The significance of school in exile

The Norwegian boarding school in Great Britain during the Second World War

RAGNHILD BIE

SUPERVISOR
Bjørn Tore Rosendahl

CO-SUPERVISOR
Peter Reid

University of Agder, 2022
Faculty of Humanities and Education
Department of Religion, Philosophy and History

Acknowledgements

Several people deserve my gratitude for supporting me while I have been writing my master thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my main supervisor, Bjørn Tore Rosendahl. Without his calm and helpfulness, and his always sound and reasonable advice, it is difficult to imagine being able to finish it at all. I also want to thank my co-supervisor, Professor Peter Reid. Peter has always made me feel like a priority, with well-thought-out and effective responses to any questions I might have had. Any mistakes in this thesis are my own.

Secondly, I want to show my gratitude to the individuals that have contributed to my research project. I owe my gratitude to Carl Jakob and the rest of the descendants after principal Jakob Rørvik for so kindly offering me to borrow his private archive throughout this process. My thesis has gotten a whole new dimension because of this archive. I will also never forget the kindness and hospitality shown to me by my informants, the former pupils of Drumtochty Castle. I am very grateful they chose to share their remarkable reminiscences with me and let me record the story of the Norwegian boarding school in exile.

Lastly, I want to thank my children, Isabelle and Bastian, for their patience during this project. I also want to thank my other family members, friends, and current and former colleagues for all the help, encouragement and understanding they have shown me during what has been a very exciting but hectic time. The current staff at Drumtochty Castle also deserves appreciation for welcoming me and giving me a grand tour of the Castle as it stands today.

Abstract

Med den norske internatskolen Drumtochty Castle i Skottland under andre verdenskrig som prisme, undersøker denne masteroppgaven betydningen av skole i eksil. Målet med oppgaven er å vise betydningen av skole fra forskjellige perspektiv. Aktørene som har blitt undersøkt er: den norske eksilregjeringen i Storbritannia, de britiske myndighetene, de tidligere elevene selv, de britiske lokalsamfunnene, de andre eksilregjeringenes eksilskoler i Storbritannia, og sist det internasjonale samfunnets perspektiv og deres utvikling av samarbeid på dette feltet. Perspektivene blir analysert i sammenheng med Gunn Imsen's tre funksjoner i skolen: den produktive funksjon, den reproduktive funksjon og den identitetsskapende funksjon.

De norske myndighetene anså eksilskolen som en arena for å holde barna trygge for sykdom og krig, for å gi dem en så god utdannelse som mulig i eksil, for å vise frem norske verdier, for å motivere nordmenn i eksil og for å holde barna så norske som mulig før hjemreisen etter krigen. Barna anså skolen som en trygg havn. Her ble de forskånet for krigshandlingene som fant sted i de større byene. Allikevel var hjemlengsel og savn etter foreldrene noe som skulle prege barna i lang tid. De britiske styresmaktene så på sin side på eksilskolene som en god arena for å påvirke andre nasjoner i en probritisk retning. Blant de øvrige eksilregjeringene ble eksilskolene i stor grad benyttet som et bånd til hjemlandet. Det var et utstrakt mål blant samtlige eksilregjeringer at man skulle hjem igjen og tiden i Storbritannia var kun midlertidig. De internasjonale aktørenes perspektiv på skole generelt var at det var en viktig fredsbyggende og -bevarende arena. Samarbeidet rundt eksilskolene fungerte som en overgang til et større og videre samarbeid mellom de allierte. Dette samarbeidet kulminerte i opprettelsen av UNESCO.

Forskningen har vist at perspektivet på skole i eksil har variert blant de ulike aktørene. Individenes personlige beskrivelser står på et annet nivå enn de store, geopolitiske diskusjonene. Det overordnende mål var ideen om en god og trygg fremtid. For å oppnå dette, måtte man holde barna så trygge som mulig før krigen var over. Det var og viktig å holde barna og de øvrige flyktningsamfunnene klare og motiverte for hjemreise. Skulle man sikre en varig fred, måtte man sikre barna og gi dem en god utdannelse basert på demokratiske verdier.

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

About 100 Norwegian children of school age had by February 1942 fled German-occupied Norway and reached Great Britain. The children lived the rest of the war in exile. The Norwegian government in exile established a boarding school for them at Drumtochty Castle near Aberdeen, Scotland.[1] There, in safe and secure surroundings, the children were provided with a proper education. In this master thesis, I will study the Norwegian boarding school in Great Britain during the Second World War, with comparative glimpses on other schools established by other European exile communities in Great Britain during the war.

My main research question is: What was the significance of schools established by occupied European nations in exile during the Second World War, mainly studied through the Norwegian boarding school at Drumtochty Castle? I will analyse its importance from the perspectives of the Norwegian government in exile, the British authorities, the school children, and the perspective of the local communities in Great Britain.[2] Further, I will compare the Norwegians' experiences to other nations' exile schools in Great Britain during the Second World War. Lastly, I will study what impact the exile schools had on international cooperation in the field of education.

As an analytical tool to investigate what role school in exile played and its significance, I will compare my results with the three functions of school in general and not related to times of war and exile, that the Norwegian pedagogue Gunn Imsen has listed. [3] These are: school as a, what Imsen term as "reproductive function", school as a productive function and lastly, school as a function to create identity. The "reproductive function" consists of the introduction of the society's cultural heritage to the children, in order of its continuation to future generations. The productive function is to educate the people, and to supply the various sectors of society with a competent workforce with the necessary and desired knowledge. The function to create identity is to give different individuals personal growth, happiness, and a sense of meaning by facilitating and providing various knowledge, values, and abilities.

1.1 The Norwegian exile community in Great Britain

During the Second World War, at least 80.000 Norwegians fled their homes. Most of the refugees were young men, crossing the Swedish border with hopes of securing transport to

[1] When the phrase "the government/the Norwegian government" is used, its meaning is the exiled Norwegian government in London.
[2] The British Authorities, meaning both English and Scottish governmental authorities.
[3] Imsen 1997: 97

Great Britain to join the Allied forces.[4] Others travelled directly to Great Britain in for instance small fishing vessels. Some also travelled east, all around the world before ending up at their final destination, which often was the United States or Great Britain. About 25.000 of the Norwegian exiles at the start of the war were seafarers on ships that soon were to be enrolled under the Norwegian state-owned shipping company called Nortraship. The ships had to keep sailing until the war was over.[5]

In addition to the young men, there were several families that fled, which also included children. Most of them travelled to Sweden. About 200 Norwegian children made it by different means to Great Britain during the war years.[6] The refugees, both children and adults, were taken care of by different authorities, both in Sweden and in Great Britain, to keep order and to make use of the Norwegians abroad as a resource for the exile government. For the adults, it often meant providing them with jobs or enlisting them in various military departments. For the children, it often meant making sure they continued or started their education when they reached school age.

In Great Britain, the first Norwegian school opened in Glasgow, Scotland in November 1941. By the summer of 1942, it had about 35-40 Norwegian pupils attending. Thereafter, two Norwegian schools opened in January 1942: one in a small fishing town in Scotland called Buckie, and another in London. The first had 6-10 Norwegian pupils attending while the latter had 10-15 pupils.[7] The rest of the children either did not attend school, were home-schooled, or attended British schools with varying success.[8] The largest Norwegian school in exile thus far was officially opened by King Haakon VII on 2 November 1942. It was located in an old castle called Drumtochty Castle, in idyllic surroundings in the Scottish countryside south of Aberdeen, and had room for about 100 people, about 70 pupils and 30 staff members. The staff members consisted mainly of Norwegians. The last Norwegian exile school was opened in Glasgow in April 1945, for the about 100 Norwegian children that arrived after the evacuation of Sørøya in Finnmark.[9] Several other occupied nations also had exile schools established in Great Britain.

Drumtochty Castle was a boarding school. The families of the pupils had to, for the most part, remain in various British cities and towns. Some pupils had parents that were enrolled in

[4] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 184
[5] Rosendahl 2015: 160, Nielsen 2021: 2. The introduction is based on the introduction of my research assignment.
[6] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181
[7] Ibid.
[8] Hjelmtveit 1969: 294
[9] Ibid. 294, Nielsen 2021: 12.

different military forces or the Norwegian merchant fleet, while others had parents working as doctors, nurses, administrators, waiters, priests and so on.[10] Several Norwegian institutions, like various welfare institutions such as doctor' or dental practises, entertainment and employment services and so forth, were established in Great Britain. Many of them served a role as motivators, to remind the Norwegians of their identities, what they were fighting for, and what they might one day witness once more - a free homeland.[11]

The teachers in occupied Norway became famous during the Second World War for being strong and resilient against the Nazi ideology. The schools were important for both the Norwegian population as well as the Nazis in Norway. This project will shed light on what importance and role the exile schools had for the different governments situated in Great Britain during the war. The Norwegian exile communities during the Second World War are in addition overdue to be researched properly. This thesis will provide better knowledge of a field that to a large degree has been overlooked in the traditional war history, - the history of the children in wartime. This thesis will hopefully help to fill in some of the gaps in the previously unknown Second World War history of both Norway and Great Britain.

1.2 Previous research and literature

The history of Drumtochty Castle boarding school has been briefly mentioned in several previous research projects and other literature. This is the first research project where Drumtochty Castle boarding school and the Norwegian exile school are the main themes. Earlier research has helped in answering some of my research questions. Next, I will list some of the most important publications.

In 2000, the historians Berit Nøkleby and Guri Hjeltnes published the first research project dedicated to telling the history of wartime Norway seen from the children's perspective, *Barn under krigen*.[12] In this book, which is based among other on oral sources, several pages are devoted to the children abroad. Drumtochty Castle is not treated in-depth, but the book is interesting as it tells the children's history from their perspectives, and provides an overview of the children and their fates during the Second World War.

Other important contributions to the knowledge of Norwegian exile environments in Great Britain are Olav Riste's two books: Volume 1 of *London-regjeringa: Norge i krigsalliansen*

[10] Riste 1987: 29, Nielsen 2021: 10f.
[11] Nielsen 2021: 17, Hjeltnes 1995: 428f.
[12] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000

1940-1945: 1: 1940-1942: Prøvetid (1973) and *Utefront* (1987).[13] Their focus lies mainly on the governments' point of view but helps create an understanding and background of the exile communities and how they were operated. Also, in *Utefront*, Drumtochty and the Norwegian children are briefly mentioned.

