the basis of implicit and – so it appears – ad hoc based assumptions – with the diplomat often appearing as a stable actor with no independent political quality, negotiating anything from bacon prices to security matters. Compared to this body of literature this paper wishes to turn the problem on its head, exploring not how the diplomatic actors contributed to shaping foreign policy processes, but how changing framework conditions in the form of an increasingly integrated international and national policy environment changed the patterns of actions and role orientations among diplomats. In order to do this it suggests drawing on approaches outside the IR literature and historiography dealing specifically with diplomacy. By doing so it hopes to be able to more consequently problematise and systematically analyse how the classical state representative – the diplomat – has responded to an increasingly dense and integrated policy environment.

The present investigation draws its theoretical and methodological inspirations from two sources. Firstly, it is inspired by the new institutionalist literature applying a sociological perspective to the world of political organisations. Recent studies have for instance looked at how the participation of national civil servants in the EU has shaped their identities and loyalties. The concept of roles is central to this literature. Based in an understanding of political organisations as a system of roles – where roles are understood as formalised or normalised expectations that define the ideal behaviour of groups of actors⁴⁴ – they have explored how actors' behaviour and professional identity has adapted and changed in the meeting with international and European cooperation.⁴⁵ I am basically interested in similar questions in this paper, sharing Martin Hall and Christer Jönsson view that diplomacy may be viewed as "...a relatively stable collection of social practices consisting of easily recognized *roles*

⁴² Max Weber "Bureaucracy" [1922], in: Aradhana Sharma and Akhil Gupta: *The Anthropology of the State. A Reader*. Malden/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp.49-70; Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation" [1919], in: H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.): *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge 1948, pp. 77-128. Meredith Kingston de Leusse: *Diplomatie. Une sociologie des ambassadeurs*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1998; Marie-Christine Kessler: "Les ambassadeurs: une élite contestée?", in Vida Azimi (eds.): *Les élites administratives en France et en Italie*, Paris: Editions Panthéon-Assas, 2006, pp. 171-185.

⁴³ This section of the paper has benefited greatly from an article I co-authored with Ann-Christina L. Knudsen, Aarhus University: "Hvor gik statens repræsentanter hen, da de gik ud? Nye rolleforståelser hos diplomater og parlamentarikere efter 1945", *TEMP- Tidsskrift for Historie*, vol.1, no.1, 2010, pp.82-113.

⁴⁴ J.G. March, and J.P. Olsen: *Rediscovering institutions: the organizational basis of politics*, New York: Free Press, 1989, cf. Jarle Trondal: "Re-Socializing Civil Servants: The Transformative Powers of EU Institutions", *Acta Politica*, vol.39, 2004, pp.4-30, here p. 9. See also Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen, "Mandariner og ministre", *Politica*, vol.15, no.3, 1983, 284-304, here p.284

⁴⁵ See for instance: Morten Egeberg: "Transcending Intergovernmentalism? Identity and Role Perceptions of National Officials in EU Decision-Making", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol.6, no.3, 1999, pp.456-74 and Trondal 2004.

coupled with underlying *norms* and a *set of rules* or conventions defining appropriate behaviour for, and governing relations among, occupants of these roles.”⁴⁶

However, in exploring these roles I do not claim to make cognitive observations, like some of the new institutionalist studies do by using questionnaires and interviews to reveal actors’ self-perceptions. That would be problematic – sometimes even impossible – in a historical analysis. Instead, I intend to map out the social profiles and patterns of action of selected groups of diplomats towards post-1945 international and European cooperation to try to evaluate what, if anything, might have changed in their role orientations. In that context it may be useful to also use a methodological tool sometimes applied in the new institutionalist literature: constructing ideal types for actors’ roles and behaviour. As I will attempt to illustrate below, such a cultivation of historical realities – in my case with reference to Max Weber – may serve as an efficient analytical tool for a more qualified understanding of changes in patterns of action and role orientations.

By drawing on a sociological approach to the study of internationalisation and europeanisation, this paper also hopes to add a new dimensions to an academic field that so far has been dominated by political scientists who tend to look at formal rather than social adaptation processes, studying primarily bureaucratic reorganisations and the development of interdepartmental structures for cooperation.⁴⁷

Secondly, the paper draws inspiration from the sociological studies that have adapted and developed key concepts of Pierre Bourdieu to the study of European, international and transnational phenomena. Instead of the alienation and othering of the world outside national boundaries that is often found in classical studies of foreign policy, the field-approach is helpful in levelling the world in which actors position themselves. Transnational positioning is thus not necessarily defined by formal organisational or state boundaries, as we observe in the classical political history (though it may be). A central assumption in this literature is that the transnational fields to a large extent are generated in the overlap between national and international organisations. It focuses on the types of capitals necessary to enter in a particular field, the struggles over political and symbolic capital in the field, and on how the field emerges over time.⁴⁸ In relation to the case study of the Danish diplomats under scrutiny here, this approach is relevant because the national diplomatic services served as key entry points into these fields. Through their work in the foreign services diplomats were increasingly becoming part of the emerging transnational European and international administrative fields in the post-war years. This was the case not only through their interactions with the new international and European institutions and their integration into networks of experts spanning both international and national, governmental and non-governmental actors. Some of them also engaged in new career patterns and shifted positions from being national diplomats to being international and European civil servants.⁴⁹ Picking up again on Clavin’s observation that transnationalism is first and foremost about people,⁵⁰ a key methodological tool in such an analysis is prosopographical studies, mapping the social profiles and positioning of these diplomats. Doing so establishes the basis for identifying structural transformations

⁴⁶ Jönsson and Hall 2005 p.25. For similar distinctions, see Harold Nicolson, *Diplomacy*, 3rd edition (London 1963) p.4 and Melissen 1999 p.xviii. The academic notion of diplomacy as an institution was introduced by Martin Wight in the 1970s (on this, see Iver B. Neumann: “The English School on Diplomacy”, *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no.79, 2002, pp.9-10).

