



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Gudmund Hatt

1884-1960

Larsen, Henrik Gutzon

Published in:
Geographers

Publication date:
2009

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Larsen, H. G. (2009). Gudmund Hatt: 1884-1960. In H. Lorimer, & C. W. J. Withers (Eds.), *Geographers: Biobibliographical Studies - Volume 28* (pp. 17-37). Bloomsbury Academic.
<http://books.google.dk/books?id=89G3aPHMngsC&lpg=PA17&dq=gudmund%20hatt&pg=PA17#v=onepage&q&f=false>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Gudmund Hatt

1884–1960

Henrik Gutzon Larsen



Gudmund Hatt was a key figure in Danish geography during the first half of the twentieth century, and he played a significant role in developing the fields of ethnography and archaeology. Yet, he is undoubtedly the most controversial individual in the history of Danish geography. The reasons for this relate to Hatt's prolific activities as a geopolitical commentator during the early years of the German occupation, which marked him as 'pro-German' – if not something more sinister. Virtually all of Hatt's human geography was located on the borderland between 'science' and 'politics', and it was largely the historical circumstances – and a stubborn sense of scientific and national duty – that led to his eventual fall, professionally as well as personally. In the post-war purges, Hatt was the only professor brought to trial by an extraordinary disciplinary court for public servants (*Den ekstraordinære Tjenestemandstol*) and sentenced for having engaged in '*uærdig national Optreden*' (dishonourable national conduct) during the occupation. This cost him the chair of human geography at Copenhagen University, but the fact that the ageing professor was allowed to keep his pension suggests that the case against Hatt – like his geopolitical work – was ambiguous.

Education, Life and Work

(Aage) Gudmund Hatt was born on 31 October 1884 in the village of Vildbjerg in western Jutland, where his father was the schoolteacher. The parents had moved to the village shortly before the birth of Gudmund as the first of seven children. Steffen Stummann Hansen has suggested that the intellectually ambitious and culturally engaged father soon became frustrated with the realities of rural life on the meagre heath-lands (Stummann Hansen 1995). This resulted in a poorly disguised intellectual arrogance, a trait one may also discern in the son as he matured to

become the professor of human geography at Copenhagen University. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the father saw in the unmistakably intelligent boy an outlet for his unrealized intellectual (and social) ambitions. Hatt grew up on a hardy diet of scientific and philosophical discussions with the father. Yet, he apparently had a very close relationship with his more unassuming mother, who sadly died at an early age, two years after the family in 1898 moved to the Zealand town of Holbæk. Hatt did not disappoint, for, although his upper secondary schooling in Copenhagen was delayed by illness and he had to pursue most exams through self-study, he passed his exams with distinction in 1904.

His prospects were brilliant, but the young Hatt was initially unsure of which direction he should choose. As he later explained in a short autobiography on the occasion of his doctorate, his interests spanned most of the natural sciences and included also philosophy and psychology (Hatt 1914). He initially matriculated to study medicine at Copenhagen University. This was evidently the wrong choice and, in 1905, Hatt left for the United States, where, according to his autobiography, he worked as groom and ditcher before becoming an assistant at a chemical laboratory. A stay with the Cherokees in Oklahoma, where a friend of his father worked as a missionary, decisively turned Hatt's attention to the field of ethnography. By paying his way as laboratory assistant, Hatt began the study of ethnography in 1906–07 under Roland B. Dixon at Harvard. Feilberg (1960) and Birket-Smith (1961) both suggest that Dixon laid the foundations for Hatt's view of ethnography and archaeology as two sides of the same coin. Yet, Hatt also saw connections between ethnography and geography. Dixon could thus in 1908 welcome his former student's decision to study geography as 'a most interesting field to take up'. But, he added, 'I am glad to hear that you have not forgotten anthropology entirely': indeed, Dixon saw 'a field open for work which combines the two', although he found 'the title "anthropogeography" ... a little terrifying' (Dixon to Hatt, 7 January 1908, private papers, box 3).

Hatt had, by 1908, returned to Denmark, where he gave some public lectures, which, by their portrayal of native Americans' dire predicament, caused some newspaper debate (Kristensen 1960). This was not the last time Hatt was to cause a public furore. Like most Danes with ethnographical interests at the time, he went on to study natural history and geography at what was then the only university in the country, Copenhagen University. This brought him into contact with the pioneers of Danish university geography, Ernst Løffler (1835–1911) and, particularly, H. P. Steensby (1875–1920), who probably first introduced Hatt to Ratzelian anthropogeography.

Hatt graduated in 1911 with distinction. That year, he married Emilie Demant Hansen (1873–1958), an artist who had lived in Lapland for a year with the Sami and who, in 1910, translated, edited and published a book in Sami and Danish by Johan Turi. Emilie Demant Hatt, in 1913, published *Med Lapperne i Høijfjeldet* (*With the Lapps in the High Mountains*) on her travels among the Sami. Her new husband's academic background was of considerable help to her in establishing her ethnographic credentials. Hatt contributed footnotes to her book and translated into English another work she produced with Turi and his nephew, *Lappish Texts*, in 1920 (see Hatt and Sjöholm 2008). Emilie lost two baby girls by miscarriage or stillbirth early in the marriage, and the couple remained childless. The newly wed couple travelled among the Sami people of Norway and Sweden in the summers of 1912 to 1914 to collect anthropological material. This was Hatt's only 'fieldwork' in the conventional anthropological sense of the word. His line of ethnographical enquiry was generally based on the study of artefacts in museums, and it was mainly on the basis of studies at museums in St Petersburg, Helsinki, Copenhagen

and Kristiania (Oslo) that he successfully defended his doctoral thesis in September 1914 on Arctic skin clothing in Eurasia and America. In the following academic year, on a fellowship from the American-Scandinavian Foundation, Hatt visited Columbia University, where he studied with Franz Boas and visited ethnographical museums in Canada and the United States.

Hatt was employed at the National Museum in Copenhagen in 1919. This position meant that Hatt became involved in archaeology as well as in ethnography. From December 1922 to September 1923, he also led an archaeological expedition to the Virgin Islands, which had been a Danish colony until 1917. Hatt had already, in 1918, planned to participate in an archaeological-ethnographical expedition to Mexico, but he left the project, apparently because of disagreements with his expedition partner, and they were in any case denied transit through the United States as the Department of State did not consider the journey necessary in a time of war (Vett to Hatt, July and September 1918; American Consular Service to Hatt, 24 October 1918; private papers, box 3). This was by no means the only example of Hatt's often stubborn and combative intellect, which arguably did much to decide his eventual fate. From 1917 to 1921, for example, he engaged in a prolonged and bitter conflict with an American anthropologist in the pages of *American Anthropologist*. Interestingly, considering his later fate, a long-time American friend and colleague suggested that the wrath of Hatt's opponent was to a large extent directed at the journal's editor, who 'was a Boas man – and Boas is *persona non grata*, owing chiefly to his pro-German attitude during the war' (Nielson to Hatt, 14 March 1921, private papers, box 4).

In 1921, Hatt applied for the professorship in geography that had become vacant following the death of Steensby. Among the applicants was Alfred Wegener, the originator of the then hotly debated theory of continental drift. Judged by the ingenuity deployed by the evaluation committee with respect to the applicants, the chair was clearly intended for Martin Vahl (1869–1946), a physical geographer who is remembered for his work on the global geography of climates and vegetation. Hatt and the other Danish applicant, Kai Birket-Smith (1893–1977), were apparently aware of this, as both, in their applications, stated that they did not want to be appointed if Vahl was an applicant (Committee's report, 4 May 1921, private papers, box 17). Around the same time, Vahl and Hatt began the ambitious project of writing a handbook in geography – what was, eventually, the four-volume *Jorden og Menneskelivet* (*The Earth and Human Life*, 1922–27). This work, known colloquially as 'Vahl & Hatt', was to become a landmark work in Danish geography. Probably because of this, Hatt was, in 1923, appointed associate professor (*lektor*) of geography at Copenhagen University. For several years, he maintained this position in tandem with his employment at the National Museum, but, from 1927, he was – with a corresponding reduction in pay – allowed to reduce his work at the museum by two days a week, and, in 1929, Hatt finally left the museum upon his appointment as extraordinary professor of human geography. The authors of the canonical geographical text of the time, Vahl and Hatt, thus came to occupy the chairs of geography in Denmark.