In addition to the literature mentioned regarding Norwegian refugees, I have also used literature regarding other nations' exile communities and schools to show the environment that the Norwegian exile school was placed in. Conway & Gotovitch's book *Europe in Exile. European Exile Communities in Britain 1940-45* (2001) has provided invaluable insight into the various exile communities.[14] Unfortunately for my thesis, and like many wartime-history publications, it does not go in-depth on the subject of children in exile.

The same goes for Pavol Jakubec's *Together and Alone in Allied London: Czechoslovak, Norwegian and Polish Governments-in-Exile, 1940-45.*[15] This publication sheds light on the challenges exiled governments from small states faced and how they tackled them. The article has been valuable for the insight it provides into how the governments fought to be heard among other, bigger states, and how they compare to each other. It also tells something about the cooperation between the nations, even though it does not focus on children, the exile schools or the cooperation that emerged in the field of education.

Lastly, Diana Jane Eastment's doctoral thesis *The policies and position of the British Council from the outbreak of war to 1950* (1982) has also contributed to help answer my research questions.[16] This thesis gives insight in an easy and understandable manner into the background, objectives, and actions of the British Council, which were deeply involved with the various exile schools. Unfortunately, Eastment's thesis does not cover the work of the Home Division, which was the department of the British Council that mainly dealt with the exiles in Great Britain during the war.

1.3 Sources

This thesis is largely based on a rich variety of sources and literature, depending on what perspective and research question I am studying. The best sources for answering some research questions have been the memoirs of key people. Using an agent's memoirs in a scientific project can sometimes be problematic, concerning the credibility and biasedness of the information

[13] Riste 1973, Riste 1987.
[14] Conway & Gotovitch 2001
[15] Jakubec 2020
[16] Eastment 1982

provided.[17] Still, using biographies and memoirs can also provide information and points of view which can be difficult to find anywhere else. For instance, how a key figure thought and what their agenda was, and what went on behind the scenes is something one can easier get an impression of by reading memoirs than for instance by reading minutes from an official meeting.

Other questions have best been answered using various archival sources, both of British and Norwegian origin. The use of archival sources has had its pros and cons. The cons are often that the sources were not made with the intent of answering my research questions and attempting to interpret the meaning behind the various persons' statements and arguments can be a challenging endeavour. Another pervasive problem is that I may have overlooked something, but this is part of the nature of historical research that hopefully has not occurred.

Memoirs

Despite the problematic aspects of using memoirs in a scientific project, I have chosen to use Minister of School and Church Affairs Nils Hjelmtveit's memoirs *Vekstår og vargtid* (1969), as well as John Hay Beith's book *Peaceful Invasion* (1946).[18] Beith was the Director of Public Relations at the British War Office during the Second World War. Hjelmtveit's book is based on his personal notes and correspondence during the war, and he problematises in the preface that some of the information provided might be coloured by his view or simply forgotten as not all of it was written the instance the events happened.[19] The fact that he showed an awareness of this can serve as a form of reassurance that he would most likely not publish very controversial information if he was not confident that they were probably correct. Also, Beith, under the pseudonym of Ian Hay, claims that the book is based on official sources, as well as personal and oral sources.[20]

When I have used information from the aforementioned memoirs in my thesis, it is information which seems likely to be correct considering what is already known. The use of Hjelmtveit's book as a source of information gives context to the establishment and background of the school. Further, it helps to show how the person responsible for the establishment, Hjelmtveit himself, perceived the role of the school to be and thus helps in answering my questions from

[17] When using the term 'agent' in this thesis, its meaning is an interested party, government or key figure of the subject of the exile schools.
[18] Hjelmtveit 1969, Hay 1946
[19] Hjelmtveit 1969: 7f
[20] Hay 1946: 5f. The claim could benefit from showing a list of sources used, as well as a general reference list.

the government's perspective. Beith's publication gives a similar insight into the British perspective.

Archives

The Covid-19 pandemic and its travel restrictions caused some challenges for my archival research but were possible to work around. The Norwegian National Archives in Norway willingly scanned and provided me with digital access to six of the archival boxes I felt were the most crucial for me to get hold of. These boxes included correspondence between the exiled Norwegian government and the school administration at Drumtochty Castle, as well as between the school administration and the parents of the pupils. This has given me an insight into what issues and conversational topics occurred between the families, the school administration, and the government, as well as what type of information was given by the school, which has been important in answering my research questions in Chapter 2.

In November 2021 I visited Great Britain, with the main agenda of visiting The National Archives in Kew in London as well as visiting Aberdeen and Drumtochty Castle. Even though I studied thousands of documents that I found at The National Archives, I still lack sources to be able to confidently answer my research questions regarding the perspective of the Scottish authorities. I have therefore decided to largely exclude it, as it would exclusively be built on comments the authorities made at various meetings. It is not possible to make any conclusions on their perspective based on the comments alone. There are likely more sources on their perspective in the National Archives in Edinburgh, Scotland, which I have sadly not been able to visit while writing this thesis. This is a topic worth researching in the future. The documents I did find in Kew, provided me with enough sources to answer research questions in Chapters 4 and 6.

It is of course always important to be aware that there might be a difference in how a person wishes to appear in public and in front of others in both letters and at meetings, and what their 'true agenda' might be. Many of the people in the archival material I researched were politicians and well-trained in how to speak and how to act to gain momentum and make a good impression. Being mindful of this while reading the sources can help in noticing their 'true' agenda.

Perhaps the most remarkable archive I have been fortunate enough to research is a private archive created by Drumtochty boarding school's last principal, Jakob Rørvik, lent to me by his son, Carl Jakob Rørvik. This archive includes correspondence between Jakob Rørvik and Nils

Hjelmtveit, as well as correspondence between several other agents. This has been of great assistance to my research, as it includes post-war correspondence between Rørvik and the pupils, where they reminisce about their time at Drumtochty Castle and give great insight into what it was like for them to attend the school, what they remembered several years later, and what impression they were left with. More pragmatically, it simultaneously gave me more updated addresses to the pupils, so it was a great deal easier to try tracking them down for interviews.

The private archive also includes raw material for a book which Nils Hjelmtveit began writing but never published, with the translated title of "The fairytale of Drumtochty Castle. The Scottish Castle that became a school for Norwegian children in the years 1942-45." [21] The manuscript starts with the establishment of the school and is built on correspondence, photographs, and personal notes. The manuscript is written in a poetic and descriptive manner. It is written by a man who worked hard for the school and probably wanted the positive aspects of it to be remembered. Even though facts and information given in this manuscript need to be validated from other sources as well, it still paints a picture of why it was so important for Hjelmtveit and what aspects of the school he emphasised when he looked back at it.

Newspapers

In order to get a sense of the public view of the Norwegian school at Drumtochty, I have chosen to use newspaper articles when applicable. The material I have used is mainly the Norwegian newspaper-in-exile, *Norsk Tidend*, as well as various British newspapers, like the *Press & Journal* and *The Scotsman*. While reading the newspapers, it has been important to remember that *Norsk Tidend* was owned by the Norwegian government in exile, which means that the newspaper articles were written with a certain agenda. It was important for the Norwegian government to maintain and strengthen the Norwegian morale, and any articles that would challenge this could easily never be published.[22] Both *Norsk Tidend* and the British newspapers were overwhelmingly patriotic during the war. This influences the overall credibility of the newspapers.

1.4 The problems and possibilities of oral history

Rørvik's address lists that give information about the pupils' Norwegian addresses was a tremendous help in order to get in touch with some of them for interviews. Without these lists,

[21] J. Rørvik. Manuscript written by Nils Hjelmtveit, "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45."
[22] Nielsen 2021: 5.

it would have taken a lot more work to track them down. As most of the female pupils got married after the war, thus taking a different surname, it would have been even more challenging tracing down the female pupils. Rørvik did most of the work for me. The lists had updated names and addresses from the 1980s, so that I could see what parts of the country they lived in. Some of them still live at the very same address that he listed when I interviewed them.

Using oral interviews as a source is not without problems. In addition to the practical issues of tracking the informants down and arrange for interviews, the flaws of human memory must be accounted for. People can remember incorrectly. In addition, the Second World War was 80 years ago, and the pupils were young children at the time. A long time has passed since their exile existence, causing the informants to remember aspects in a different light and with the knowledge they have today.

As Grove & Heiret describes in Melve & Ryymin's (ed.) *Historikerens arbeidsmåter*, the human brain will make one forget several elements of an event shortly after something has happened before the long-term memory kicks in, and the memory stabilises. [23] Interviewing them straight after they attended Drumtochty would probably have helped the former pupils to remember more details of events that happened during their stay there. Interviewing them in 2022 perhaps displayed a different perspective on what attending Drumtochty actually meant to them in their lives.

Importantly, my intentions were not to get as many hard facts as possible by interviewing the pupils. Most of the hard facts I needed were available in various literature and archives. What I wanted, was their impressions and experiences. What they were left with, in terms of how the attendance at Drumtochty had influenced them and their sense of identity, how it had impacted their lives, and in short, what significance Drumtochty Castle had had for them. Answers to this could not be found in the archives.

Oral interviews, despite all the challenges and problems they bring, were necessary to give a thorough and well-rounded answer to my questions. Lastly, as a final argument for using oral history in this thesis, I also want to emphasise that it has been 80 years since the children attended the school. If I had not collected their stories now, there is a real chance that no one would have before it was too late. The story of when Norwegian children attended school in exile is a unique and extraordinary one, and one that deserves to be remembered for posterity.

[23] Melve & Ryymin 2018: 127

I have been able to visit four of the former pupils, two men and two women, and in addition, interviewed two more over the phone – one male and one female. The gender balance was partly coincidental and partly deliberate, - I wanted there to be a balance, but would have gone through with the interviews even if I had not been able to balance it out perfectly. I have not been able to visit the last two informants due to the long travel distances in Norway and the time limit that a master thesis has. As a substitute, I have interviewed them over the phone. One of them multiple times.

The phone interviews went well, but it would of course have been beneficial visiting all of them. You get a different kind of connection and people can open up more when talking with them in person than over the phone. It is still much better talking over the phone than not doing it at all, and both informants provided a lot of useful information that I have been able to use in the thesis. One of the informants needed to finish the interview over three sessions, so we spoke once a week for three weeks. This could have provided the issue of a feeling of starting over every week, but it rather seemed to help him remember more details.