⁴⁷ For a recent example of this genre, see Ove K. Pedersen, Bengt Jacobsson og Per Læg Reid: *Europeanization and Transnational States. Comparing Central Nordic Governments*, London: Routledge Press, 2004.

⁴⁸ Niilo Kauppi: “Bourdieu’s Political Sociology and the Politics of European Integration”, *Theory and Society*, vol. 32, 2003, pp.775-89; Mikael Rask Madsen: “Transnational Fields: Elements of a Reflexive Sociology of International Law”, *Retfærd*, vol. 29, no.3/114, 2006 pp.23-41; Antonin Cohen and Antoine Vauchez (eds.): *La Constitution européenne*, Bruxelles, 2007.

⁴⁹ Jürgen Kleiner: “The Inertia of Diplomacy”, *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, vol.19, 2008, pp.321-49, here p.333.

⁵⁰ Clavin 2005 p.422.

in the practices of these type of agents, and thus allows us to explore aspects of how the international and European administrative fields have emerged.

Based in these theoretical and methodological approaches, the article presents a pilot study of a group of diplomats, which was highly exposed to and came to personify the new multilateral framework conditions of the post-war years. Looking at the case of Denmark, I wish to explore the group of multilateral economic diplomats who emerged after the Second World War, who came to play a central role in the Danish economic diplomacy of the 1950s and 1960s and some of whom became independent players in the emerging European administrative fields.

VI. CATCHING THE DIPLOMAT – A CASE STUDY

Changing preconditions for Danish diplomacy

For Danish diplomats, as for other European diplomats, the preconditions for conducting diplomacy rapidly changed after the Second World War. The German occupation of Denmark during the Second World War and the rise of the Cold War led to an abandonment of the low-profile policy of neutrality of the inter-war years. Instead Danish politicians and diplomats embarked on a multilaterally oriented security policy based on NATO's collective system of security. In the area of foreign economic policy too Denmark was dependant on and increasingly involved in multilateral cooperation. A small, open economy, the Danish foreign economy was struggling with the consequences of the protectionist and nationally regulated European post-war economy.⁵¹ However, unlike their continental counterparts the first impulse of Danish politicians was not to look to European integration for solutions to these problems. Many politicians had a strong Nordic inclination based in the cultural and political commonalities among the Nordic countries and they viewed the continental integration project of the Six during the 1950s and 1960s with only guarded enthusiasm. This went not least for the social democratic party, the largest of the Danish political parties and in office, either alone or in coalition governments, for the major part of the post-war years until the so called land-slide election in December 1973. However a more pro-European stance was introduced in the party when the politician Jens Otto Krag took over key political positions in the social democratic party (as Minister for Foreign Trade (1957-58), Foreign Minister (1958-1962), and Prime Minister (1962-1972)). And when Great Britain, the single biggest export market for Danish agricultural products, decided to apply for EEC membership, Denmark followed the British path and presented three membership applications from 1962 to 1970, the last of which resulted in Danish accession.⁵²

Grappling with these international changes involved a marked growth of Danish diplomacy. By the end of the Second World War, 125 diplomats worked in the Danish Foreign Service.⁵³ This number had doubled after 16 years.⁵⁴ Due to a parallel expansion in office personnel and external consultants hired to deal with matters of trade and industry, the total number of people employed in the Foreign

⁵¹ See for instance Thorsten Borring Olesen and Poul Villaume: "I blokopdelingens tegn", *Dansk udenrigspolitik historie* vol.4, Copenhagen 2006.

⁵² Thorsten Borring Olesen and Johnny Laursen: "A Nordic Alternative to Europe", *Contemporary European History*, vol.9, no.1, 2000, pp.59-92.

⁵³ Counting as diplomats here are employees earning the five highest wage rates in the Foreign Service and considered to belong to 'the diplomatic career' at the time (Klaus Kjølsten et al.: *Den danske udenrigstjeneste 1770-1970*, vol. 2, Copenhagen: J. H. Schultz, 1970, p. 248).

⁵⁴ N=246 (Kjølsten et al. p.340).