Although no longer attached to the National Museum, Hatt sustained his work in ethnography and archaeology. Funded by a steady stream of grants from the Carlsberg Foundation, he engaged in almost constant movement between Copenhagen and excavations in northern and western Jutland, which often had him sleeping in night-trains to make his arduous schedule work. These studies focused chiefly on prehistoric fields and Iron Age settlements – an interest that also took Hatt (and Emilie) to Scotland, the Orkney and Shetland Islands, the Faeroes.

Iceland and South Greenland. As a by-product, he also became involved in efforts to preserve historic Danish landscapes.

In parallel with these activities, Hatt also devoted himself to the field of human geography – a line of work that appears to have begun almost by coincidence. As he told a Swedish colleague in 1938, ‘I am the oldest among [Steensby’s] students and saw myself first and foremost as an ethnographer and archaeologist, but through his influence I acquired a human-geographical attitude’. Indeed, he generally saw Danish geographers as ‘belonging more to archaeology and ethnography than to geography in a narrow sense’. This did not bother Hatt. With a formulation that resonates surprisingly with the future problem-orientation of the progressive 1970s universities, he concluded: ‘Disciplinary demarcations are after all human creations and are particularly the result of the universities’ need for a division of subjects. The problems, which are the most important in science, often cut across all subject divisions.’ Yet, ‘As the university after the death of Steensby needed a teacher in human geography, . . . I was directed to economic-geographical [*erhvervsgeografiske*] and political-geographical analyses’ (Hatt to Friberg, 2 May 1938, private papers, box 10). These fields were to come together in Hatt’s human geography and, through this convergence, Hatt emerged in the late 1930s as a well known – and quite rapidly vilified – public intellectual.

Hatt’s entrance into the public domain, so to speak, began with his participation in a 1934 series of talks on the Danish state radio on inheritance and race. This led on to a large number of radio talks, particularly on colonialism and, increasingly, on the geopolitics of the unfolding world conflict. These talks were generally published as books, journal articles or newspaper features, the first being the 1936 *Stillehavsproblemer (Pacific Ocean Problems)* on the rise of Japan, which appeared as the first volume in the Royal Danish Geographical Society’s human geography monograph series (Hatt 1936). Following articles in 1939 in the Copenhagen evening paper *Berlingske Aftenavis*, Hatt extended his involvement in the daily press to an unprecedented level. From 1939 to 1942, he wrote at least 115 often essay-long newspaper articles (Larsen 2009). Apart from *Berlingske Aftenavis*, the articles appeared in the morning paper *Berlingske Tidende* and the tabloid *BT*, which were (and are) all politically Conservative newspapers. This fact does not necessarily hint at Hatt’s political leanings. He did have great regard for Erik Scavenius, the social-liberal foreign minister, and he praised the foreign politics of the longstanding social-democratic Prime Minister, Thorvald Stauning. And although Hatt developed a manifest fear of Soviet expansionism, he was not generally anxious about the Left. Hatt sided with the Republican side in the Spanish Civil War (Jerrild 1939), and signed a protest against the government’s attempt to block a 1935 visit to Denmark by Maurice Dobb, the Marxist economic historian, whom the petition described as ‘decidedly leftwing’ (Petition, April 1935, private papers, box 7). Yet, Hatt was not a revolutionary, either of the Left or of the Right. If he leaned towards a political party, we might concur with the qualified guess of Joachim Lund and locate Hatt with the Social-Liberal Party (Lund 2007).

Hatt’s veritable avalanche of publishing in the late 1930s and early 1940s was heralded by a handful of scholarly human geography articles with a contemporary vantage point and by his *Jorden og Menneskelivet*. But Hatt’s human geography was, in general, educational in orientation: Hatt sought to illuminate what he considered to be the geographical foundations of the pressing problems of then troubled times, and he aimed at the widest possible audience. Perhaps fatefully, he continued until August 1943 – well into the German occupation of Denmark. The first phase of the occupation is the oddest and most hotly disputed period in modern Danish history. For the present purpose, it is sufficient to note that from the

occupation on 9 April 1940 to 29 August 1943, Denmark was largely treated as an independent, neutral state under German ‘protection’ – the so-called ‘sovereignty fiction’. This meant that all branches of the state continued to function, including the democratically elected parliament, and that Danish–German relations were formally maintained by their respective foreign offices. The key figure in this policy of ‘collaboration’ was Foreign Minister Erik Scavenius, who, in 1942–43, also assumed the position of Prime Minister. For some, this represented a sensible exercise in small-state *Realpolitik*, which carried Denmark reasonably unharmed through the war. For others, the policy of collaboration was seen as shamefully cynical and unprincipled (especially after the war). Like most of the wartime Danish establishment, and probably also the majority of Danes generally, Hatt subscribed to the first view and acted in accordance with this position.

Hatt’s first real action was to be a founding member of the Danish–German Society (*Dansk-Tysk Forening*), which was established on the instigation of the Danish Foreign Office in the summer of 1940. In his statement to the extraordinary disciplinary court, Hatt later explained that he had been somewhat reluctant to take this step, as he ‘was not sure whether it was right to prostrate oneself before the Germans’. But, considering that the request was initiated by the Foreign Office, Hatt accepted because he was ‘convinced that the policy of Foreign Minister Scavenius was the only right one under the given circumstances’ (Statement, 10 December 1945, T.225). It was in his capacity as, by then, also a board member of the Danish–German Society that, in Berlin in October 1941, Hatt presented his most republished geopolitical paper, ‘Norden og Europa’ (‘The Nordic Countries and Europe’), in *Nordische Verbindungsstelle*, after having attended a conference on the European economy in Weimar. The paper was originally prepared for a talk Hatt gave in August 1941 at the summer meeting of the National Sweden–Germany Association (*Riksföreningen Sverige-Tyskland*) in Jönköping, Sweden. In his statement after the war, Hatt described this organization as a Swedish version of the Danish–German Society, but, in contrast to this organization, the Swedish association harboured – possibly unbeknown to Hatt – clearer national-socialist sentiments. In August–September 1940, Hatt also made a visit to Slovakia as an official guest of the newly established fascist regime. The Danish Foreign Office had facilitated this visit and Hatt’s other wartime travels outside Denmark.

In conjunction with these activities, Hatt wrote steadily for the newspapers. A prominent example in this respect was his article in *Berlingske Tidende* on New Year’s Day 1941, which, under the headline ‘World Political New Year’, took up the entire front page and most of the following four pages. Following a gap after the occupation, Hatt also resumed his talks on the radio. In spring 1941, he gave a series of talks that were subsequently published as *Hvem kæmper om Kloden* (*Who is Fighting over the Globe*) and, in August 1941, Hatt began an extended series of monthly talks under the heading ‘*Verdenspolitisk Oversigt*’ (World-Political Overview). These talks had their origin in mounting German pressure upon the Danish authorities to schedule programmes that would provide Danes with an ‘understanding’ of current affairs. Rather than run the risk of having Nazi speakers forced upon radio by the Germans, the Foreign Office decided to pick ‘reliable’ lecturers. Hatt was among the speakers the ministry suggested to the radio. He eventually gave almost 30 of these talks. The last took place on 26 August 1943, three days before the government resigned following a general strike and subsequent German demands for the introduction of capital punishment. This broadcast marked the end of Hatt’s hectic engagement as a geopolitical commentator.