The interviews have contributed to answering my research questions in Chapter 3, where the perspective of the children is in focus. This work has been very rewarding and has provided knowledge of the significance of the exile school that it would have been impossible to find elsewhere. Their memories fill a gap in the knowledge we already have of the Norwegian exile community and the history of the Second World War, the latter often focused on the experiences of 'prominent' people, such as the government and the royal family. The informants' stories tell of the experiences of two often overlooked groups when it comes to the dissemination of Norwegian wartime history: the children and the Norwegian refugees in Great Britain. To be able to provide more information from their point of view is important for more extensive knowledge of the Second World War in Norway and Great Britain.

The process

Before interviewing any of the former pupils, I sent out letters consisting of several documents. One document was a letter explaining who I am and why I contacted them. Another document was an "informed consent", explaining their rights, with room for a signature. There was also a prepaid return envelope for them to mail me their informed consent if they decided to speak with me. Lastly, the letter consisted of a simple interview guide, in the form of a list of questions we would typically cover during an interview, with room for deviation. In advance of this, I had gotten permission from the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD), to perform the

interviews and collect the informants' memories under certain conditions, such as to make sure to keep the informants anonymous and follow certain limitations and rules on how to store the information provided.

I have also received two written statements given by local Scots alive at the time Drumtochty Castle was a school. These Scots got in touch with me after I gave an interview to The Press & Journal, a newspaper in Aberdeen, and wrote to me about their memories of the school at the time. I wanted to visit the two while I was in Scotland gathering sources and visiting the Castle. However, the Covid-19 pandemic was on a real rise at the time I was in Great Britain. The age of the informants put them at a higher risk, and I had to travel and visit several people and places before a meeting could take place, so I decided that the written statements I received had to be sufficient. It would of course have been beneficial to visit them in person and get a more detailed account of what they still remember. Still, the pandemic set limitations for what I considered to be responsible in terms of the potential risks of visiting them physically.

After successfully getting in touch with six of the former pupils at Drumtochty, I decided that their accounts would be sufficient to answer my research questions, which they were. There are probably more former pupils still alive that I have not been able to track down and talk to. The interviews were generally structured as qualitative interviews, in a form of life history interviews, starting with the Norwegian occupation and ending when they returned to Norway.[24] The interviews had room for deviation, and some of the pupils also spoke of their lives after the war as well. The intention of performing the interviews was to get their perspective of what the school meant for them. Therefore, it was important to keep the interview guide flexible, as well as letting the informants control the conversation, and not correcting them if they, for example, got a date wrong. To sit back and let them speak freely was to me considered the best way of getting hold of their reminiscence, unaffected and not influenced by me as the interviewer.

The informants told me about their memories of the war, how they reached Great Britain, their time there before going to Drumtochty, and their memories of attending the school in question. For the informants I visited in person, I also brought photographs. Some of them were taken when I visited the Castle a few months earlier, others were photographs of the Castle and its' inhabitants during the war that I found at the National Archives of Norway. The photographs were used in an attempt to help wake their memories.

[24] Ibid.: 133

1.5 Concepts

Exile

Berit Berg & Kirsten Lauritsen explain in their book *Eksil og livsløp* (2009) that being in exile is a breach in the exile's life.[25] Although the circumstances may vary, an escape from your homeland includes a loss of varying degree. The cost is both material and human loss, with a break of bonds to family and friends at home and can thus lead to a reorientation of the exile's identity. The relief of reaching a safe harbour is quickly accompanied by a need for practical information, as well as periods of frustration and grief over what and who they have left behind.[26]

The term 'exile' originates from displacement as a form of punishment, where one was doomed to live a miserable life. The difference between being an emigrant and an exile in the modern world is according to Sverre Varvin in his book *Flukt og eksil* (2015) that the emigrant leaves their homeland voluntarily, by their own choice, for multiple different reasons. To define when one is displaced or moved by choice can be challenging, but the children in those situations can almost always be said to be exiled because they are not the ones to make the decision.[27] In this thesis, I have chosen to use the term exile and exiles about the Norwegians in Great Britain during the Second World War because of the situation with Norway being occupied by a foreign and hostile power, and the numerous dangers that the Norwegians abroad could expect if they ever returned while Norway was still under German occupation.

Identity

Identity is a concept closely connected to the field of migration studies but can often be criticised for being too static or imprecise. Berg & Lauritsen claims that identity must be understood in relation to the social structure of the society one lives in, which can be altered through, for example, migration.[28] Identity is constructed through interactions with other individuals and can be perceived as a social construction itself, eligible for change, with certain, physical limitations such as linguistical accents, skin colours or lifelong incorporated behavioural patterns.[29] Varvin refers to 'nostalgic disorientation' as a feeling of rootlessness

[25] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 171
[26] Ibid.: 171f
[27] Varvin 2015: 167
[28] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 175
[29] Ibid.: 176

after the experience of losing the feeling of home, and that the feeling of home itself is at the core of one's identity.[30]

Cora Alexa Døving refers to, in her book *Integrering. Teori og empiri* from 2009, identity as something that people can perceive as difficult to alter, as it lies at the core of one's persona, and that it is given by birth.[31] This perception is particularly present in situations that involve xenophobia, and in the difficult meetings that can occur when natives meet immigrants, where stereotypes are widespread. Identity can then be perceived as something stable and almost unchangeable and continue to contribute to alienation and perception of "us" and "the others", and in those environments it can potentially create hostility.[32]

Berg & Lauritsen explains that exiles and migrants often have a greater sense of affiliation as well as knowledge of different cultures than most.[33] The feeling of where they belong is dependent on multiple aspects, and one aspect is *time*. The younger the exile, the bigger part of their life has been spent in the new nation and can therefore affect how they picture the future and themselves.[34] How they deal with and how they are treated and handled while being in exile has a great impact on the future. To not be victimised, but rather be allowed to grow and develop during exile, can have a great impact on the exile's future as well as the eventual return to their homeland.[35]

1.6 The thesis' structure

Each chapter of the thesis consists of an analysis of the different agents and their perspectives on the importance of either Drumtochty Castle or school in exile during the Second World War in general.

Chapter 2 is devoted to an analysis of the Norwegian government in exile's objective and agenda for establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school. Chapter 3 provides new knowledge in the form of an analysis of the former pupils' experience and perception of the boarding school's significance. The next chapter consists of an analysis of the host nation's perspective on Drumtochty Castle and various exile communities, as well as provides an overview of some of the most relevant agents in the establishment of the Norwegian school. Chapter 5 analyses some of the other exile schools situated in Great Britain during the Second World War,

[30] Varvin 2015: 172
[31] Døving 2009: 130
[32] Ibid.: 130f
[33] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 177
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.: 182

comparing them to the Norwegian boarding school to see if the Norwegian boarding school was more or less important for the host nation or the exiled government. Chapter 6 is an analysis of how international cooperation on education and exile schools developed through the Second World War. Lastly, the conclusion can be found in Chapter 7.

2.0 The perspective of the Norwegian government in exile

During the German occupation of Norway in 1940-1945, many Norwegian children fled their homeland. By the end of the war, 7000 Norwegian children had sought refuge in Sweden and about 200 Norwegian children had fled to Great Britain. Some children travelled to Great Britain by aeroplane from Sweden.[36] Others came over by way of 'Englandsfarten' and arrived at British ports in small fishing vessels. Most of the Norwegian children arrived in Great Britain as evacuees on British naval ships that participated in the operations in Northern Norway in 1941 and early 1945.[37] The Norwegian government in exile had to facilitate for the children to be included in communities both in Sweden and in Great Britain. This chapter seeks to analyse what function the Norwegian government in exile perceived the Norwegian exile school in Scotland, Drumtochty Castle, to have. This can show what the Norwegian government in exile, with The Minister of Education and Church Affairs, Nils Hjelmtveit, in charge, perceived the significance of exile schools to be.

To better be able to discuss the role of the Norwegian exile school in Great Britain, a brief comparison to the Norwegian schools in Sweden is useful.[38] One of the biggest differences between the exile schools in the two nations was that Norwegian pupils in Sweden often attended Swedish schools instead of Norwegian schools, even though several Norwegian schools were established in Sweden during the war.[39] According to the Norwegian historian Ole Kristian Grimnes, the Norwegian exile government's main objective for establishing the various schools in Sweden was to keep the refugees occupied.[40] Many of the Norwegian exiles, including youths and children under the age of 18, had problems coping with their new exile existence, and that caused disturbances and concerns in different Swedish communities.[41]

2.1 The objectives for establishing a Norwegian boarding school in exile

On 31 March 1942, a group of representatives consisting of four Norwegian and two British men inspected Drumtochty Castle outside Aberdeen, Scotland, with the purpose of learning whether it could be suitable as a boarding school for Norwegian children in exile. The men were Minister of Trade Anders Frihagen, Minister of Education and Church Affairs, Nils

[36] Informant C, 24.02.2022 & Informant D. 24.02.2022. How many children were sent to Great Britain by aeroplane is unknown, but most of them did remain in Sweden.
[37] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181, 184. Nielsen 2021: 2.
[38] The comparison is largely built on my unpublished research assignment: Nielsen 2021. More in-depth argumentation can be found there.
[39] Ibid.: 12ff, Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181
[40] Nielsen 2021: 14, Grimnes 1969: 35
[41] Grimnes 1969: 33ff

Hjelmtveit, Director General Alf Sommerfelt, consul Sandvig, representative of the British Council Mr Lane, and architect Mr Allan.[42] It seems as if the Norwegian exile government found the decision of choosing a school location to be important, due to them being personally represented at the inspection of the possible Norwegian exile school. The Norwegian exile government was based in London, thus having the advantage of being physically present in Great Britain. In comparison, the situation was different in Sweden. There, the Norwegian government did not have the same opportunity of inspecting possible locations for the Norwegian exile schools.