Service had by then reached around 1000 – a number which had grown to approximately 1500 by 1970.⁵⁵

The expansion of the Foreign Service also meant that a process of specialisation took place among the diplomats. The Danish Foreign Service at the end of the Second World War was a ‘unitary service’ – meaning that ministry, embassies and consulates functioned as one administrative system in which employees could be posted in any one of the three administrative branches.⁵⁶ While this system was formally maintained after the War, in practical terms a substantial functional specialisation took place among Danish diplomats. During the first decade after the War, specialisations in multilateral economic matters, UN- and NATO-related issues as well as legal questions developed. In parallel with this a linguistic specialisation took place, along with specialisations in particular geographic regions. In addition to this, the ministry developed a large press section entrusted with the task of promoting Danish industry and culture abroad.⁵⁷

This new differentiation of the diplomatic profession challenged in various ways the institutionally embedded conceptions of what constituted a diplomat. Before we look at this, and in particular on how the new economic multilateral diplomats reinterpreted the role of the diplomat in the Danish Foreign Service, it is however necessary to first briefly outline the diplomatic role characterising the Danish Foreign Service by the end of the Second World War.

The diplomat in 1945

An organisation like the Danish Foreign Service, may, as touched on above, be viewed as a system of formalised role structures. Further, the diplomatic role associated with the service at the end of the Second World War can be viewed as fundamentally structured around two principled dividing lines: the distinction between the national and the international and between bureaucracy and politics.

As has been pointed out by political scientists, the diplomatic profession has never been characterised by holding any unique competency compared to other bureaucratic professions.⁵⁸ Diplomats do not hold a professional monopoly over their key professional skills such as gathering and analysing information or mediating and negotiating political deals. What has made the diplomat’s profession unique since the Foreign Services were set up as sections specialising in the handling of international relations was his position at the intersection between the national and the international. A key defining feature of the diplomat has been his position as a gatekeeper with a monopoly on negotiating ‘his’ state’s external relations with other states.⁵⁹ This was also the case for Danish diplomats at the end of the Second World War, where only a few other ministries in the Danish central administration dealt with international matters and only the Foreign Service had the competency to negotiate internationally.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ N=940 in 1960 (Erling Bjøl: *Hvem bestemmer? Studier i den udenrigspolitiske beslutningsproces*, Copenhagen: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag, 1983, p.89).

⁵⁶ Kjølsten et al. p.248.

⁵⁷ Kjølsten et al. pp.381-2, 394.

⁵⁸ Paul Sharp: “For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations”, *International Studies Review*, vol.1, no.1, 1999, pp.33-47, here pp.41-2.

⁵⁹ Brian Hocking: “Introduction: Gatekeepers and Boundary-Spanners – Thinking about Foreign Ministries in the European Union”, in: Brian Hocking and David Spence (eds.): *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*, Basingstoke/New York 2002.

⁶⁰ The ministers for trade and defence were dealing with international issues but had no competence to negotiate these issues internationally (on Danish foreign policy in the inter-war period, see: Viggo Sjøqvist: *Danmarks udenrigspolitik 1933-1940*, Copenhagen 1966).

At the same time the diplomats' role was, with a few exceptions, based on a clear dividing line between bureaucracy and politics. It had been a defining element of the Danish diplomatic self-understanding in the inter-war period that a clear distinction should be made between the setting up of the foreign policy goals – a task for the politically responsible government – and the execution of this policy – a job that rested best with the professional diplomat.⁶¹ This division of labour was particularly pronounced under the strong willed Foreign Minister P. Munch (1929-40) and apart from some notable anomalies created by the Second World War,⁶² Danish diplomacy by the end of the war came close to qualifying for Max Weber's ideal type bureaucracy: It was a hierarchical, rule bound organisation characterised by the distinction between impartial bureaucracy and political leadership; the diplomats were predominantly legally trained and they were generally diplomats for the duration of their professional life.⁶³ In this way Danish diplomacy reflected a widespread view among diplomats about the nature of diplomacy around the Second World War. For instance Harold Nicolson stressed how diplomacy should be viewed as an *executive*, not a *legislative* phenomenon and how the two should be kept separate;⁶⁴ he was convinced that one of the main reasons for the chaotic course of the Versailles Peace Conference was that politicians had not stuck to devising *policy* but insisted on meddling with *negotiation* – the prerogative of diplomats.⁶⁵

The new multilateral economic diplomats

One group of diplomats was particularly central in reinterpreting the role of the diplomat in the Danish Foreign Ministry after the Second World War: the diplomats responsible for Danish multilateral economic diplomacy after the war. This section of the paper aims to show how international and European economic integration in its various multilateral forms presented diplomats of the 1950s and 1960s with new demands and challenges. Based in a collection of data of their social characteristics and initial findings in published and unpublished sources, it will show how this group of diplomats positioned themselves differently towards politicians and public opinion than diplomats had previously done while gradually challenging and developing the existing role of the diplomat.

The prominent position of these economic diplomats was based in two conditions. Firstly, it reflected the move away from the foreign policy of the inter-war years, which had been concerned primarily with questions of military security and towards a foreign policy agenda of economic, social and technological issues. This shift meant that international politics and domestic political strategies and priorities were merged in new ways and to a larger degree than had previously been the case.⁶⁶ This created a need for a new type of diplomats who – consciously or unconsciously – broke with a series of norms for what a Danish diplomat was and reinterpreted that role for others to follow later.

⁶¹ Regarding P. Munch see for instance Sjøqvist 1966.

⁶² Most notably the administrative rule from 1943 to 1945 when leading bureaucrats were in charge of the central administration after the Danish government stepped down following confrontations with the German occupying power; the Danish ambassador, Henrik Kauffmann's independent diplomacy in Washington during the war and the career diplomat Gustav Rasmussen's nomination as foreign minister in the immediate post-war years.