As German fortunes in the war began to wane, the newspapers lost their appetite for Hatt’s analyses, but his work continued to be published by politically suspect

journals. These included the monthly *Globus: Tidsskrift for Nutidskultur, Planøkonomi og Geopolitik* (*Globe: Journal of Contemporary Culture, Planned Economy and Geopolitics*), which was established in 1941 by a group of left-wing social-democrats, who saw the war as an opportunity to implement a planned economy. The journal initially had the support of some social-democrats, including Prime Minister Stauning, but the party soon detached itself from the venture, and the journal increasingly took the form of a Nazi-oriented propaganda outlet, which – probably unknown to Hatt – received covert financial support from the occupying power. This pro-Nazi tone was even truer of *Europa Kabel: Økonomisk Ugeskrift* (*Europe Wire: Economic Weekly*), a thinly concealed Nazi propaganda magazine to which Hatt contributed two articles. According to his post-war statement to the extraordinary disciplinary court, Hatt turned down an offer to become its editor. In addition, the more respectable (and Foreign-Office-supported) *Tidsskrift for Udenrigspolitik* (*Journal of Foreign Politics*) printed most of his ‘World-Political Overview’ radio broadcasts.

Neither formally nor by orientation was Hatt a Nazi. On the contrary, there is much to suggest that his work – in part, at least – aimed at countering the intrusion of Nazism in Danish society and politics. But his geopolitical analyses and public actions during the war were highly favourable towards Germany – a point Hatt never tried to dodge and, even with a charitable interpretation, he all too frequently proffered statements that went well beyond what political pragmatism could require. *Land og Folk*, the then underground Communist bulletin, was hardly an unprejudiced voice, but one can, from Hatt’s writings, see why, in 1942, it numbered him among ‘Hitler’s creatures in Denmark’ and as one of the ‘illegal [i.e. covert] supporters of the traitor-party’, the Danish Nazi party (‘Hitlers Kreaturer i Danmark’, *Land og Folk*, 1 August 1942). Moreover, no matter Hatt’s own inclination, Nazis and those more or less declared as such frequently regarded Hatt’s work with enthusiasm. It is hardly surprising, then, that the ageing Hatt was among the many who were roughly and humiliatingly arrested and interned on Liberation Day, 5 May 1945. Hatt was released without charge after a week. Yet, he was still the object of criticism, in the public domain and, apparently, from some colleagues and friends. In a letter to an Irish archaeologist, for example, he recalled that a ‘Russophile’ colleague in 1945 had said that he ‘ought to be shot’ (Hatt to Ó Riordáin, 22 July 1947, private papers, box 14). And, in one of the first books to deal with the occupation, Hatt was, for his geopolitical work, accused of having ‘made a whore of science’ (Blædel 1946, 570).

In late July 1945 and at his own behest, but suggested by the university’s leadership and his solicitor, Hatt requested that his activities during the occupation should be investigated by the extraordinary disciplinary court for public servants, which the parliament had established as part of the retrospective judicial settlement of the years of occupation. Hatt’s passage through this problematic mechanism for retrospective retribution took a long time, and it was not until February 1947 that the prosecutor presented a final indictment against Hatt. In the meantime, Hatt was not formally suspended from the university, but he was relieved of all functions. Hatt was indicted on four counts, each of which was considered to constitute ‘dishonourable national conduct’, and, in relation to one, he was also accused of having ‘afforded the occupying power significant propaganda support’ by way of his position (Indictment, 3 February 1947, T.225). The first and most extensive count related to statements in Hatt’s geopolitical writings and radio talks, which, according to the prosecutor, had voiced understanding for why Germany began the war, conveyed strongly the opinion that Germany would win the war, glorified Hitler and Germany’s standing among the European nations, agitated for consent to the ‘new Europe’ and for friendly attitudes towards Germany, criticized the

Allies, mentioned the Danish participation in German military units (on the East Front) with understanding, spoke strongly against the resistance movement and repeatedly emphasized that it would be a tragedy for Europe and particularly the Nordic countries if Germany lost the war to Russia and to the other Allies. In addition to this lengthy charge, the indictment's other counts criticized Hatt for his speeches in Germany (including three archaeological lectures) during the war, that he had allowed a Nazi student magazine to publish a quote in which he said that friendliness towards Britain and communist sympathies should not be confused with Danish patriotism, and, finally, that, in a private letter, he had praised a radio talk by one of the Danes who kept on giving such talks after August 1943. The problem was that the speaker, who was later sentenced for treason, read parts of the letter on the radio. In bringing forward the case against Hatt, the prosecutor had clearly searched high and low for anything that could incriminate him.

On the basis of this mix of charges, the disciplinary court began its hearings in early April 1947. The hearings lasted for three days and received considerable press coverage. This had to do with Hatt's high (if, by then, infamous) public profile, but the media attention was also fostered by the appearance of well known witnesses like Scavenius and Cecil von Renthe-Fink, Germany's first ambassador to Denmark during the occupation. Hatt did not try to distance himself from his wartime geopolitical analyses. In fact, he conceded that his conclusions could be seen as 'pro-German', but he steadfastly maintained that this had nothing to do with sympathies for Nazi Germany: in Hatt's view, he had only done his scientific and national duty. How Hatt arrived at this view will be addressed below. Here, it is sufficient to note that Hatt's defence mainly sought to emphasize that he had acted in accordance with the policy of the Danish government at the time, and that mainstream newspapers had published similar analyses.

The defence did not convince the three judges. In early May 1947, they followed the prosecutor's recommendation and ruled that Hatt be dismissed from his chair at Copenhagen University. Like the indictment, however, the ruling was a hotchpotch. The judges ruled that the quote in the Nazi student magazine was regrettable but not in breach of the law. Similarly, they found several of his wartime visits to Germany unfortunate but not sanctionable. But Hatt's participation in the Weimar conference was seen to constitute 'dishonourable national conduct' – a view that applied also to his acceptance of an invitation to a conference in Prague on the future of (a German-led) Europe (in which, in the event, he did not participate). The Danish Foreign Office had facilitated invitations for both conferences, and Hatt reported to Foreign Minister Scavenius on the Weimar conference. Hatt was also found guilty in relation to the private letter aired on the radio. Aside from these somewhat odd rulings, the judges' ruling devoted most space to the main charge relating to Hatt's geopolitical writings, which 'cannot be seen to express an objective–scientific account for geographical–political viewpoints [as the] statements contain both attacks on British–American–Russian politics and defence of German–Japanese politics of a purely moral character' (Ruling, 6 May 1947, T.225). Hatt was therefore also in this respect guilty of 'dishonourable national conduct', but, with the indecisiveness typical of the ruling, the judges cleared Hatt of the additional charge of having 'afforded the occupying power significant propaganda support'. The question of moral support for Germany seems to have been a linchpin in the court's ruling. It conceded that Hatt could have found support for his views in the politics of the government (and in press writings). But whereas the judges found that the government's policy was not based on sympathies, they found that Hatt's activities and writings had been decidedly so. Partly because of this murkiness, the court did not deprive Hatt of

part of his pension as demanded by the prosecutor. Yet, despite its façade of jurisprudence and attempted even-handedness, it is today difficult not to agree with Lund's conclusion that the extraordinary disciplinary court in the trial of Hatt revealed itself as a moral court (Lund 2007).