Drumtochty Castle met their requirements and was purchased for £1.850. The total price for the Norwegian government was calculated to be £5.500, which included the necessary renovations and inventory, and was considered to be reasonable. It was in a report highlighted that the Castle grounds were big, with 60 acres of land and the Castle itself spacious enough to house 100 people, where about 70 of them would be children. This indicates that it was important for the government that the children should have enough space, and that the Castle grounds could facilitate outdoor activities, thus providing the children with a healthy environment.[43]

Before buying the Castle, the Norwegian government discussed what was to happen to it after the war. This immediately shows a sense of temporariness for the government, and that they perceived the school to be a diaspora school that was to be dissolved when the war was over, and the children were to go back to Norway. The term diaspora is often used as a description of national or religious minorities in foreign surroundings.[44] The identity of the exiles is within the usage of the term diaspora connected to the network between the individuals, rather than the territory.[45] That the Norwegian pupils, as well as the rest of the Norwegian exiles, lived in a diaspora in Great Britain can be argued for by the set of four requirements for the use of the term, and we will see throughout this thesis that they accommodate all of them.

The first requirement is that the environment must be set outside of the original homeland. The second, and most important distinction between a diaspora and an immigrant expatriate community, is that the diaspora has kept a form of connection and orientation towards the homeland. The third requirement for the term diaspora is that there have been established

[42] J. Rørvik. «Drumtochty Castle som norsk internatskole for folkeskolebarn.» Report by Nils Hjelmtveit, 2 April 1942.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Etymologically originates from the Greek word ‘diasperein’, meaning ‘disperse’. Diaspora 2021
[45] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 184

institutions in the host nation that reflect the culture of the homeland, which enables the maintenance of bonds and behaviours to the homeland. Lastly, the fourth requirement is that a life in the diaspora often is connected to a low degree of integration into the host nation, either because the members of the diaspora do not feel accepted by the host nation and/or they have a dream of one day returning to their homeland.[46]

The children were perceived to be exiles and not emigrants, and their stay in Great Britain was meant to be temporary. The post-war plan for the Castle was that it could be used as a summer estate to hold courses for students and teachers from both Norway as well as Great Britain. Accordingly, the Castle could be a significant contribution to the connection between the British and the Norwegian people and culture.[47] Even though the estate was reasonably priced, it was still an investment during wartime, when finances often were under pressure. The use of Drumtochty Castle as a Norwegian boarding school was merely temporary, equal to the children's status as refugees or exiles. There lay potential in the Castle, which after the war could contribute to a strengthening of the Anglo-Norwegian relationship and cultural exchanges. This was something that the government, represented by Hjelmtveit, obviously found important, as Great Britain had a history of being a close ally of Norway.

During a cabinet meeting on 1 May 1942, the final decision of purchasing Drumtochty Castle was made, and the renovations began the same month. Due to the war, there were problems acquiring enough building materials and workers for the renovations. It was decided that 12-15 Norwegian boys from the schools in Glasgow and London, in addition to two teachers and a sergeant from the Norwegian army, should be sent to the estate during the summer of 1942 to help finish up the renovations.[48] Several British workers also worked on the estate during the summer, under the surveillance of two Norwegian guards. The reason for the surveillance was said to be to make sure that nothing was taken from the Castle. This sheds light on two different aspects or possibilities. Firstly, there could still be some distrust between the Norwegians and the British, as there had been at the very start of the war.[49] Secondly, the school was of such importance that the government was eager to avoid any delays.

[46] Ibid.: 185
[47] J. Rørvik. «Drumtochty Castle som norsk internatskole for folkeskolebarn.» Report by Nils Hjelmtveit, 2 April 1942.
[48] J. Rørvik. "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45." Manuscript by Nils Hjelmtveit.
[49] Riste 1973: 45, 70. Nielsen 2021: 10

It was soon clear that the renovations would take longer than anticipated. Hjelmtveit was not all pleased with the effort of the British workers, which he found worked too slowly.[50] To help speed up the process, Hjelmtveit encouraged all the future teachers and staff of the school, to travel to Drumtochty Castle with him to help with the renovations.[51] It is remarkable that a Minister of Education was so impatient for a school to open, that he voluntarily chose to spend a week or two of his summer vacation with manual labour to expedite the opening. Simultaneously, he encouraged the rest of the staff to join him, spending part of their summer renovating their future workplace as well. The fact that many of the staff members obeyed is equally remarkable and indicates that the significance of the school had a foothold within the Norwegian exile communities.

This event tells a great deal about Hjelmtveit's dedication toward the school, the children and to the Norwegian exile communities. That he spent his vacation helping with the renovations at the Castle, indicates that perhaps it meant a greater deal more to him personally than it did to the Norwegian government. He could have easily tried to hire a bigger workforce instead, or even encouraged the future staff to go help without him being personally present, and no one would probably have given it more thought. This shows that the school meant a lot for Hjelmtveit, even before it had opened.

On 24 June 1942, the government sent a circular to all known Norwegian parents with children of school age in Great Britain. The circular informed the families that all Norwegian children of school age between six and fifteen years old would be summoned to attend Drumtochty Castle boarding school the following autumn, as soon as the school was ready.[52] Furthermore, the circular officially explained why the government chose to establish the boarding school. It does not, however, tell of what was discussed internally within the government, but the government's arguments to the parents.

Predictably, many of the parents hesitated and showed reluctance to send their children away to live at a boarding school.[53] The families, their children included, had already been through a lot. First, they had experienced Norway being occupied, before making an often arduous escape to Great Britain. When arriving in Great Britain, everything was new. The culture, their homes,

[50] J. Rørvik. "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45." Manuscript by Nils Hjelmtveit.
[51] Hjelmtveit 1969: 295
[52] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» Circular 24 June 1942.
[53] J. Rørvik. "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45." Manuscript by Nils Hjelmtveit.

language, communities, and their whole existence as refugees from war. It is easy to imagine that sending their children away to a boarding school must have been traumatising for both the parents and the children in question. This differentiates from the situation for the Norwegian children in Sweden. In Sweden, families had more of a choice on where to send their children. If they preferred, they could rather go to Swedish schools.[54]

The circular began with the statement: "The school system we have had until now has only been temporary and in several ways inexpedient."[55] The Norwegian children had up to this point often lived in larger British cities, like London or Glasgow, and some lived in the small fishing town in Buckie in Northern Scotland. Some of them attended British schools, without even speaking the English language properly. This separates the British schools from the Swedish schools. The Norwegian refugees in Sweden would not have the same language barriers as they did in Great Britain, thus removing an incentive to establish Norwegian schools in Sweden. [56] Other Norwegian pupils in Great Britain attended one of the small Norwegian schools that had opened in Glasgow, Buckie, and London. Others did not attend school at all.[57] This was not a satisfying solution for the Norwegian exile government, and with the increasing number of Norwegian children in Great Britain, it was necessary to facilitate that the newly arrived children would also get the opportunity to continue their education in exile.

The Norwegian government emphasised in the aforementioned circular that their decision to establish a boarding school was in accordance with the decisions made by the other Allied governments.[58] This is an early indication of what was to come, multilateral cooperation between the exiled governments located in Great Britain. It also indicates that it was important for the ministry to stress that this was something the other governments did as well. One can imagine that the reason for this may have been to gain legitimacy for their decision. Furthermore, it can also indicate that the Norwegian government was worried that the parents would disagree with their conclusion and refuse to send their children away. This would in turn cause more problems for both the government, who would have to come up with a different solution, and for the children who in the meanwhile would get inadequate education.

[54] Nielsen 2021: 14.
[55] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» Circular 24 June 1942. The author's translation. Original quote: "Den skoleordning vi har hatt hittil, har bare vært midlertidig og på flere måter lite hensiktsmessig."
[56] Nielsen 2021: 12f, Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181
[57] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181, Hjelmtveit 1969: 294.
[58] RA/S-2066/ D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» Circular 24 June 1942.

The ministry continued pointing out in the circular that: "The children ought to get away from the cities to rural environments with fresh air, large playgrounds where they also can get a solid and healthy diet."[59] This sheds light on the importance of the health benefits that the government imagined the establishment of the boarding school would bring. They wanted the children away from the big cities, out to the countryside where the air was fresh, the nutrition was healthy and more possibilities for outdoor activities. This could provide the children with a stronger constitution and overall better health, which was of utmost importance to them.

Health was indeed mentioned as one of the most important arguments in the circular, but it was somewhat under-communicated how crucial this matter actually was. This could be because the Norwegian government did not want to induce greater fear in the exile communities. In a letter to the Ministry of Defence, health was listed as the main reason for establishing the boarding school.[60] Before moving into the Castle, all children and adults had to go through medicinal examinations to determine if they were healthy and fit to move in with the other children and staff.[61] In 1943, the year after the opening of Drumtochty, doctor Alf Seweriin, manager at the Norwegian Public Health Service in Glasgow, wrote a statement to Nils Hjelmtveit where he explained the impact the boarding school had on the health of the Norwegians living in Glasgow.[62]

Before the children left for Drumtochty Castle, doctor Seweriin said that among both Norwegian children and adults alike, sickness and diseases, such as tuberculosis, had been a much greater problem than one could normally expect. Deaths caused by tuberculosis had occurred among both children and adults, and the risk of infection had been so great because of how densely the Norwegians in Glasgow were living. After the children moved to Drumtochty Castle, the apartments in Glasgow were still crowded but not overpopulated anymore. The risk of infections was much lower in 1943 than it had been in 1942. The difference in infection rates was so significant that doctor Seweriin even warned the government of allowing the children

[59] Ibid. The author's translation. Original quote: "Barna bør bort fra byene til landlige omgivelser med frisk luft og rikelig med tumleplass der de også kan få kraftig sunn kost."
[60] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0007, KUD-London. «Ang tjenerpersonale til Internatskolen i Skottland.» 11 December 1942.
[61] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. «Det Kgl. Kirke- og Undervisningsdepartement, Kingston House.», Suggestion of examining all residents, Didi Sunde, 3 July 1942, «Dr John Caspersen, Medisinaldirektoratet» schedule of medicinal examinations, 29 September 1942.
[62] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0025, KUD-London. «Ad: De hygieniske forhold i den norske kolonien i Glasgow - i forbindelse med Internatskolen i Skottland.» Dr. Alf Seweriin, 20 September 1943.

to visit their families for a longer period during vacations, worried that the infection rates would rise again.[63]

This shows that the benefits of establishing the boarding school were not solely intended for the children attending it, but that the exile government also had the rest of the Norwegian exile communities in mind. The health aspect would benefit the families living in the overcrowded apartments around Great Britain. The risk of infections would overall decrease, and therefore the health conditions in several Norwegian exile households would improve after placing the children at Drumtochty Castle. Their overall living conditions would also improve, as the apartments got less crowded.