⁶³ Weber 1922 [2006]; The point that the bureaucrats of the Danish central administration in the 1901-1945 period came very close to meeting the criteria for the classical Weberian bureaucrat has been made at a more general level by Mogens Bundgaard-Nielsen et al.: *Forholdet mellem minister og embedsmænd*, Kbh. 1998 (printed version of white paper no. 1354 presented to the Ministry for Finance 1998), pp.13-17 in the web document: <http://www.fm.dk/Publikationer/1998/Betaenkning%20nr%201354.aspx?mode=full> (accessed 29 Sep 2010)

⁶⁴ Nicolson 1939 p.16.

⁶⁵ Harold Nicolson: *Diplomacy: A Basic Guide to the Conduct of Contemporary Foreign Affairs*; London 1939, in particular pp.82-84.

⁶⁶ Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen: "Blurring the International-Domestic Politics Distinction: Danish Representation at the EC Negotiations", *Scandinavian Political Studies*, vol. 4, 3, 1981 pp.191-208, here p.191; Knud Erik Jørgensen: "Denmark", in Brian Hocking and David Spence (eds.): *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Secondly, it reflected the prominence of this issue on the Danish foreign policy agenda. The highly regulated European post-war economy and the various plans for multilateral free trade and customs union agreements gave the foreign economical issues a central position across Europe. But for a small, open economy there was a particular necessity to get diplomatically involved in this issue.

During the 1950s there was certainly an acknowledgement within the Foreign Ministry that the new multilateral diplomacy posed different and more demanding challenges for the diplomat. When in 1957 a commission was set up to draft new legislation regulating the Foreign Service, several commission members made this point. For instance the leader of the Danish delegation to the OEEC, Eyvind Bartels claimed that a situation had now developed where multilateral diplomacy shaped and defined bilateral diplomacy. And he also pointed out that:

“The work of the OEEC representation, which aims at attempting to assure that the course for international economic cooperation is charted in such a way that Danish interests are met to the largest possible extent, places great demands on the individual member of the representation. Thus, besides possessing the necessary professional competence, they must also be able to associate with and assert themselves quite easily among foreigners.”⁶⁷

The ability of Danish diplomats to meet these demands were helped along by new recruitment practices and a generational shift in the Foreign Service after the War.

The expansion and specialisation within the Danish Foreign Service in the post-war years took place through a consequent practice of recruiting new diplomats from the lower end of the career ladder, bringing about a significant rejuvenation of the Service. In 1946, the average age of a Danish diplomat was 47 years. By 1956, it had dropped to 36 years. While the average diplomat of 1946 had 21 years of experience in the service, this number had dropped to 12 in 1956. By the end of the War, the dominant generation of diplomats was those born in the decade between 1888 and 1897 (a reflection of the expansion of the service in the early 1920s).⁶⁸ Ten years later almost all diplomats of this generation had retired and the ministry was now dominated by the generation of diplomats born during and immediately after the First World War.⁶⁹ The rejuvenation was particularly pronounced in the political-economic section of the ministry which grew rapidly in the early post-war years.⁷⁰ Here, for the first time, candidates with an educational background in economics (the Danish term for their MA-level degrees was *cand.polit.*) were recruited in large numbers. In this part of the ministry, the average age dropped from 49 to 35 years, and the average experience in the Foreign Service dropped from 22 to 9 years. In the new office for multilateral economic affairs (ØP IV, a sub-section of the political-economic section) the generational shift was absolute: Ten years after the war the average age was a mere 32 years, and no diplomats had worked in the service before or during the war – indeed the average diplomatic work experience was a modest 6 years. It was also here that the group of economists (the *cand.polit.*'s) was most strongly represented – ten years after the war there were twice as many economists as lawyers working in the office (ten economists vs. five lawyers).⁷¹

⁶⁷ Minutes from 1st and 2nd meeting in the commission on the reorganisation of the Foreign Service 27 and 28 Jan 1958 (the quote originates from the meeting on 27 Jan 1958), cf. also statements from ambassador M.A. Wassard and J. Gren, spokesperson for the Danish Bankers' Association (Danske Bankers Fællesrepræsentation), Foreign Office Records 1946-72, 3.E.191.E/1, I, National Archives Copenhagen). Alyson J. K. Bailes has pointed out how multilateral experience came to be seen as a distinct and important competency in the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the same period: Alyson J.K. Bailes: "Reflections on Thirty Years in the Diplomatic Service", *Contemporary British History*, vol.18, nr.3, 2004, p.189-97, her p.192.

⁶⁸ They made up 43 % of employees in 1946(cf. *Udenrigsministeriets Kalender* 1946).

⁶⁹ Thus diplomats born in the decade 1918-27 made up 52 % of employees (*Udenrigsministeriets Kalender* 1956).

⁷⁰ Namely from 14 til 97 employees (jf. *Udenrigsministeriets Kalender* 1946 og 1956).

⁷¹ All numbers in this paragraph are based on *Udenrigsministeriets Kalender* 1946 og 1956.

In short, the recruitment and social basis of Danish diplomacy shifted in the 1950s and 1960s and the new group of multilateral economic diplomats epitomising this shift began to display a pattern of behaviour which diverged significantly from the traditional role of the Danish diplomat.