The ruling was a devastating blow from which Hatt never recovered. It not only terminated his tenure as a professional geographer, but it also marked his intellectual departure from the field of geography. With robust symbolism, Hatt sold his significant collection of geographical books and journals. Fortunately, the Carlsberg Foundation continued to fund his excavations, and Hatt devoted the rest of his working life to archaeology and ethnography. Yet, in this respect, too, his work was hampered by the trial. In his view, he was, for a time, subjected to a tacit block on his publishing in Denmark and, in at least one case, also in Sweden. That the Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters seemed to hesitate in publishing two manuscripts, which he had submitted in 1945 and 1946, was in this respect particularly upsetting. Hatt was also informally requested not to appear at the Academy's meetings after a quarrel with the president, Niels Bohr. From Britain and North America, on the other hand, the 'pro-German' Hatt was frequently asked to submit book reviews for journals like *Man* and *American Anthropologist*, for example, and this was where his and E. Cecil Curwen's *Plough and Pasture* (1953) was published. Post-war passions soon began to wane, however, and, with the emergence of more sober views concerning the occupation, Hatt was seen in a kinder light. In 1949, the Academy published his earlier manuscripts, as, later, it published his major archaeological treatise, *Nørre Fjand* (Hatt 1957). It was apparently for the presentation of this work that Hatt first reappeared in the Academy, where Bohr personally welcomed his return. And, on the occasion of his 75th birthday, a group of former students compiled a special issue of the archaeological journal *Kuml* in Hatt's honour.

In spite of such honours and accomplishments, and the fact that his private papers bear witness of the sympathy many showed him, Hatt's post-war years were in general dark. Letters from Emilie suggest that, from the early years of the occupation, Hatt had become absorbed by a mounting rage against people in general, and, with some justification, the injustice he felt he had incurred at the hands of the extraordinary disciplinary court greatly aggravated such sentiments. In what may be seen as a self-imposed semi-exile, he and Emilie increasingly lived in the village of Kauslunde on Funen. Hatt also sought peace in the writing of thinly disguised (and never published) autobiographical essays and particularly in the composition of poems, of which he published two collections, the first under a pseudonym. His chosen nom de plume, *Sempervirens* (evergreen), hardly matched Hatt's gloomy poetry, and the death of the ailing Emilie in 1958 did away with such fortitude as remained. As a friend was to say at his grave, 'wounded and torn as Gudmund Hatt's soul had become, in the great loneliness that became his fate, he could not conceal that in his innermost "twinkling darkness" he had been vanquished by "hate and malice". It was in such moments of despair that the yearning for death doubled' (Roos 1961, 259).

Hatt died on 27 January 1960 at Frederiksberg Hospital near his Copenhagen home. In keeping with his semi-exile, he was buried in Kauslunde, where Emilie had been laid to rest. If they mentioned them at all, the many obituaries tended to downplay his activities during the German occupation.

Scientific Ideas and Geographical Thought

'Geopolitics' looms large in geographers' memory of Hatt. But Hatt's geopolitical engagement has conventionally been seen as only a part of his geographical oeuvre, which unfolded in an 'unfortunate' period during the late 1930s and early 1940s. In part, this is because historiographers like geography professor Sofus Christiansen (1930–2007) have seen Hatt's ethnography, archaeology and geography as interrelated. And with good reason, since, as we have seen, this was also Hatt's own view. (Hatt's archaeology is addressed in several papers by Steffen Stummann Hansen (1984; 1995), and Ole Høiris (1986) provides an excellent analysis of Hatt's ethnography.) Here, I confine my scrutiny of Hatt's work in geography to a more circumscribed understanding. This was first and foremost an engagement with human geography that particularly focused on the fields of economic and political geography. But whatever label we may choose as identifier, most of Hatt's human geography was a geopolitical engagement in two intertwined phases, detailed below. Initially, let me look briefly at Hatt's idea of geography.

It is not coincidental that we have to look to the first volume of *Jorden og Menneskelivet* to find an exposition of Hatt's notion of geography (Vahl and Hatt 1922–27). Hatt was not in the habit of building theoretical frameworks or advancing succinct conceptualizations. Geography was first and foremost about describing 'facts': as Vahl and he wrote, 'the actual description of geographical facts is the foundation on which geographical science builds' (Vahl and Hatt 1922–27, I, 1). Vahl and Hatt devoted less than a page to general considerations about the field of geography before they began what was, excepting their respective 'systematic' introductions to physical and human geography, essentially a four-volume long opus of descriptive regional geography. But they did propose a definition of their field, which, in many respects, epitomizes the conventional Danish notion of geography:

The task of geography is to depict the Earth as the home and field of activity of human beings. Land and people, nature and culture, are the topics the geographer strives to connect; his [sic] goal is to demonstrate how human life and culture are conditioned by the Earth's natural conditions and utilise the possibilities afforded by the Earth's nature. (Vahl and Hatt 1922–27, I, 1)

Geography was, in other words, about the integration of natural and human phenomena, and Vahl and Hatt's formulations often harboured strong hints of environmental determinism. Hatt rarely included physical geography in his geographical works, but his human geography was, particularly in the early years, tainted by determinism. But most programmatic for Hatt's geographical work to come was probably this statement: 'What in particular must be demanded of the geographer are accounts of distributional conditions' (Vahl and Hatt 1922–27, I, 1).

COLONIAL ANTHROPOGEOGRAPHY

What Hatt approached as *Erhvervsgeografi*, which literally translates as 'commercial geography' but may be described as 'economic geography', was precisely about distribution. With its large-scale focus on colonies and human and cultural propagation, 'colonial anthropogeography' would arguably be the best designation; it is hardly a coincidence that the title of his first major geographical work,

Jorden og Menneskelivet, mimics Ratzel's *Die Erde und das Leben* (1901–02) (on Ratzel, see *Geographers* Vol. 11). Climate, race and class were the keywords, which, together, revolved around the pivotal issue of colonialism, and underlying these notions was Hatt's conception of culture.

Culture was, for Hatt, primarily a material concept. Indeed, if one might attach a single label to his work, it would be materialism. Sometimes, this even took the form of a crude historical materialism. Partly derived from his ethnography and echoing Ratzel, Hatt maintained that a culture could only develop in a unique geographical location, from which it could spread by migration or 'culture loan'. The originally West European industrial culture was, in this respect, central: 'New cultural forms have originated within limited areas and have spread to larger parts of the Earth, displacing older forms. Even today we thus see the latest and most developed economic culture-form, the West European *industrial culture*, advancing through countries by migration, trade and cultural influence of different sorts, displacing and exterminating [*udryddende*] older forms' (Vahl and Hatt 1922–27, I, 101).

Hatt's use of 'exterminating' was not just figurative, as he often recognized that the spread of West European industrial culture was accompanied by violence, exploitation and hypocrisy. Yet, geographical expansion was, for him, an inherent and seemingly unavoidable feature of this culture: 'The industrial culture is expansive; its nature is the exchange of commodities between countries, the processing of own and foreign raw materials with an eye on the world market. A people cannot possess a well-developed industrial culture without raw material and sales markets; and industrial development can to a great extent be furthered by colonisation and emigration, which creates or secures such market' (Hatt 1928a, 230). Questions of access to resources, markets and (increasingly) the exploitation of labour were, in this way, the material foundations of Hatt's anthropogeography. This led him to probe 'the colonial question', not least in relation to the tropics that, for him, possessed 'vast productive power' for 'the civilised humanity' (Hatt 1928b, 178).

Like so many at the time, Hatt also dabbled in questions of human acclimatization in relation to the tropics, and this often, if uneasily, led him to environmental determinist conclusions. As a parallel to Vahl's delineation of global climate–plant zones, one could say that Hatt, in *Jorden og Menneskelivet*, made the first move in drawing up a global geography of colonial types that referred to climate in important respects. In the English-language version (Hatt 1929a), it was thus partly in relation to European acclimatization that he distinguished between immigration, plantation and trade settlements. Later, it was again with reference to climatic factors that he introduced (and mapped) 'The white man's countries' in temperate and sub-tropical regions (Hatt 1936). And, although Hatt, from an early stage, noted anomalies in this rather deterministic geography, he generally maintained that Europeans in the tropics could only undertake hard physical work in highlands more than 1,500 metres above sea level. The tropical plantation settlements with vital resources were, therefore, to be found in regions 'where climate prevents European immigration. The settlers here make an upper class, exploiting the economic possibilities of the country by means of a subjugated race' (Hatt 1929a, 4). This made the European foothold in the tropics tenuous and, not least because of what Hatt saw as the Chinese's superior adaptation to all climates, he initially considered them 'the most vital people of the Earth', since they could 'utilise the tropics' life-opportunities both as under-class and as upper-class; they can render both the Negroes and the whites superfluous' (Hatt 1928a, 228–9). With the rise of Japan, he later modified this view (Hatt 1936). Hatt also saw climate as a

presences behind different colonial regimes. For reasons of acclimatization, the British had imposed indirect rule in West Africa, while the native population in East Africa, and especially in the Kenyan highlands, 'have been deprived of large and fertile areas, which have been given to white planters and land speculators'. The dispossessed populations were here 'made to work under slave-like conditions of indentured labourers, and in many cases become moral and physical wrecks' (Hatt 1929a, 7).