The circular sent to the parents continued stressing: "By the gathering of practically every Norwegian child in one school, one would be able to create a far better school than those we have now."[64] Further, the ministry claimed that would be of the most vital significance "For the Norway that is to rise after the war […]".[65] It was important to give the children a good start, as part of the work for the new Norway when the war was over. This separates them from the Norwegian children in Sweden. Firstly, with there being about 7000 Norwegian children in Sweden, it would be difficult to gather them all in one school. Secondly, it seems that the Norwegian government did not prioritise the children in Sweden the same way as they did the children in Great Britain. This could simply be because Sweden was far away from London, and the problems that occurred in Sweden were less severe than the problems that occurred in Great Britain.

The argument with regard to the future of Norway shows two things. First, Norwegian children ought to be well educated. This was important not only for the children themselves but also for their homeland and shows a perception of the school' as having a productive function. The Norwegian population needed to be well-educated and capable of performing the tasks that were necessary for the society. Secondly, it shows that children were considered vital in the rebuilding of Norway. If the parents or children perhaps did not wish to send their children to the boarding school for their own sake, they should do so for the future of Norway. School as an exile institution was too important for the government to accept inadequacy as they had experienced with the current schools and education offered to the exiled children. Much-needed

[63] Ibid.
[64] RA/S-2066/ D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» Circular 24 June 1942. The author's translation. Original quote: "Ved samlingen av praktisk talt alle norske barn til én skole, vil en kunne skape en langt bedre skole enn dem vi nå har."
[65] Ibid. The author's translation. Original quote: "For det Norge som skal oppstå etter krigen […]."

changes were on their way, and the Norwegian exile communities were encouraged to embrace them. As the other exiled nations' communities were as well.

The health aspect may have been the most important reason for establishing the boarding school internally in the exiled government, but other aspects played a part as well. For instance, there was a constant fright of German air raids in Great Britain during the war and especially in the larger cities. The exiled government also had concerns about Drumtochty Castle being a possible target for German bomber pilots. Worries occurred when the government was made aware that the British press had published identifiable material about the school and requested that the British Ministry of Information made sure that any mention of the name 'Drumtochty Castle' and any descriptions of the exterior and surroundings should be censored from all newspaper articles and reports about the school.[66]

It was important to show the Norwegians in Great Britain that they took care of their children. Children are vulnerable and in need of protection. Showing the Norwegians that they took good care of them would be important for their will to fight for their nation and in their overall morale.[67] Keeping the children as safe as possible from diseases and acts of war was understandably a top priority for the Norwegian government. The sense of well-founded responsibility the exiled government must have felt toward the Norwegian refugees, and perhaps especially the young and innocent children, would naturally make their safety a top priority.

The establishment of the Norwegian boarding school can also be seen as a way of maintaining the good reputation of the Norwegian exile government. As the government claimed in the circular, the gathering of the children in boarding schools was a decision shared by various Allied governments in exile. One can imagine that if the other nation's children were to be kept safe and secure, it would look bad if the Norwegian children continued living in the large cities, becoming victims of diseases and air raids, while the government powerlessly observed. Simultaneously, it could potentially provide the German occupiers in Norway with very effective propaganda.

It was important for the government to establish and maintain a good relationship not only with the British authorities but also with the other exile governments. Although it is not mentioned

[66] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0025, KUD-London. Letter to consul Sandvig from Hjelmtveit and Sommerfelt, 18 July 1942, regarding the press coverage. "To the Directors of Censorship, British Ministry of Information." Request of censorship of Drumtochty Castle. 11 August 1942 by Tor Gjesdal.
[67] Nielsen 2021: 3

in the sources, this could relate to a Norwegian desire to be able to influence the creation of the post-war world. Being able to cooperate and come to an agreement with various exiled states, while being in exile yourself, would be a good foundation for future international cooperation. Simultaneously, showing responsibility toward your own exiled population was probably a good place to start.

Another objective of the exiled government in establishing the school was to keep the children "proper Norwegian". This coincides with the government's agenda of providing the Norwegian sailors with different all-Norwegian welfare institutions.[68] Maintaining the children as proper Norwegian could be done by providing them with a Norwegian education and upbringing, given by Norwegian teachers in the Norwegian language.[69] Hjelmtveit wrote in his memoirs: "A great deal was done to make the environment of the school as Norwegian as possible."[70] Classrooms were named after different areas of Norway which in turn were decorated by enlarged photographs of said areas, daily reminding the children of where they came from.[71] The teachers were all Norwegian, except for a British English teacher.[72]

The creation of a Norwegian environment at Drumtochty Castle is evident in several documents. In a letter from the second principal of the school, Ivar Benum, to Nils Hjelmtveit, he mentions regarding a new English teacher that English will always be a *foreign body* in the Norwegian society they had at Drumtochty Castle.[73] Furthermore, a letter from British Council to Alf Sommerfelt informs of a visit they will make to the boarding school: "[…] I should be setting foot on Norwegian territory during my brief visit to Scotland."[74] This helps paint a picture of it being well-known in various environments that this was a proper *Norwegian* school and a *Norwegian* domain.

Drumtochty Castle's last principal, Jakob Rørvik, wrote a letter to one of the parents claiming that the goal of the school was to give the children a good home while in Great Britain, and simultaneously give the pupils the best *Norwegian* tuition possible.[75] Lastly, in a letter from Dr Olaf Devik, Director General of the Norwegian Ministry of Church Affairs, he claimed that the Norwegian refugees in Great Britain are "[…] considered as temporary visitors here, […] under

[68] Rosendahl 2015: 177, Nielsen 2021: 17f.
[69] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181
[70] Hjelmtveit 1969: 296. The author's translation. Original quote: "Det ble gjort svært meget for å gjøre miljøet på skolen så norsk som mulig."
[71] Ibid.: 296
[72] Nøkleby & Hjeltnes 2000: 181
[73] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0025, KUD-London. Letter to Nils Hjelmtveit from Ivar Benum, 6 February 1943.
[74] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0025, KUD-London. Letter to Dr. Sommerfelt from British Council, 9 March 1945.
[75] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002, KUD-London. Letter to Mrs. Simonsen by Jakob Rørvik, 26 June 1945.

the obligation of the Norwegian School Laws […]".[76] These examples helps to show that keeping the children proper Norwegian was emphasised on multiple occasions by both the school and the Norwegian government. It also shows that integration with the British communities probably was considered less important and perhaps even something that they could try to avoid.

The reasoning behind this was to keep the children prepared to go home when the war was over. As described, the Norwegians were in Great Britain only temporarily. They were not supposed to become British or to identify themselves as such. The children were exiles and not immigrants. They were Norwegian and were to remain as such. It was perceived that the children, when travelling back to Norway after the war, would be vital in the rebuilding of Norway. The children were the future. It was probably important for the government that also the children were mentally prepared for this task. A good place to start would be to implement and maintain pride in the children's origins, which also connects to Imsen's term of school as a "reproductive function". This could be connected to the fact that the children remaining Norwegian was probably more for future events than for the situation at the time of the establishment of the school.

Being solely Norwegian does not seem to have been a priority regarding the Norwegian children in Sweden. The Norwegian children and students in Sweden seem to have had a larger degree of integration and interaction with the local Swedes.[77] One could argue that it would have been even more important to keep the children in Sweden proper Norwegian, as their numbers were so much higher. The high number could also explain that it was not the case, as it could be much more challenging to provide 7000 children with exposure to Norwegian culture, as opposed to the 200 that were in Great Britain. The Swedish culture was also more similar to the Norwegian culture than the British, which could lessen the motivation of keeping them segregated.[78]

As Sweden was in a different situation than Great Britain, it may not be so strange that there were so big variations on multiple aspects of the establishment of schools. While in Great Britain, the agenda was to a large degree to keep the children safe from diseases and air raids, the agenda for the children in Sweden was to the contrary, keeping the local communities safe from the refugees. Neutral Sweden did not suffer from bombings and air raids and was not even

[76] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0026, KUD-London. Letter to Mr. Leadbetter from Dr. O. Devik, 5 January 1944.
[77] Nielsen 2021: 20.
[78] Ibid.: 7.

at war, so naturally, the objectives were different. The education the Norwegians received at Swedish schools was sufficient. There were few, if any, language barriers. Further, there were several similarities in the structure of the schools, and this did not call for a need for better education. It seems as when it comes to the case of Sweden, the significance of exile schools was less because there already existed adequate and safe options for the refugees. This indicates that it was not the exile schools themselves that were most important for the Norwegian government, but the benefits they provided.

2.2 The motivation for Drumtochty Castle's opening party

Drumtochty Castle boarding school was finally ready, after several delays, for the children to arrive on 7 October 1942. The children travelled by train from London, Glasgow, and Buckie, with the majority of the children from Glasgow.[79] The formal opening ceremony took place on 2 November 1942, with several British and Norwegian celebrities attending. The biggest celebrity was King Haakon VII., who also was a patron of the school.[80] This shows that the King and Norwegian government officially wanted to portray the school as a matter of utmost importance. The opening party was a big event for both the Norwegian exile communities as well as the British communities.

It was important for the government to get positive publicity for the school, both regarding the Norwegian exile community, as well as the host nation. Showing that the Norwegian government took good care of their young ones could motivate and strengthen the bonds between the government and the Norwegian people. As previously mentioned, it could also help strengthen the bonds between the Norwegian and British governments, as well as the other exiled governments situated in Great Britain at the time.