The new roles of the multilateral economic diplomats

The diplomat as boundary spanner

Perhaps the most important new feature of the multilateral economic diplomat's behaviour was their close working relationships with bureaucrats from other branches of the Danish central administration. Due to the fact that the national and the international political spheres were more closely inter-related in the field of multilateral economic affairs than in other foreign policy areas, it was the first field in which continuous systems for policy coordination developed. Already in the late 1940s in relation to Denmark's OEEC membership,⁷² a system was set up where "... all foreign economic matters of any significance were discussed in meetings with the interested ministries and interest groups before the Danish standpoint was established".⁷³ In other words interest groups and central administrative units such as the Ministry of Economy, the Ministry of Trade, the Economic Secretariat (*Det Økonomiske Sekretariat*) and the Directorate for Commodity Supplies (*Direktoratet for Vareforsyningen*) – and the predominantly *cand.polit.*-trained bureaucrats working there – were included in the foreign policy-making process.⁷⁴ This mode of policy coordination was formalised and systematised in relation to the negotiations about Danish EC membership in 1961, and in 1966 the special status of the multilateral economic diplomacy found a formal expression when the small office for multilateral economic affairs was converted into an independent 'Market Secretariat' (*Markedssekretariatet*). The secretariat was responsible for Danish relations with EFTA, the EC and bilateral economic diplomacy with states within these two blocs. Though the office remained within the bureaucratic structures of the Foreign Service, its political leader was the Minister for Trade and it was thus granted a special, independent status.⁷⁵ Similarly, the Danish EC representation developed into a 'mini-version' of the Danish central administration with representatives from many different ministries accredited with the mission.⁷⁶

However, this was not the only way in which the increasingly porous international-national divided manifested itself. Parallel to the emergence of the new system of coordination, the Foreign Ministry was in a broader process of losing its monopoly on international negotiations related to multilateral economic matters. In the OEEC, the ministers for trade and finance were meeting, in the ILO, Denmark was often represented by the ministers for work and social affairs, and the Danish Central Bank had its own contacts with central bankers from other countries.⁷⁷ In combination with the systematic policy coordination with administrative units and interest groups in the foreign policy making process, this 'diplomatisation' of parts of the central administration, which were given independent mandates to negotiate internationally changed the diplomat's role and function. Together

⁷² Bjøl pp.107-8.

⁷³ Minutes from 1st and 2nd meeting in the commission on the reorganisation of the Foreign Service 27 and 28 Jan 1958(the quote is a statement by H.C. Hansen on the meeting 28 Jan 1958) Foreign Office Records 1946-1972, 3.E.191.E/1, I, National Archives, Copenhagen)

⁷⁴ Johnny Laursen: "De nye mandariner i dansk markedsdiplomati. Jens Otto Krag og embedsmændene 1953-1962", *Vandkunsten* no.9/10, 1994, pp.132-44.

⁷⁵ Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen: "Den fleksible og robuste forvaltning", in Martin Marcussen and Karsten Ronit(eds.): *Internationaliseringen af den offentlige forvaltning i Danmark – forandring og kontinuitet*, Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag 2003, p.66.

⁷⁶ Bjøl 1983, p. 108. A similar participation by different ministries in a multilateral representation had already occurred in Denmark's NATO and OEEC missions (Grønnegård Christensen 2003, p.63).

⁷⁷ Bjøl p.104; Borring Olesen and Villaume p.460.

with the rapidly growing number of institutional actors at the international stage it meant that Danish economic diplomats were moving away from their traditional gatekeeper role and towards the role of ‘boundary spanners’ pointed out by Brian Hocking.⁷⁸

Arguably, the Danish Foreign Service was not at the forefront of this development. In some European countries the national administrations had already been fractured and developed a variety of international specialisations in relation to the League of Nations. And the founding members of the ECSC/EC had generally decentralised negotiations more than Denmark – not least in relation to the negotiation of the CAP, where Ministries for Finance and Agriculture had gained prominent roles.⁷⁹ The relatively hierarchical and monistic Danish system of coordination which had been established around the Foreign Ministry in relation to the OEEC and Denmark’s position outside the EC during the 1960s probably meant that the loss of diplomatic control was of a comparatively limited nature here.⁸⁰ However, this did not change the fact that the diplomats involved in negotiating Denmark’s international economic relations lost their special status and became one of a growing number of players engaging with and crossing the borderland between national and international economic politics

The diplomatic hero

Not only were the multilateral economic diplomats among the first diplomats to handle a porous dividing line between the national and the international. Through their activities they also challenged the other central dividing line in the traditional role of the diplomat: the distinction between the bureaucratic and the political sphere. It seems that among the diplomats involved in the questions of European economic cooperation there was an overrepresentation of what the Norwegian political scientist and anthropologist, Iver B. Neumann, has called ‘the diplomatic hero’. In an investigation into the present day Norwegian Foreign Ministry (*Utenriksdepartementet*), Neumann has argued that there is a repertoire of three roles available for a diplomat to play: that of a mediator, a bureaucrat and a hero. The heroic role, according to Neumann, can be subdivided into two roles: One is ‘the diplomat abroad’, who operates internationally and creates results in particularly difficult circumstances – be it in the face of physical hardship and danger or by creating critical results in complicated international negotiations. The other is the advisor situated at home in the Foreign Ministry:

”... the robust, prudent, and seemingly indefatigable analytical force who can muster a wide-ranging and high-powered network that guarantees access to as many sources of information and as high-placed decision makers as possible. [...] Advisers aim to be as close to the action as possible, which means that they thrive in secretariats and tend to complement their strictly diplomatic work with political work that may extend their interface with politicians. Indeed, the full-grown face of a diplomatic adviser is the face of a politician”⁸¹

These are fairly precise characterisations of the role played by key diplomats in the multilateral economic representations, the political-economic section and the office for multilateral economic affairs (from 1966 the Market Secretariat). To people with an interest in the post-war foreign policy of Denmark, names like Erling Kristiansen, Jens Christensen, Finn Gundelach and Niels Ersbøll would

⁷⁸ Brian Hocking: “Introduction: Gatekeepers and Boundary-Spanners – Thinking about Foreign Ministries in the European Union”, in: Brian Hocking og David Spence (eds.): *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*, Basingstoke/New York 2002.

⁷⁹ Laurence Badel, Stanislas Jeannesson and N. Piers Ludlow (eds.): *Les administrations nationales et la construction européenne. Une approche historique (1919-1975)*, Brussels, 2005; Ann-Christina L. Knudsen, *Farmers on Welfare. The Making of Europe’s Common Agricultural Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

⁸⁰ Jørgensen 2002. On the different systems of coordination in the Nordic and European states, see: Hocking and Spence 2002 and Ove K. Pedersen, Bengt Jacobsson and Per Læg Reid: *Europeanization and Transnational States, Comparing Central Nordic Governments*, London: Routledge Press, 2004.

⁸¹ Iver B. Neumann: ”To Be a Diplomat”, *International Studies Perspectives*, vol.6, 2005, pp.72-93, here pp.73-4.

be quite familiar. They all had steep careers⁸² and became key players in the shaping of Denmark's foreign economic policy, either through handling large and complex negotiations or by serving as strategic advisors in the Foreign Ministry (or sometimes both through the course of their career).⁸³ An illustrative example of this is the role played by the leader of the Market Secretariat, Jens Christensen, in coming up with the idea for and convincing the Foreign Minister to pursue the plans for closer Nordic economic cooperation (NORDEK) in 1968 when no progress was being made for Danish EC membership.⁸⁴ Also, it is well known in the Danish context how the EC ambassador, Finn Gundelach was a key figure in devising the strategy for and carrying through negotiations about Denmark's EC membership once they got under way again.⁸⁵ Sometimes the dividing line between bureaucracy and politics was not only blurred but actively crossed. In 1966, for instance, the social democratic Prime Minister, Jens Otto Krag, appointed the head of the Danish EC mission, ambassador, Tyge Dalgaard, as Minister for Trade when the Market Secretariat was created – thus giving Dalgaard the political responsibility for the bureaucratic focal point of Danish multilateral economic policy.⁸⁶

In a recent study of the European experts in the Norwegian Foreign Ministry and their involvement in accession negotiations in 1960-63, similar findings about the political importance of the new economic diplomats have been made. In particular the author stresses the power that the 'inner circle' of Norwegian European economic policy had due to its authority to decide which actors should be included and excluded from the policy process and their work with strategic communication and agenda setting.⁸⁷

This last feature is also recognisable in the Danish context. The heavy and politically toned role of the new economic diplomat also had a public dimension in Denmark. The multilateral economic diplomats were among the first to break with the anonymity that had so far been one of the key features of the Danish diplomat. Before the Second World War it was practically unheard of that diplomats made statements to the public regarding issues they were working on – this was considered a job for the Foreign Minister.⁸⁸ In relation to the negotiations on Danish EC membership, however, several economic diplomats stepped out of anonymity and played an active part in public debates through educational lectures and articles.⁸⁹ When appearing in these contexts, the diplomats acted exactly in their capacity as experts and institutional representatives (and not as private citizens). Thereby the diplomat took on a public personality and diplomacy was given a personal face which it had not previously had. This new dimension to the diplomatic role on one level reflected the prominent position and influence of the multilateral economic diplomats in Danish foreign economic policy. At a more fundamental level it also reflected a broader transformation of the diplomatic environment after the Second World War. The growing politicisation of foreign policy issues and EC related matters in particular with NGO's and political parties taking a growing interest in and debating

⁸² Jf. *Udenrigsministeriets Kalender*, selected years.

⁸³ Regarding the general status and role of this group, see Laursen 1994 pp.134-5.

⁸⁴ Borring Olesen and Villaume 2006 pp.536-7; Morten Rasmussen: "NORDEK – hasard med dansk europapolitik?", in: Lise Hedegaard Rasmussen og Kristine Midtgaard (eds.): *Omverdenen trænger sig på. Politik og ideer i det 20. århundredes historie. Festskrift til Thorsten Borring Olesen*, Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2006, pp.91-106.

⁸⁵ Niels Nørlund: "Den første dansker i Europa", *Berlingske Tidende* 14. Oct 1981; Bjøl p.95; Morten Rasmussen: *Joining the European Communities. Denmark's Road to EC-membership, 1961-1973*, PhD dissertation, European University Institute, 2004, pp.199-201.