Hatt's ideas about climate were closely intertwined with questions of race, and it is probably in this respect that his work today particularly raises critical eyebrows. His geography was racist, but one should remember that this was neither unusual nor particularly controversial in his time. As Keld Buciek (1999) observes, Hatt did not depart from the views of his predecessors, Løffler and Steensby, and the racist descriptions in *Jorden og Menneskelivet* were often directly cribbed from Løffler's work. In fact, it can be argued that he sought to counter some forms of racism. Hatt rejected, for example, the view that humans could be divided into distinct races and, with only thinly veiled reference to Nazi racism, he wrote ironically about notions of a 'Semitic' race, lauded the evolutionary potentialities of inter-racial mixing and questioned notions of racial hierarchy. In part at least, this had to do with Hatt's essentially neo-Lamarckian ideas of environmental influences: 'The human races are in all probability based on the human species' adaptation to different environments. This assumption is corroborated by the races' sensitivity to unfamiliar climates.' Yet, he added, 'not only a change of geographical environment but also a cultural change can within a few generations have profound influence on a population's genetic substance' (Hatt 1928a, 159, 161). Human characteristics were not only influenced by the physical environment: Hatt's neo-Lamarckism extended to the human environment. Particularly odd in this respect was his 1934 explanation of anti-Semitism in 'certain European countries' as resentments spurred by the Jewish people's successful adaptation to modern urban environments. Yet, in spite of arguments to the contrary, Hatt frequently, freely and, often in contradictory ways, operated with racial categories, including subdivisions such as 'Jews': more often than not, he was also liable to racist stereotyping and hierarchizations.

While by no means exceptional, Hatt's racism is inexcusable by modern standards. It is worth noting, however, that – even in texts ostensibly about race – he generally slipped from writing about 'races' to addressing 'peoples' (*Folk*), which, in Danish, may imply national communities. His key concern was, in other words, to map the potentialities for peoples (and states) to heed or resist the expansive drive of industrial culture, and questions of climate and race were, here, only elements in a larger picture. While Hatt initially had seen colonies as a means both to secure markets and to reduce what he considered an overpopulated Europe, he increasingly came to reject colonies as a destination for European migration. European overpopulation, which, for Hatt, manifested itself in unemployment, was rather to be solved through the import of resources and the export of produce. This was not mainly because the tropics were unsuitable for Europeans. Particularly in relation to Africa, Hatt came in important respects to view colonialism as embedded in a race-related class conflict. At an early stage he found, for instance, that 'the struggle between white and black' in South Africa had not ended with the European conquest: 'By making the natives a working underclass, the Europeans have given the race-struggle a social character and at the same time barred the way for a sizable European immigration' (Hatt 1928a, 218). More generally, he argued later, 'There appears to be a fundamental economic law that *expensive labour must yield to inexpensive labour*' (Hatt 1938a, 27). He came to see 'the native labour force'

as 'Africa's greatest asset' and that this involved a 'proletarianisation of the natives' (Hatt 1938a, 43, 81). This did not imply that Hatt rejected colonialism. For the resolutely materialist Hatt, access to colonial resources and markets was a simple necessity for the industrial culture. If anything, Hatt was critical of the ways colonialism functioned and, not least, the hypocrisy it engendered: 'English authors have in recent years often described the colonies as a burden the white man must bear for the sake of humanity and civilisation. In reality, this burden has paid off exceedingly well' (Hatt 1939a, 200). But Hatt's critical eye faltered when it came to Denmark's only colony, Greenland. With a show of that moral superiority he disdained in other colonial powers, this was, for Hatt, 'one of the few colonial areas where the consideration of what is best for the native population weighs more heavily than the demands of European trade' (Hatt 1929a, 13).

With the inconsistencies characteristic of his work, Hatt never altogether discarded environmental or racial arguments. His colonial anthropogeography was always environmentalist in the sense that the tropics for climatic reasons were of key importance for the industrialized economies. And his racism emerged clearly in his assessments of different peoples' abilities to adopt elements of the industrial culture. Asians were well suited in this respect, while, for Hatt, Africans were ill equipped for adopting this culture: looking at the peoples of Africa, he infamously noted that 'neither the Chinese nor the Indians possess the Negroes' excellent underclass qualities' (Hatt 1938a, 41). But, in the late 1930s, he seemed to have moved a long way towards viewing colonialism as involved in ethno-class conflict:

Europeans, even of Nordic race, can live and work and thrive in a hot and humid tropical climate when they are secured good conditions, particularly in the respect that any form of competition with other races' cheaper labour is blocked. . . . The Europeans have vanquished almost all foreign people on the world's battlefields; but in the field of work have the coloured races again and again asserted themselves, though often only under thralldom. (Hatt 1940a, 97, 100–1)

POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

In the late 1930s, Hatt began to use the notion 'geopolitics' (*Geopolitik*). This was undoubtedly inspired by the growing use of the term, not least in Germany, and he prudently reverted to speak of 'political geography' after the war. But, in important respects, Hatt, in his use of the term, only refined and developed key elements of the worldview that had been present in his colonial anthropogeography. Fatefully, however, this brought his by-then broadly disseminated analyses closer to events in Europe.

Like that of Mackinder (*Geographers* Vol. 9), and other contemporaries, what underlay Hatt's worldview was a vision of a world that had 'closed' around the turn of the century. This was, for Hatt, in key respects, a political-economic phenomenon. 1 August 1914 marked for him the end of 'Europe's happy age'. Accompanied by 'much human extermination and much bloody oppression' for peoples of non-European origin (Hatt 1940a, 176), this had been an age in which the colonial powers could expand overseas. Crucially, however, other European nations could also take part in exploiting overseas natural resources in the lee of Britain's liberal trade politics. But this system collapsed, Hatt argued, mainly because 'economic liberalism *did not bring equal economic progress to all states*' (Hatt 1938b, 5, italics in original). In the twentieth century, therefore, 'it became apparent that the world already was already taken into possession, the Earth was

divided up between its conquerors, emigration from Europe had to be closed off, and the economic exploitation of overseas countries was no longer open for all European nations. Thus ended Europe's happy age' (Hatt 1940a, 176).

For Hatt, the 'chief cause of the increased tension which finally culminated in the Great War sprang from colonial policy' (Hatt 1929a, 10). And broadly the same material logic applied to the century's second conflagration: '... what is happening in the world today is a tremendous struggle, not over ideologies but over real assets; [t]he struggle concerns such realities as colonies, markets and resources' (quoted in Jerrild 1939, 174). This led Hatt to formulate an explicit analysis of *Livsrum* ('living space') and emerging economic-geographical blocks – an analysis infused with urgency by his interpretation of balance of power politics.