In a letter from Hjelmtveit to the first Principal of Drumtochty Castle boarding school, Simon Liljedahl, the Ministry presented a detailed program of the opening, what they should pay special attention to and who should be invited to the ceremony.[81] It is remarkable that the Ministry of Education and Church Affairs was so involved with the opening of a Norwegian school, although the first of its kind, and tells a lot of how big of a priority this was for the Ministry and the Minister himself. It also indicates that the Ministry had more time available while being in exile than they would usually have during peacetime. During the opening, a press

[79] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0007, KUD-London. Letter to Liljedahl from Hjelmtveit, 29 September 1942.
[80] Hjelmtveit 1969: 295
[81] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0007, KUD-London. Letter to Principal Liljedahl from Nils Hjelmtveit, 12 October 1942.

conference was held and Hjelmtveit proudly emphasised in his memoirs how much publicity it got from the world press.[82] He wrote:

> *With these festivities, the Norwegian Boarding School was firmly planted in the English and Scottish people's consciousness, and also in American newspapers richly illustrated reports of the opening emerged. And the interest of the school remained alive throughout the war years. […] The Belgian and Dutch schools had to make do with very little publicity.*[83]

It is obvious that Hjelmtveit took pride in the school and the attention it got, and he also showed a bit of schadenfreude that the same attention was not granted to everyone. He also considered the institution itself to be significant, attention or no attention. In his memoirs, he refers to it as one of the most important tasks he had while in exile. It was also one of the first tasks he was given directly by Prime Minister Johan Nygaardsvold when he returned to Great Britain after a trip to the United States in 1942. Nygaardsvold had, according to Hjelmtveit, told him to do his best to sort out the problems of school for the Norwegian children in Great Britain.[84] This shows that the matter of school was significant at several layers of the Norwegian government, up to the Prime Minister.

The fact that Hjelmtveit considered the school to be of such a big significance is also proven by that he post-war started writing a book about it, with the argumentation that the story of Drumtochty Castle was a piece of Norwegian school history that he considered should never be forgotten.[85] He also wrote detailed descriptions of what to do with the manuscript to make sure it was not forgotten.[86] The reasoning behind his perception of the school's major significance is not specifically told. It can be related to the fact that the whole endeavour made a big impact on him and that he devoted much time and effort to the school. He was aware that the whole history of the Norwegian exile school was something new and different, and wanted to cement it into the history of the Norwegian school. One can also claim that the attention the school got from both British and American media reflected on Hjelmtveit and enabled him to get his time

[82] Hjelmtveit 1969: 295
[83] Ibid.: 295. The author's translation. Original quote: "Med denne høytideligheten fikk vi plantet Den norske Internatskolen fast inn i det engelske og skotske folks bevissthet, og også i amerikanske aviser kom det rikt illustrerte reportasjer fra skolens åpning. […] De belgiske og hollandske skolene måtte nøye seg med meget lite publicity."
[84] Ibid.: 293
[85] J. Rørvik. "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45." Manuscript by Nils Hjelmtveit.
[86] J. Rørvik. Note by Hjelmtveit and Rørvik. 1 November 1979. I have sadly not been able to find the original and complete manuscript.

in the limelight. Not only was it a way to ease the process of returning and rebuilding Norway after the war, but it was also an excellent way to show off the Norwegian school system to the world, and perhaps even show off the exile government itself and the work they put down for their refugees.

It can be argued that the school itself was used by the government as propaganda toward both the Norwegian exile communities as well as the British and American media. Both British and Norwegian exile media were overwhelmingly patriotic during the war. A school like Drumtochty Castle can easily be imagined to strengthen the bond and relationship between the government and the public, as well as a motivational factor for Norwegians both at home and abroad. The fact that the Norwegian King was a patron of the school also indicates this. The school may well have been used to strengthen the bonds between the public and the Norwegian King and government.

Children are vulnerable and adults want to protect them from danger, in peace as in war. For the exiled government to show externally to the public how well the children were taken care of and how the children were a priority to the government, could have been a powerful motivator for the Norwegians both at home and abroad to keep fighting for Norway and not lose hope in neither the cause itself nor the exile government. It is unknown whether the Norwegian people in Norway knew of Drumtochty Castle. Various prints and information travelled from London to Norway by couriers. Some directly across the North Sea, others through Stockholm.[87]

Different welfare measures were made throughout the war to help motivate exiled Norwegians, for instance, to solve the manning question of the sailors in the Norwegian Merchant Fleet.[88] The school could in this regard serve as a reminder of what the Norwegians were fighting for. This is not a diminishment of the perception of the significance the exile government had of the school itself and how important it was for future Norway. It is rather a claim that the government wanted to take advantage of all the positive aspects of the school to aid in matters that were important to them throughout the war years.

2.3 A new Norwegian school model takes shape

A substantial amount of work was put into the physical building of Drumtochty Castle to prepare it for the around 100 people that were to live there for what turned out to be the next

[87] Riste 1987: 31.
[88] Rosendahl 2015: 177

three years. In addition to that, there was also a substantial amount of work put into the planning and administration of the school. Researching what the Norwegian authorities' guidelines and plans for the school were, will also help to explain what their perception of the school was and what its' function in exile should be.

On 9 July 1942, a document consisting of the school's guidelines was created. Three specific assignments were listed to always be put in focus. The first assignment was that the school should be a good home for the children. Secondly, it should provide the highest degree of knowledge possible, as well as give the pupils a healthy and harmonic development. This was described as both in consideration to the pupils themselves, and with the idea that the pupils were youths and the ones that would contribute to rebuilding Norway on a healthy, democratic foundation. This connects to Imsen's identity-creating function of school, as well as the productive function. Lastly, it was to be a representation of the Norwegian school system, education, upbringing, and school spirit in Great Britain. The school was obligated to be a worthy representative of an institution with strong values that the world admired, after the attention the Norwegian school resistance against the Nazis had received. Hjelmtveit summarised it as that the school should be an important factor in the rebuilding of Norway and the future of its people.[89]

Establishing and running a boarding school in exile was a new experience for both the exiled government as well as the staff of Drumtochty Castle. In 1936, before the war, a new school law was introduced in Norway, and new plans and curriculums for the school year were created with the new school law in mind.[90] The government in exile wanted the main points of the new plans to be maintained while being in Great Britain, although the plans did have to be altered to fit the circumstances.

Surprisingly, the government rather wanted to develop and adjust the Norwegian school plan to their exile situation instead of being inspired by the British boarding school system. The British had much experience with boarding schools, which naturally must have made them more developed than any Norwegian boarding school. Instead, the government emphasised in the plans and guidelines of the school that the pupils ought to get as much of a 'normal' Norwegian tuition as possible, with certain necessary alterations. The new Norwegian school model was viewed as an experiment, one they would all make mistakes and learn from as they went along.

[89] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002, KUD-London. «Retningslinjer og planer for norsk folkeskole i Storbritannia." 9 July 1942.
[90] Ibid.

In the five-page document, it is not once mentioned that one could benefit and learn from the experiences the British had already made with their centuries of boarding school tradition.[91]

This is not to be mistaken for a claim that the Norwegian government did not seek advice from the British authorities. In Hjelmtveit's speech during the opening ceremony, he among others especially thanked the British school authorities as well as the Scottish Education Department.[92] Hjelmtveit also sent a thank you note to the latter in 1943, showing his appreciation for "[…] their assistance in all questions relating to the establishment and the running of the school […]".[93] Exactly what this assistance consisted of is unclear. It may have been merely practical assistance, such as providing equipment and books.

The Norwegian school authorities wanted the boarding school in exile to be as familiar and Norwegian as possible for both the staff and the pupils under the new, extraordinary circumstances they were living in. Not only to ease them all into the transition of attending or working at a boarding school but also for when they were to return to Norway and continue their tuition or teaching there. Still, acknowledging and taking advantage of the fact that they were exiled to a country with a tradition of boarding schools would have been understandable. Remarkably, the Norwegian government decided to keep as much as possible to their Norwegian ways of education.

2.4 Drumtochty Castle in the Norwegian exiled media

It is well known that propaganda was widely used from multiple sides of the conflict in the Second World War, including from both British and Norwegian sides as well as the more infamous German propaganda. Propaganda as a tool to change someone's opinion using emotional influence has a long and broad history. Although the German Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, greatly contributed to giving the concept of propaganda the bad reputation it still holds today, propaganda has not always been frowned upon and was actively being used more or less openly by the Allies as well.

In parts of this thesis, it can be useful to look for the use of propaganda by the different governments and other authorities, and in the newspapers. Since the concept of propaganda can be versatile, I will use a broad definition of the word to apply in my analysis, inspired by Edward

[91] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002, KUD-London. «Retningslinjer og planer for norsk folkeskole i Storbritannia." 9 July 1942.
[92] Norsk Tidend 1942a
[93] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0025, KUD-London. Letter from Hjelmtveit to Mackay Thomsen, Scottish Education Department, 17 June 1943.

Corse's even wider definition of the concept.[94] The definition I will use in this thesis is: propaganda is an attempt to influence or change someone's mind using emotional and convincing remedies. The reason for using this in my analysis is to get a better understanding of the perspective the various agents had on the significance of school, and how they wanted to portray it to the public.

"Publication of newspapers is not normally among the tasks that the state has to handle".[95] The quote is from the first issue of the government-owned newspaper *Norsk Tidend* published in London. This newspaper was among the publications the Government's Information Office in London established, and the majority of its readers were Norwegian exiles in Great Britain.[96] The newspaper provided news of special interest to its Norwegian readers, in the Norwegian language.

Olav Riste explains in his book *Utefront* (1987) that the government's agenda of these publications were twofold; it should serve as a unifying element, providing information on all sides of the Norwegian struggle and every-day-life, both abroad and in Norway, to Norwegians at home but mainly to the Norwegians in exile. Some information reached Norway through couriers. Simultaneously, it served as a tool to show off the Norwegian contribution to the war to foreign Allies and to secure Norway's position in the alliance.[97]

There are obvious issues with a newspaper being owned and run by a government. It raises questions regarding its accountability and credibility in reports of events, from what angle the articles are styled and what articles they choose to publish or not to publish at all.[98] However, that it was state-owned can also be an advantage when researching what significance the exile government perceived that school as an institution in exile had, by studying the reports the newspaper made of Drumtochty Castle. The newspaper was owned by the government, and so was the school. What the newspaper reported, to what extent, and how they angled it, can give a pointer to the government's perception of the school's role in the exile community.