⁸⁶ Jens Christensen. "Før og efter 1970. markedsproblemer – udviklingslande- eksportfremme", Udenrigsministeriet: *Nye grænser. Den danske udenrigstjeneste 1970-95*, København 1995, pp.36-7.

⁸⁷ Ikonomou 2010, see in particular p.138.

⁸⁸ As was for instance the case with Foreign Minister P. Munch's regular meetings with Danish press representatives in the 1930's (Sjøqvist 1966 p.42).

⁸⁹ See for instance Erling Kristiansen. "Romtraktaten – dens indhold og baggrund", in *Danmark og de Seks*, Copenhagen: Forlaget Aktuelle Bøger, 1961; Niels Ersbøll: "EEC og landbruget", *Information*, 6 Oct 1971.

diplomatic decisions and priorities called for a public appearance from diplomats. As apparent to this day, some of the first multilateral economic diplomats have maintained and developed this role as political debaters, at odds with the traditional, and still dominant, role orientation of the diplomat.⁹⁰

From an institutionalist perspective, the political toning and prominent public position of the economic diplomats is interesting. Historical institutionalism assumes (and this is confirmed by the gradual development of the Danish system of policy coordination) that institutional responses to external pressures tend to be preservational – i.e. characterised by path dependencies and ‘search for familiarity’. Sometimes, however, as institutionalist theorists have also noted, external pressures can also result in a shift in existing power balances, often related to broader discourses of modernisation.⁹¹ And this seems to have been the case with the Danish economic diplomats. Their swift onward march within the Foreign Service not only reflected that they possessed competences that were scarce and in high demand. It was also reflective of a broader political and bureaucratic modernisation of Danish foreign policy and the Danish central administration of the 1960’s. The new economic diplomats assumed their roles in the foreign policy decision-making process when the social democratic economists Viggo Kampmann and Jens Otto Krag took over the posts as, respectively, Prime and Foreign ministers.⁹² Also their progress took place in parallel with a generational shift in the leadership of the ministry. Difficulties in cooperation between Krag and the director of the ministry, the pre-war diplomat Nils Svenningsen (1894-1985), lead to Krag’s handover of the leadership of the ministry to Paul Fischer (b.1919) in 1961. Under Fischer’s leadership a new flexible management style was introduced, softening the internal hierarchy and leaving more responsibility with the individual heads of sections and offices.⁹³ This shift was not unique for the Foreign Service. The new politically toned role of the diplomats corresponds well with a general shift in the relationship between bureaucrats and politicians in this period; the 1960’s was a decade in which Danish bureaucrats in the central administration were increasingly advising their ministers, among others the Prime Ministers and the Ministers for Trade and Economy, and this advisory work was moving away from technical issues towards political and tactical advice.⁹⁴

The diplomat who seized to be a diplomat

The last significant role breach performed by several of the multilateral economic diplomats identified here is related to their personal career trajectories and relates (in a more direct way) with the emerging international and European administrative fields. Some of the economic diplomatic ‘high-flyers’ did not – as assumed by Weber – stay in the national diplomatic role their entire professional life. The build-up of international networks and multilateral experience which took place in relation to their diplomatic work was a capital that could be converted into jobs and careers in the new international and particularly European multilateral arenas. This created a possibility for shifting between national and international professional positions,⁹⁵ which some of the economic diplomats took advantage of. The most prominent example of this was Finn Gundelach (1923-81) – the EC ambassador mentioned

⁹⁰ See for instance Niels Ersbøll and Jens Peter Bonde: ”Et mere demokratisk EU”, feature in *Politiken* 12 May 2006; Jens Christensen and Niels Ersbøll: ”Minitraktat og folkeafstemninger”, feature in *Politiken*, 25 May 2007.

⁹¹ James March and Johan P. Olsen: *Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics*, London/New York: The Free Press, 1989, pp.34, 53-67 cf. Robert Harmsen: “The Europeanization of National Administrations: A Comparative Study of France and the Netherlands”, *Governance*, vol. 12, 1, 1999, pp. 81-113, here pp.85-6.

⁹² Borring Olesen and Villaume p.522. Kampmann was prime minister from 1960 til 1962, Krag was foreign minister from 1958 to 1962 and prime minister 1962-68 and 1971-72.

⁹³ Bjøl pp. 85-6.

⁹⁴ Bundgaard-Nielsen et al. p.66 in web document.

⁹⁵ Cf. also Kleiner 2008, p.333.

above.⁹⁶ Gundelach had a background in economics and from 1955 to 1959 he worked as Danish representative at the UN's European headquarter in Geneva. After this stationing he put his national diplomatic career on hold and took a job with GATT where he played a central role in the Kennedy round and became Deputy Executive Secretary. In 1967 he returned to the Danish Foreign Service, now assuming one of the most important diplomatic postings at the time as Denmark's ambassador to the EC. When Denmark had become an EC member in 1973, Gundelach's experience as one of the primary interlocutors between the new member state and the EC was converted into an appointment as the first Danish commissioner in the European Commission. This was quite an achievement; his closest competitor was Per Hækkerup, a prominent social democrat and former Foreign Minister who belonged to one of the leading families over time of that political party.⁹⁷ For the still largely EC-sceptical Danish social democratic party however there was good reason to pick a top trained economist rather than a top person from their own ranks as Denmark's first commissioner.