The ostensibly Ratzelian notion of 'living space' was not a new idea in Hatt's geography. This was, as we have seen, a foundation of his view of industrial culture: 'Any vital people possess the need and ability for expansion' (Hatt 1928a, 163). But, inspired we may assume by the popularization of *Lebensraum* thinking in the 1930s, he now formulated an explicit view of living space. In contrast to Ratzel's essentially agrarian view of *Lebensraum*, and closer to that of the German school of *Geopolitik*, Hatt's idea was rooted in his view of the industrial culture's innate need for resource and outlet markets. And in a world increasingly 'closed' for expansion by territorial growth or trade, this had, for Hatt, led to the formation of autarkical economic-geographical blocks around leading industrial great powers. The parallels with German discussions of 'pan-regions' and *Großraumwirtschaft* are obvious. But living-space politics was in Hatt's perspective neither a new phenomenon nor a German invention: 'Living-space politics did not originate on mainland Europe – it actually arrived to Europe *last*. The division of the world into large economic blocks, which is now being finalised, began a long time ago' (Hatt 1941b, 13). The Monroe Doctrine, Russia's expansion into Asia, and the establishment of the British Empire were thus early examples of living-space politics, which had split the world into 'satisfied' and 'hungry' great powers, the latter being Germany, Japan and Italy. And when this politics had become associated with the 'national socialists', Hatt argued, it was because the 'necessity and practical implementation' of economic-geographical blocks had been intensely discussed by the Germans, while the other great powers had been satisfied 'with practising practical living space politics without producing a literature on its theory' (Hatt 1941b, 14). Similarly, Hatt did not view 'geopolitics' as something distinctly German, because '[o]utstanding statesmen have always conducted practical geopolitics' (Hatt 1940a, 178).

While Hatt, in these ways, borrowed heavily from German *Geopolitik*, he warned against the Ratzelian tendency to measure a state's vitality in terms of its territorial size. Hatt probably had a particular small state in mind when he emphasized that one 'should guard oneself from counting so strongly on quantity that one forgets quality' (Hatt 1940a, 174). He similarly recognized that living space did not necessarily derive from territorial possessions, and that 'capital power' transcending territorial boundaries was, for him, 'one of Britain's main assets' (Hatt 1939a, 200). Significantly, Hatt, the small-state geopolitician, also argued that his native Denmark had shown its vitality by expanding but that this had happened neither territorially nor through state power:

The Danish people's expansive capability has ... not unfolded particularly through state expansion. But through private enterprise and often under foreign colours the Danish expansive power has asserted itself all over the

Earth. . . . The increasing intensity of Danish commercial life has thus walked hand-in-hand – and is partly based on – a kind of expansion, a mounting adjustment to and integration in the world economy. (Hatt 1942, 6–7)

With such a relational view of Danish living space, the fading of the liberal economic order must have worried Hatt. It was arguably for this reason that, from the late 1920s, he began to see Denmark's future in a wider political–economic European order. This included that he rejected the realism of a Nordic customs union, and Hatt was, for a while, attracted by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi's pan-European ideas.

The shocking victories by Nazi Germany in the first years of the war made, for a while, the prospect of a 'unified' Europe a likely, if also a worrying, possibility. In a sense, this provided legitimacy for Hatt's pan-European visions, and his musings in *Norden og Europa* (1941) came close to sketching elements of the future European Community. But, within the limits imposed by censorship, a Europe under German hegemony also seemed to worry Hatt. Like much of the Danish establishment, he appeared to fear that Denmark in a new European order would be reduced to an agrarian economy and, in a charitable reading, his frequent references to Hitler's alleged respect for the 'national principle' could also be read as a plea for a measure of Danish autonomy. But it was mainly his interpretation of European balances of power that prompted Hatt's pro-German views.

According to Hatt, 'It is always the privileged social classes and nations that want balance'. For more than two centuries, it had thus been Britain that had maintained a European balance-of-power, because a 'strong and unified Europe . . . could threaten the British Empire's very existence' (Hatt 1939a, 198). Indeed, as he observed with a flourish of *Realpolitik*, the 'British love to speak of principles' like democracy and liberalism, but 'the fundamental principle in British foreign policy is and must be the balance-principle' (Hatt 1940b, 118). This also applied beyond Europe, the notable exception being South America: 'England has preferred to let the USA enforce power on the western hemisphere rather than letting rivals from the European continent extend themselves to South America' (Hatt 1939b, 15). In Europe, however, Hatt found that power was sliding eastwards, towards the Soviet Union, and 'this move will accelerate if West and Central Europe destroy one another' (Hatt 1939a, 211). Moreover, he warned that to 'vanquish Germany with the help of Russia must, from a British point of view, be to exorcise the Devil by means of Beelzebub'. And, Hatt continued, 'Hitler's fall could very well entail a German alliance with the Soviet Union. The European balance always pursued by England would then forever be eliminated' (Hatt 1939a, 209). But Hatt did not observe from a British point of view. His viewpoint was Danish, and Denmark and the other Nordic countries lay 'in a battlefield between three great blocks, . . . the British–American, the Russian, and the continental European' (Hatt 1942, 9). What Hatt, not least after the annexations of the Baltic States and the wars with Finland, came to view as an expansive Soviet Union was, in this respect, particularly threatening to the more local balance of power. In his interpretation, the Soviet Union's geostrategic aim was to control the Baltic sea-lanes to the Atlantic, and this could 'Russia only achieve by conquering the entire Scandinavian Peninsular and Zealand' (Hatt 1941c, 18). Arguing that the semi-enclosed Baltic Sea could only be defended by air power from land, Hatt concluded that 'the Nordic peoples' chances of resisting this pressure' from the Soviet Union 'would hardly be great if there were no other factors in the equation between Russia and the Nordic countries. . . . There are two other factors, namely England and Germany. Germany is the most important of these two, because Germany is a

Baltic power and a land power, whereas England lies outside the area and is a sea power' (Hatt 1941c, 26).

Hatt had, from the late 1930s, increasingly come to address Britain and the United States as one power block, the 'Anglo-Saxons', and even spoken of an 'Anglo-Saxon world order' (Hatt 1939a, 199). As the war wore on, however, Britain began to wane from the picture. But the rise of the United States did not brighten his view of the prospects for Denmark or for Europe. Towards the end of his geopolitical career, Hatt ruefully predicted that 'If the Axis Powers fell, their defeat would probably be celebrated by many as a victory for the national self-determination of European peoples. But the joy would most likely be short-lived. If there are not enough strong, unifying forces within our own continent, Europe will be subjected to foreign rule, first American and Russian, later Russian alone' (Hatt 1943, 55).

Stripped to its bones, Hatt's portrayal of mechanistic balance-of-power geopolitics could read as political realism: one might say that he fleshed out some basics in the West's perception of the Cold War to come. But the packaging was often highly unsavoury. Hatt had not been an anti-Semite before the war. In fact, he found that Nazi-Germany's racial theories and harsh behaviour towards German Jews could justify fears that African's conditions would deteriorate significantly if Germany were again to acquire African colonies (Hatt 1938a, 76–7). Hatt was also among the 'representatives of Danish science' who, in 1938, signed a call to help the Hebrew University in settling 'the presently homeless Jewish scientists and young Jewish academics' (Komiteen for Indsamling til Det hebraiske Universitet to Hatt, 14 and 28 February 1938, private papers, box 10). Yet, towards the end of 1942, Germany, Italy and Japan were suddenly united in the 'fight against the British–American–Russian–Jewish world hegemony' (Hatt 1943, 49). And, whether it was a sign of political naivety or rather a hard-nosed willingness to sup with the devil to further his cause, Hatt, in 1941, wrote that 'Germany in this war struggles against foreign, Europe-hostile forces. Germany's defeat in this struggle will amount to a European catastrophe. Germany's victory could be the entry to a new and rich European blooming. . . . If the new Europe is realised, it will happen because a large and vigorous people [*Folk*] put its existence to the task' (Hatt 1941b, 22, 26).