On 7 November 1942, the front page of *Norsk Tidend* was covered with pictures and reports of the opening party of Drumtochty Castle.[99] The main photo is of a laughing King Haakon VII

[94] Corse 2013: 6
[95] Norsk Tidend 1940. The author's translation. Original quote: "Utgivelse av nyhetsaviser pleier ikke å høre til de oppgaver som staten skal ta sig av."
[96] Riste 1987: 31
[97] Ibid.: 31f
[98] Nielsen 2021: 5
[99] Norsk Tidend 1942a

surrounded by smiling children, with a Norwegian flag waving in the background. A subtitle reads "A school inauguration which became like a day in Norway".[100] The article itself retells excerpts of the numerous speeches that were held, as well as the official background of the establishment of the school which to a large extent matches what was written in the previously mentioned circular sent to the families of the pupils.[101]

Drumtochty Castle boarding school is in the article portrayed as unifying for Norwegians around the world. It shows the exiled King and government caring for and showing consideration for the vulnerable children, who were finally placed at a safe distance from the crowded cities to more peaceful and spacious environments. It could have reminded the Norwegian exiles of home, of what they were fighting for, and therefore also be a motivational factor for instance for the thousands of Norwegian merchant sailors in exile. The newspaper issue also had an English excerpt of the event, highlighting the gratitude shown in a speech toward the British people's hospitality and friendliness, which could have contributed to boosting the goodwill between the nations.[102]

Positive articles like this can easily be imagined as having the ability to brighten up any war-weary person's day. A picture of a smiling King surrounded by happy, Norwegian refugee children is, in addition to being uplifting and inspiring, also propaganda. Obviously, the editors attempted to influence the readers to feel a stronger connection with the King and government. They tried to appeal to their readers' emotions. Smiling children awaken feelings in many adults and to see that their King was the one that made the children happy, would increase his positive reputation among both the exiles and also perhaps the public in the host nation.

Other lengthy articles about Drumtochty Castle like the one from the opening party cannot be found in *Norsk Tidend*. This is likely caused by the fact that every-day-life set in at the school after the opening party that did not need or cause too much attention. At least not the kind of attention that would be useful to the government to promote to the exile communities. Notes and photographs of the school in the newspaper still happened occasionally, with a varying degree of propaganda.

[100] Ibid. The author's translation. Original quote: "En skoleinnvielse som ble som en dag i Norge."
[101] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» 24 June 1942.
[102] Norsk Tidend 1942d

In the same issue of *Norsk Tidend* as the report of the opening party, a photograph shows a teacher at Drumtochty Castle dressed in a bunad together with a young, blonde girl.[103] The caption says: "[…] She [the girl] certainly lacks nothing – she even has sunshine on her desk. Hopefully, the little one knows how well off she is compared to her schoolmates back in Norway!"[104] A similar photograph of a female, bunad-dressed teacher helping a girl by her desk was also posted a week later, with a caption that said: "The idyll at Drumtochty."[105] Both of these examples also show clear indications of propaganda. They can also serve as a reminder for the Norwegians of what they were fighting for.

The government wanted to portray the school as a peaceful and harmonic place for the children during the war. They speak nothing of the problems that occurred, like the previously mentioned tuberculosis infections, troubles with the staff or the pupils' difficulties adapting to being away from their families during a time of crisis. The government also facilitated a recording of a video film of life at the school, allegedly the first Norwegian video documentary recorded in colour.[106] This is another contribution to the idea that the government did perceive the school as an important part of Norwegian school history, and that its role in the exile Norwegian community was important, and ought to be remembered.

2.5 Final thoughts

The Norwegian exile government officially had six main objectives of establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school. For the sake of the children, the government in exile's objectives included the children's health, quality of education and security, and the maintenance of the children's Norwegian identity. This can be connected to all three of Imsen's functions of school. School served as a function of creating identities, providing the children with a happy upbringing and growth. Further, school had as a productive function, making sure the children are well-taught and useful for the Norwegian post-war society. Lastly, school had a 'reproductive' function, with the new generations being taught about the Norwegian culture and tradition.

For the Norwegian government and their politics, establishing the boarding school could help strengthen the relationship with both the host nation as well as the other exile governments

[103] The national costume of Norway.
[104] Norsk Tidend 1942c. The author's translation. Original quote: "Hun mangler såvisst ingenting – hun har til og med solskinn på pulten. Måtte bare vesla forstå hvor godt hun har det sammenlignet med skolekameratene sine hjemme i Norge!"
[105] Norsk Tidend 1942b. The author's translation. Original quote: "Idyll på Drumtochty."
[106] J. Rørvik. Video film of Drumtochty.

situated in London. It could serve as a portrait of Norway and the Norwegian spirit and lastly, as an effective tool for propaganda and motivation toward the rest of the Norwegian communities in exile. Drumtochty Castle boarding school must have been perceived as a unifying factor for Norwegians abroad. Nils Hjelmtveit must have found personal joy and motivation in the work he did for the children at Drumtochty, considering the effort he placed for them. But it was a significant institution for several layers of the Norwegian government in exile. The next chapter consists of an analysis of whether the Norwegian government succeeded with their objectives, by studying the pupils' experiences.

3.0 The pupils' post-war perspectives – the impact of Drumtochty Castle on their lives

The Norwegian government in exile, with the Ministry of Church and Education at the front line, dedicated a lot of their time to support and facilitate for the children in exile. As seen in the previous chapter, the government had multiple reasons for doing so. In this chapter, an analysis of the pupils' experiences and reminiscences will help answer whether the government succeeded with their agendas, and what kind of function the school had for the children.

The agendas that are to be examined through the children's perspectives, are: Did the pupils receive an improved education after the opening of Drumtochty Castle boarding school? Were the children kept secure from the acts of war? Were the children kept safe from diseases? Lastly, did the children feel like 'true' Norwegians? Answering these questions will contribute to determine what significance and function the school had for the pupils. To help answering the aforementioned questions, I will analyse about 100 letters from former pupils and staff members in the personal archive of Jakob Rørvik, the last principal of Drumtochty Castle boarding school, combined with interviews of six former pupils.[107]

3.1 'The Drumtochty family'?

The term 'the Drumtochty family' is a term used by Jakob Rørvik and the pupils in letters written between them after the war. The term 'family' shows a kinship between them, and that they had a perception of a special relationship between them, a closer relationship than most regular principal-pupil-relationships. This connects to Imsen's function of school as creating identities and will therefore need to be more thoroughly examined to see how this impacted their post-war lives and identities. It also indicates that being enrolled at Drumtochty was of major significance to the pupils. Taking a closer look at their use of the term in the letters is important to answer my research questions.

The historical value of the letters is problematic if it is measured merely on the basis of the accuracy of the pupils' memories. But what the letters can tell, is what the pupils highlighted in their letters regarding their memories of their time at Drumtochty Castle. Further, it sheds light on what significance going to the school had for them as individuals, looking back several years later.

[107] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Most of the letters are written in the 1980s.

In the letters Rørvik wrote to the former staff and pupils, and in their replies, they on several occasions referred to themselves as 'The Drumtochty family'. The letters show that so did Hjelmtveit, who was still alive at the time and allegedly still talked about the 'family' and remembered the pupils by name even at the age of 90.[108] Given the age of the pupils at the time they attended Drumtochty Castle, it is somewhat understandable and natural that the residents of the school considered themselves as part of a big family. Especially considering the conditions they were living in and what they had all been through before going to Drumtochty. It is extraordinary that a minister knew pupils by their names and perceived himself to be part of the Drumtochty family, something that was probably unique for Minister Hjelmtveit and the Norwegian exile era. It also gives an impression of a special identity shared between the former residents and facilitators of Drumtochty. This identity and background were something that no one else could claim, and that still connected them, nearly 40 years later.

Members of the school calling each other family is by itself unusual, given the fact that Drumtochty Castle was part of an institution that was based on educating children. It is doubtful that any regular Norwegian school pre-war referred to themselves as being a family. Obviously, the staff got a special care-taking relationship with the pupils in addition to being their teachers, with the pupils living at the facility, and only visiting their biological families during the holidays. Under those circumstances, bonds between the staff and pupils could grow stronger and tighter compared to any regular pre-war school.

Simultaneously, circumstances like the ones the Drumtochty inhabitants were living under, could also cause friction between the children and their caregivers, especially considering some of the children being traumatised by their wartime experiences. Likewise, the staff themselves were understaffed and could also be traumatised. Still, they were suddenly supposed to take care of about 70 children around the clock whom they did not previously know. It is evident from talking with the former pupils' that some of the teachers were known to be stricter than others, but still the relationships between the children and the staff seem overall to have been quite harmonic.

After reading the about 100 letters between Rørvik, the pupils and some of the staff members, it is evident that most of the pupils continued to stay in touch with some of the other pupils, at least occasionally. Only five former pupils reported that they had not been in touch with anyone

[108] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. For instance: Til tidligere elever og ansatte ved Den norske Skolen i Skottland, Arendal, 1 November 1982. Til ALLE i Drumtochty-familien, Arendal, 15 January 1988. Letter to Rørvik from "pupil Q", Longyearbyen 09.08.1983.

after returning to Norway, but the majority of these had a sibling or other family members that attended the school simultaneously as themselves and therefore still had another person in their life with memories of Drumtochty.[109] Another letter reported of a 'West Coast Department' ('Vestlandsavdeling') that formed after the war, part of 'the Drumtochty family'. This group consisted of pupils and former staff living in the same area in the west of Norway, which had occasional meetings, although the frequency of this was not reported.[110]

The general perspective seems to be that due to the pupil's young age at the time along with the fact that they were spread all over Norway when returning after the war, it was difficult to stay in touch with one another, at least as a collective group.[111] 'The West Coast Department' was the exception here. Many did not have regular contact with anyone from Drumtochty Castle, except family members that may also have attended. The years they shared at the Castle seem to still bond the pupils together, and even though the contact may have been sparse, several of the pupils had the Castle and its inhabitants in their thoughts frequently.