Gundelach was also appointed as commissioner for a second term in 1977, and took another step up the career ladder when he became commissioner of agriculture and thereby responsible for the main part of the EC budget⁹⁸ as well as vice president of the Commission.⁹⁹ From this point on he was part of the informal 'inner cabinet' of the Commission gathered around the president, Roy Jenkins,¹⁰⁰ and shortly before he died in 1981 – allegedly worn out by the European bureaucratic machinery, as stated in one of the obituaries for him¹⁰¹ – he was considered as a candidate for the post as President of the Commission.¹⁰² In this way, Gundelach had not only transgressed the boundary between national and international diplomatic careers, he had also blurred the distinction between bureaucracy and politics.

However it was not only for diplomat-cum-politicians like Gundelach that the new international multilateral arenas which opened up after 1945 created fresh possibilities. For instance the EC's growing committee system under the European Commission and the Council of Ministers created a framework within which diplomats as well as other nationally employed bureaucrats came to negotiate national and sectoral policies and met with colleagues working on similar issues in other member states.¹⁰³ This horizontal integration gave a negotiating mandate to a broader group of bureaucrats, further eroded the gate keeping role of the diplomats and consolidated a number of European administrative fields in which diplomats only played a limited role. In these contexts diplomats as well as other bureaucrats assumed a new 'double mandate' as both national and European representatives. In structural terms this double positioning had clear parallels with the developments in the international parliamentary sphere where the double mandate became the dominant form of representation in international organisations such as NATO, The Council of Europe, and Nordic Council – and until 1979 the European Parliament.

⁹⁶ Other examples of Danish EC-diplomats who continued their careers at the international stage are: Niels Ersbøll, Jørgen Ørstrøm-Møller and Poul Skytte Christoffersen. The legal advisor to the Foreign Ministry, Max Sørensen, made the same shift when he became member of the European Court of Human Rights and (1955-1972) and the European Court of Justice (1972-79).

⁹⁷ Bo Lidegaard: *Jens Otto Krag 1962-1978*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2. ed., 2004, p.650.

⁹⁸ At this time about two thirds of the EC budget was spend on agriculture. For an introduction, see Knudsen 2009, pp. 266-303.

⁹⁹ Kai Mieritz: "Den stærke dansker i Bruxelles", *Weekendavisen* 28 Dec 1974; Niels Nørlund: "Den første dansker i Europa", *Berlingske Tidende*, 14 Oct 1981.

¹⁰⁰ Michelle Cini: *The European Commission: Leadership. Organisation and Culture in the EU Administration*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996, p.61.

¹⁰¹ Børge Visby: "Han sled sig ihjel på EF", *Politiken*, 14 Jan 1981.

¹⁰² Birgitte Ersbøll: "Et dansk bud på en præsident", *Berlingske Tidende* 27 Apr 1980

¹⁰³ Knudsen and Morten Rasmussen 2008.

VII. CONCLUSION

The overall aim of this paper has been to reflect on how, from a historical starting point, one can grapple with the changes diplomacy has undergone in an increasingly interconnected and institutionally integrated world. It has argued that in order to do this it is necessary to bring the study of diplomacy into dialogue with the recent transnational – or global governance – perspectives, which have gained a central position within both IR and history and which have been key in identifying the changes that the international political system has undergone during the 20th century. In order to develop this argument it has proceeded in the following way: First, it has briefly outlined the dominant ways in which diplomacy has been depicted within International Relations (IR) and history. Second, it has introduced a number of studies within both disciplines which have broken away from these standard interpretations and in some cases linked the study of diplomacy to transnational developments and structures. Against this background, the third main section of the paper has suggested one possible approach to analysing how the changes in the policy environment have reshaped diplomatic patterns of actions and role orientations based on theories and methodologies from political science and sociology. In a final section the paper has presented an example of how this approach may be applied by conducting a pilot study into how increased regional European economic cooperation in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to reshaping diplomatic roles and patterns of actions in the Danish Foreign Service.

The analysis of the economic diplomats has suggested that the various forms of European economic integration created at least three important breaches in the classical diplomatic role orientation. Due to the new entanglement of national and international political priorities and strategies the economic diplomats came to challenge the division between national and international politics that had traditionally structured the role of the diplomat. Instead, they became ‘boundary spanners’ who administered and mediated between a growing number of bureaucratic and political actors in foreign policy. Also the economic diplomats challenged the distinction between bureaucracy and politics that had previously defined the diplomatic occupation; they were ‘hero’ diplomats who were not only responsible for the bureaucratic implementation of foreign policy but also played an independent role in developing policy and formulating strategies on the politically highly profiled foreign economic scene. Finally, the economic diplomats of the 1950s and 1960s broke with the classical expectation of diplomatic employment for life. They made use of the increasing possibilities of switching career tracks in the national diplomatic service and international organisations. In this way they began to operate as independent agents in the new emerging transnational and European administrative field

Author Contacts:

Karen.Gram-Skjoldager

Department of History and Area Studies

Aarhus University

Bartholins Allé 16

DK-8000 Aarhus C

Denmark

Email: Karen.Gram-Skjoldager@EUI.eu; hiskgs@hum.au.dk