Influence and Spread of Ideas

Hatt's life came to overshadow his geographical ideas. Birket-Smith had a point when he wrote that it is 'as an ethnographer and archaeologist rather than a geographer that [Hatt's] name will remain' (Birket-Smith 1961, 80). This is not to say that Hatt did not have an impact. As a teacher, he trained that generation of geographers that took over Danish geography from the mid-twentieth century, such as Johannes Humlum (1911–90), the first geography professor at Århus University, and Carl Gunnar Feilberg (1894–1972), who, in 1949, replaced Hatt as the professor of human geography at Copenhagen University. *Jorden og Menneskelivet* similarly had a noticeable effect. It is no coincidence that the most extensive history of geography at Copenhagen University includes a long section entitled 'Vahl and Hatt: The great textbook's period', where the authors found that the development of Danish geography for 20 years 'to a large degree was based on this outstanding work. Outstanding because it so abundantly builds on new, proper geographical material treated through geographical methods' (Christiansen,

Jacobsen and Nielsen 1979, 402). Birket-Smith bestowed similar praise: 'Vahl and Hatt's regional geographical handbook [must] be described as outstanding in Nordic literature, and it retains its great worth in many respects' (Birket-Smith 1961, 76–7). (Reviewers in English and American geography journals were less impressed when the first volume was published: see *Geographical Journal* 63 (1924), 261–2; *Geographical Review* 14 (1924), 676–7.)

In spite of such direct and indirect influences, Hatt's impact on Danish geography was mostly negative. Changing views of what constituted 'geography' played a part, but it is probably also due to the legacy of Hatt that political geography – let alone geopolitics – was conspicuously absent in post-war Danish geography. We have to look to the 1990s before such subjects systematically returned to the curriculum. Hatt's wartime geopolitics was clearly an embarrassment to Danish geography, and it seems worthwhile, therefore, to conclude this essay by briefly considering what led the highly intelligent and, for long, widely respected Hatt to his pro-German position.

It is not altogether clear why Hatt sided so whole-heartedly with Germany. After the war, an acquaintance suggested that this was because he had become appalled with British and American society, and that he possibly felt slighted by American academia. But there is little to support such views. Hatt was critical of elements in British and American politics, but it was with Britain and America that, before and after the war, he maintained his closest connections. His relations with Germany, on the other hand, were always weak, and he generally sought to avoid writing in German. Moreover, in an interview after the outbreak of the Second World War, Hatt declared himself a democrat and found democracy to be the only possible ideology for the Nordic peoples. In this vein, he stated his 'natural sympathy for the democratic great powers', which he would not like to see vanquished by the Central Powers. Yet, the arch-materialist Hatt characteristically added that democracy was an ideology that could be used as a weapon of war and 'I consider it a greater misfortune if Denmark should be laid to waste in a struggle over who shall master the world markets' (quoted in Jerrild 1939, 174).

It is in his materialism and unsentimental small-state political realism that we find the most rational explanation for Hatt's position. Curiously, it was thus the Western power's inability or unwillingness to counter the Nazi and fascist onslaughts on small or smaller European states (Austria, Czechoslovakia and Republican Spain) that cautioned Hatt against trusting the West to protect small states like Denmark – a view only hardened by the West's inability meaningfully to resist the attacks on Poland and the Baltic states by the Soviet Union and Germany. But it was arguably the fate of Finland in the wars with the Soviet Union that decidedly made Hatt look towards Germany. Faced with the perceived expansionism of 'the eastern giant state and its, to the Nordic way of thinking, disgusting social order' (Hatt 1941d, 122), Hatt put his trust in Nazi Germany. That the German track record in protecting small states was less than poor was, in this respect, – whether naively or opportunistically – of lesser importance.

In his own view, Hatt's support for Germany was based on an objective analysis of what was best for Denmark. It is here important to acknowledge that while Hatt scorned the sentimental nationalism that gripped Danes during the German occupation, he clearly considered himself a Danish patriot. In his statement to the extraordinary disciplinary court, Hatt concluded:

My work to contribute my part to mitigate the relationship between Denmark and Germany, I have carried out for the benefit of my own country. I viewed such work as necessary. And as only very few could or

would do this, I found that I could not evade this duty. I understood the situation such that the Danish government and particularly Foreign Minister Scavenius – in whose insight and unselfish patriotism I continuously have had complete trust – needed support from non-Nazi men, who could and would speak reasonably with the Germans. (Statement, 10 December 1945, T.225)

Objective analysis and a national standpoint were apparently not contradicting to him. When Hatt, in May, 1939 offered Prime Minister Stauning an analysis of Denmark's precarious geopolitical situation, it was 'as a political geographer – and as a Dane' that he urged the government to accept Hitler's offer of a non-aggression treaty (Hatt to Stauning, 10 May 1939, private papers, box 11). In this respect, Hatt did not depart from the position of his contemporaries and geopolitical peers. But, in contrast to the better known geopoliticians of the great powers, Hatt could not rise or fall with his own state: as a small state geopolitician, he had to link his national geopolitical hopes to those of one of the rival great powers. In his case, this positioned Hatt with the power that became the enemy.

Yet, it would be wrong simply to see Hatt's fate as a consequence of historical and political-geographical circumstances. His personality most certainly played a part. Possibly already instilled in him from childhood, Hatt did not doubt his abilities and, as he rose through the social ranks, he frequently and unyieldingly exchanged intellectual blows with other academics. Criticism apparently only prompted him to persist stubbornly in his views and in their propagation. Several people, including his wife, from an early stage of the German occupation, alerted Hatt to how his position could be perceived. This seemingly only provoked him to carry on with an energy and single-mindedness that went well beyond what could count as 'scientific' or 'national' duty, let alone political prudence. Miranda Carter has noted of Anthony Blunt, the Soviet 'mole', that, in common with many academics, he 'possessed a stubborn confidence in his own conclusions, despite a naive and limited understanding of politics. This was aided by his tendency to see the world in stark and obvious oppositions' (Carter 2001, 176). This serves well as an epigram for Gudmund Hatt.

Conclusion

As with much geography of the recent past, Gudmund Hatt's geographical ideas and analyses have long been archaically curious, if not outright problematic and his position during the occupation greatly accelerated the virtual redundancy of his geography. But Hatt has a place in the history of geographical thought, which, internationally, has been hindered by the simple fact of language. In his colonial anthropogeography and political geographies, we can see clear parallels to wider geographical reasoning during the first half of the twentieth century. In notable respects, however, Hatt also departed from his more well known contemporaries. This does not imply that his ideas were in any way superior, but illustrates the truism that geographical thought always bears the imprint of the author's historical-geographical context. Further, Hatt's history clearly demonstrates that geographical thought is always inseparable from politics. For Hatt, this proved academically, if not personally, fatal.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Keld Buciek, Helen Carter, Joachim Lund and Barbara Sjöholm for comments on drafts of this essay. Emilie Demant Hatt's portrait of Hatt is reproduced with kind permission of Skive Kunstmuseum.

Bibliography and Sources

A comprehensive bibliography of Hatt's geopolitical writings is available in Larsen (2009), which also includes a bibliography of publications on Hatt. Only Hatt's contributions to geography are included in the bibliography of selected works below. Partly overlapping bibliographies of Hatt's work in ethnography and archaeology are presented in Brøndsted and Feilberg (1959) and Nicolaisen (1960).

1. SELECTED REFERENCES ON GUDMUND HATT

- Blædel, N. (1946), *Forbrydelse og Dumhed*. Copenhagen: Hagerup.
- Birket-Smith, K. (1961), 'Gudmund Hatt' (obituary), in *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Oversigt over selskabets virksomhed juni 1960–maj 1961*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, pp. 71–80.
- Brøndsted, J. and Feilberg, C. G. (1959), 'Gudmund Hatt' (with English translation), *Kuml: Årbog for Jysk Arkæologisk Selskab* 7–12, 241–2.
- Buciek, K. (1999), 'Aage Gudmund Hatt – mellem forskning og ideologi: En forskerbiografi', in S. Illeris (ed.), *Danske Geografiske Forskere*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde University Press, pp. 75–88.
- Christiansen, S., Jacobsen, N. K. and Nielsen, N. (1979), 'Geografi', in T. Wolff (ed.), *Københavns Universitet 1479–1979*. Copenhagen: Gads Forlag, pp. 377–446.
- Feilberg, C. G. (1960), 'Gudmund Hatt' (obituary), in Copenhagen University, *Festskrift*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen University, pp. 132–40.
- Hatt, G. (1914), 'Aage Gudmund Hatt' (autobiography), in Copenhagen University, *Festskrift*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen University, p. 145.
- Hatt, E. D. and Sjöholm, B. (2008), 'A Danish Lapp-Lady: With the Lapps in the High Mountains', *Antioch Review* 66(2), 288–301.
- Høiris, O. (1986), *Antropologien i Danmark: Museal etnografi og etnologi 1860–1960*. Copenhagen: Nationalmuseets Forlag, pp. 103–52.
- Jerrild, H. (1939), 'Hos Professor Hatt' (interview), *Gads danske Magazin* 33, 172–8.
- Kristensen, H. K. (1960), 'Gudmund Hatt' (obituary) *Fra Ribe Amt* 15, 145–8.
- Larsen, H. G. (2009), *Gudmund Hatt og geopolitikken: En kommenteret bibliografi*. Aalborg: Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg University.
- Lund, J. (2007), "'At opretholde Sindets Neutralitet": Geografen Gudmund Hatt,

det ny Europa og det store verdensdrama', in J. Lauridsen (ed.), *Over strengen – under besættelsen*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, pp. 242–93.

- Nicolaisen, J. (1960), 'Gudmund Hatt: His work in ethnology' (obituary), *Folk: Dansk Etnografisk Tidsskrift* 2, 133–9.
- Roos, C. (1961), *Indhøstningens Tid*. Copenhagen: Gad.
- Stummann Hansen, S. (1984), 'Gudmund Hatt: The individualist against his time', *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 3, 164–9.
- (1995), 'Gudmund Hatt – et arkæologisk liv mellem videnskabsfolk og hedeboer', in J. Nordbladh (ed.), *Arkeologiska liv*. Gothenburg: Institutionen för arkeologi, Gothenburg University, pp. 41–75.

2. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS BY GUDMUND HATT

- 1922–27 (with Martin Vahl) *Jorden og Menneskelivet* [*The Earth and the Human Life*], four volumes. Copenhagen: Schultz Forlagsboghandel.
- 1928a 'Menneskeracerne og deres Udbredelsesmuligheder' ['The human races and their possibilities of propagation'], *Geografisk Tidsskrift* 31, 151–63, 214–32.
- 1928b 'Hvor mange Mennesker kan Jorden ernære?' ['How many humans can the Earth support?'], *Naturens Verden* 12, 161–84.
- 1929a 'Types of European colonization', in M. Vahl et al. (eds), *Greenland*, Vol. 3. Copenhagen: Reitzel, pp. 1–14.
- 1929b 'Begrebet "Mellemeuropa"' ['The concept "Middle Europe"'], *Geografisk Tidsskrift* 32, 92–115.
- 1934 'De menneskelige racer' ['The human races'], in T. Winge et al., *Arv og Race*. Copenhagen: Martins Forlag, pp. 37–61.
- 1936 *Stillehavsproblemer* [*Pacific Ocean Problems*]. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Geographical Society.
- 1938a *Afrika og Østasien: Kolonispørgsmaalene* [*Africa and East Asia: The Colonial Questions*]. Copenhagen: Frederik E. Pedersens Forlag.
- 1938b *Den europæiske Situation* [*The European Situation*]. Copenhagen: Reitzel.
- 1938c 'The potentialities of inter-northern commerce', *Le Nord: Revue Internationale des Pays du Nord* 1, 143–62.
- 1939a 'Den europæiske Ligevægt' ['The European balance'], *Tilskueren* 56, 198–211.
- 1939b *Sydamerika: Fremtidens Verdensdel* [*South America: The Continent of the Future*]. Copenhagen: Frederik E. Pedersens Forlag.
- 1940a *Kampen om Magten: Geopolitiske Strejflys* [*The Struggle for Power: Geopolitical Sidelights*]. Copenhagen: Berlingske Forlag.
- 1940b 'Hvorpaa beror Spændingen mellem England og Tyskland?' ['On what depends the tension between England and Germany?'], in A. Førslev et al. (eds), *Krigen*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, pp. 114–33.

- 1941a *Hvem kæmper om Kloden?* [*Who is Fighting over the Globe?*]. Copenhagen: Fergos Forlag.
- 1941b *Norden og Europa* [*The Nordic Countries and Europe*]. Copenhagen: Fergos Forlag.
- 1941c *Østersøproblemer* [*Baltic Sea Problems*]. Copenhagen: Fergos Forlag.
- 1941d 'Finland', *Tidsskrift for Udenrigspolitik* 7, 121–7.
- 1942 'Danmarks rumpolitiske Stilling i det nye Europa' ['Denmark's space-political position in the new Europe'], *Globus* 2, 1–12.
- 1943 *Fra Landsbyen til Verdensriget* [*From the Village to the World Empire*]. Copenhagen: Forlaget Globus.
- 1957 'Nørre Fjand: An early Iron Age village site in West Jutland', *Arkaeologisk-Kunsthistoriske Skrifter*, 2, 1–382.

3. ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Hatt's private papers are kept in the Danish State Archives (*Rigsarkivet*) in Copenhagen (archive number 7256), which also stores the prosecutor's files on Hatt's trial by the extraordinary disciplinary court (*Auditøren ved Den ekstraordinære Tjenestemandsdømstol*, case number T.225).

4. CONTEXTUAL REFERENCES ON GUDMUND HATT

Carter, M. (2001), *Anthony Blunt: His Lives*. London: Macmillan.

Chronology

- 1884 Born 31 October, Vildbjerg, Denmark
- 1906–07 Ethnographical studies under Roland B. Dixon at Harvard University.
- 1911 Master (*skoleembedseksamen*) with distinction in natural history and geography from Copenhagen University
- 1911 Marries Emilie Demant Hansen (1873–1958)
- 1912–14 Ethnographical fieldwork in Lapland (summers)
- 1914 Dr.phil. from Copenhagen University on the thesis *Arktiske Skinddragter i Eurasien og Amerika* [*Arctic Skin Clothing in Eurasia and America*]
- 1914–15 Studies under Franz Boas at Columbia University and visits ethnographical museums in the United States and Canada
- 1919–29 Employed at the National Museum, Copenhagen
- 1922–23 Leads archaeological expedition to the Virgin Islands
- 1923 Appointed lecturer in geography, Copenhagen University
- 1929 Appointed extraordinary professor of human geography, Copenhagen University

- 1932 Archaeological expedition to South Greenland (via the Faeroes and Iceland)
- 1940 13 August–4 September, travels to Slovakia
- 1940 17 May, gives ‘Baltic Sea Problems’ talk to Danish–German Society
- 1941 Gives ‘The Nordic Countries and Europe’ talk in Riksföreningen Sverige-Tyskland (Jönköping, 23 August) and in Nordische Verbindungsstelle (Berlin, 13 October)
- 1941 9–11 October, participates in Arbeitstagung des Vereins Deutscher Wirtschaftswissenschaftler in Weimar
- 1942 Archaeological talks in Kiel, Greifswald and Leipzig
- 1943 26 August, gives the last of the monthly world political overview talks on Danish state radio
- 1945 5 May, arrested by the resistance movement (released without charge after one week in detention)
- 1947 8–11 April, trial by the extraordinary disciplinary court for public servants. 6 May, convicted of ‘dishonourable national conduct’ during the occupation and sentenced to discharge (with full pension)
- 1960 Dies 27 January, Frederiksberg, Denmark