The difficulties of staying in touch with each other were something that Rørvik wanted to mend. He placed great efforts in reuniting the pupils, all of them, in a grand reunion. Simultaneously, he also wanted to offer them a video of the Castle from when they attended, the video previously mentioned in chapter 2.[112] Rørvik must have perceived the significance of the school as being great, for him on a personal level, and as an important piece of Norwegian school history that needed to be remembered. Rørvik started writing a book about the time at Drumtochty but was never able to finish it before he passed away.[113]

The endeavour of writing a book about Drumtochty Castle was not exclusive to Jakob Rørvik. As mentioned in chapter 2, Minister Nils Hjelmtveit himself also intended to write a book about the history of the school. He began the process but was sadly not able to finish either.[114] Parts of the unfinished manuscript was sent to Rørvik, who kept it safe in his archive. The original manuscript was allegedly sent to the Norwegian Educational Study Collection for

[109] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. For instance, letter from "pupil E" to Rørvik, Kopervik, 14.06.1983, and letter from "pupil J" to Rørvik, Rolvsøy, 05.12.1982.
[110] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Letter to Rørvik from "pupil H", Bergen, 18.11.1982.
[111] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Letter to Rørvik from "pupil P", 04.06.1983.
[112] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Til tidligere elever og ansatte ved Den norske Skolen i Skottland. Letters from pupils. Til soknepresten i Salangen, from Jakob Rørvik. Arendal, 17.09.1983.
[113] C.J. Rørvik, personal communication, 07.01.2022. Jakob Rørvik's private archive also shows clear signs of his preparation for writing a book, with documents showing the intended book's disposition
[114] J. Rørvik. Manuscript written by Nils Hjelmtveit, "Eventyret om Drumtochty Castle. Det skotske slottet som ble skole for norske barn i årene 1942-45."

safekeeping.[115] How safe it was kept is debatable, as I have not succeeded in tracking down the original manuscript or any other personal documents by Hjelmtveit that is not part of Rørvik's archive.

Neither Rørvik nor Hjelmtveit were able to write a book about Drumtochty before they passed away. Their intentions to do so, and their endeavour of preserving their personal documents and archives regarding the school proves that it was of great importance to them even several decades later. Hjelmtveit was as we have seen in chapter 2 one of the most important people in the establishment of the school. The inhabitants of Drumtochty Castle formed strong bonds between them. Likely, other Norwegian refugees in Great Britain formed close-knit bonds between them as well, as they shared several experiences from both the occupation, the escape and living in exile.

3.2 The quality of education at the exile school

One of the agendas of establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school was the need to provide better education for the Norwegian refugee children. In this subchapter, I will discuss whether they succeeded with this agenda and if the education of the Norwegian children improved after they started attending Drumtochty.

In the letter written by Sommerfelt and Hjelmtveit in 1942 to all Norwegian parents that they knew about in Great Britain, the need for better education was highlighted. They wrote:

> *The school system we have had until now has only been temporary and in several ways inexpedient. […] By the gathering of practically every Norwegian child in one school, one would be able to create a far better school than those we have now. […] The Norway that is to rise after the war will need that its sons and daughters have been taught well.*[116]

The exile government felt that the establishment of a larger school was important for providing a better education not only for the sake of the children, but also so that the children would be better equipped to take part in the future rebuilding of Norway. It was difficult obtaining a clear overview of the children and their situation before the establishment of Drumtochty. As

[115] J. Rørvik. Note by Hjelmtveit and Rørvik. 1 November 1979.
[116] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. Letter. «Fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet til norske foreldre med skolepliktige barn i England.» 24 June 1942. The author's translation. Original quote: "Den skoleordning vi har hatt hittil, har bare vært midlertidig og på flere måter lite hensiktsmessig. […] Ved samlingen av praktisk talt alle norske barn til én skole, vil en kunne skape en langt bedre skole enn dem vi nå har. […] For det Norge som skal oppstå etter krigen vil ha god bruk for at dets sønner og døtre har fått en god opplæring."

mentioned, 80-100 Norwegian children were in Great Britain at the time. Some of them were just staying at home with their parents, some of them attended small Norwegian schools, and yet others attended British schools even though they did not know the language very well – or at all. For the children attending British schools without understanding the English language, attending Drumtochty must without a doubt have been a big improvement, because the classes were held in a language they understood.

While talking to the informants, they all confirmed that the tuition at Drumtochty was indeed held in Norwegian, with the natural exception of the English classes. Still, the pupils all seem to have a better remembrance of their time outside the Castle during their spare time, than the time they spent inside the Castle walls. This is especially the case when it comes to the classes, where most seem to have been forgotten over the years. There are some exceptions to this, especially regarding certain episodes consisting of pranks and following consequences that will be more thoroughly covered later in this chapter.[117]

Their spare time which consisted of playing and exploring outdoors and the weekly marches they took to the Castle Chapel are something that seem to have stuck to the pupils' memories.[118] Also specific memories of the staff seem to a large degree be limited to the staff members they felt were their main caregivers, and not the various teacher's style in pedagogy.[119] This can indicate that from the children's perspective, the main significance of attending the school was perhaps not the improvement of their education, but rather as a safe haven during war. With using Imsen's terms, it was not the productive function of school that was the most significant for the children, but perhaps rather the identity-creating function.

The fact that all schools in Great Britain had trouble providing enough textbooks, equipment, and staff, must have influenced the quality of the tuition. This, combined with the children having very different backgrounds and levels of knowledge, as well as having all gone through traumatic events and now for the most part lived without their families, could have made an impression on both the children's priorities and needs, as well as their focus while doing their schoolwork. To some degree, this must have influenced the tuition, as the teachers had to take into account several more considerations than what was normally to be expected.

[117] Informant B, 21.02.2022.
[118] Informant F, 26.02.2022.
[119] Ibid.

One of the informants left the school after 1,5 years to take care of his mother and sister in Buckie. He said that, in comparison, the Norwegian school in Buckie was simpler. He often did not attend the classes but bicycled around the dock area in Buckie instead.[120] Obviously, it must have been easier making sure that the children attended class at a boarding school, hours away from the nearest village than at a day school. Providing the Norwegian refugee children with a school with tuition held in their own language, and with a school model that was in many ways familiar to them from their time at school in Norway, indicates that the establishment of Drumtochty Castle boarding school may have offered them a better education.

However, had the children been well taught in the English language, it is not so certain that Drumtochty would have been an improvement compared to attending British schools. The Norwegian refugee children in Sweden often went to local schools, without this being reported as a problem for the quality of the education. It is also not a given fact that the boarding school at Drumtochty was an improvement of the small, Norwegian day school in for instance Buckie. But with the scarce resources available in Great Britain, it is likely that by the gathering of most of the Norwegian children in one school, it would be easier to provide a better education for a majority of the children.

3.3 The school as a safe haven

The safety of the pupils was, as seen in chapter 2, one of the most important reasons for the establishment of Drumtochty Castle boarding school. Several of the former pupils highlighted the frightening events while living in London, mainly because of the German air raids. One of the informants pointed out during our conversation that the introduction of the horrific German V-bombs was the sole reason his father decided to move his family from London to Scotland. The traditional bombs were nothing in comparison.[121] Did Drumtochty provide the pupils with a secure environment?

There was a wide consensus among the former pupils that the reason they went to Drumtochty Castle was because of the bombings in the larger cities of Great Britain.[122] One of the pupils claimed in her interview: "If it were not for Drumtochty, I may have been dead."[123] She further explained that the apartment her family was living in in London was bombed the week after she and her sister left for Drumtochty Castle. Her parents were not home at the time of the bombing,

[120] Informant B, 21.02.2022.
[121] Ibid.
[122] For example Informant E, 25.02.2022 and Informant B, 21.02.2022.
[123] Informant F. 26.02.2022. The author's translation. Original quote: "Jeg hadde kanskje ikke levd hadde det ikke vært for Drumtochty."

but the sisters most likely would have been, had they not left for Scotland. Thus, she had Drumtochty to thank for being alive.[124]

This coincides with one of the Norwegian government in exile's most important agendas of establishing the school. Several of the pupils also mentioned in the interviews that they felt safe at Drumtochty. It was calm, the German pilots never found them there, and even though attending the school may have been hard because of the longing for their families and that their stay might have been boring because of all the rules, it did keep them alive.[125] Finding school to be boring can easily be perceived to be a positive element during a war and is to be preferred over too many dramatic incidents.

The children's stay at Drumtochty kept them safe from the bombings. However, it did not keep them safe from internal danger, whether it was tuberculosis amongst the pupils, which will be explained further in the next subchapter, but also from the misbehaviour of the other pupils. As one can expect of a group of around 70 pupils of different ages living together under one roof, not all of them always abided by the rules. It is also easy to imagine that the friction between the pupils could be exaggerated by the fact that they had nowhere to go and was forced to spend their days and nights in the same place. Sometimes the trouble seems to indeed be more than the staff could handle by themselves, and they needed help or advice from the Education department, and in other words, Nils Hjelmtveit himself.

There was frequent correspondence between the staff at the school and Hjelmtveit. Disciplinary issues were something they corresponded about, and the staff sought advice from Hjelmtveit to figure out the correct response or consequence whenever issues occurred that was more out of the ordinary. This shows a tight bond between the Ministry and the school, and a feeling of kinship and a sense of them being able to have an openness between them that is not to be taken for granted between a school and a Ministerial department. It also highlights the small conditions the Norwegians in exile were living under and how short the distance was from the 'common man' to the Ministry.

The extended contact between the Ministry and the school is likely due to multiple factors. The Norwegian state was in a unique situation of being in exile. The Norwegian Minister of Education had a motivation for making a difference for the Norwegian refugee children, while simultaneously actually being able to do so, with several of his regular duties in peacetime being

[124] Ibid.
[125] For example, Informant B, 21.02.2022 and Informant F 26.02.2022.

impossible or irrelevant to perform while living in exile. Also, the conditions in exile were much smaller than in peacetime Norway, as the number of schools to take care of was significantly lower. This combination provided the willing minister with a unique opportunity to take part in both bigger and smaller issues that emerged at the boarding school.

The school staff at Drumtochty felt free to approach Hjelmtveit with all sorts of issues regarding the school, the pupils, and the staff. This shows a kinship and friendliness between them. In regular times a teacher or principal would most likely never even consider approaching the Minister of Education regarding disciplinary questions of their pupils. The tools for dealing with behavioural issues would usually also be more established in a school that had existed for some time, than what was possible at a new type of school in a foreign country in an exile situation.

Perhaps more importantly, it can also tell us something about the Norwegian exile community, and the common people's sense of being able to influence their situation to a higher degree than what would normally be possible. It also indicates that in exile the feeling of equality was bigger than it was in peacetime Norway. There was possibly less difference between 'high and low', and everyone was in it together. Cooperation was vital to achieving their common goals, and all had a role to play. Their end goal was to return to a free homeland while in the meantime trying to prepare as best as they could, as well as keeping everyone, both children and adults alike, as safe and motivated as they could.

I will not dive deep into all the disciplinary challenges at Drumtochty Castle that the sources describe, as that will fall out of the frame of this thesis. I will however display a few examples of the issues, to see how it was dealt with and the eventual aftermath of them. This is to help show the role the school played in the pupils' exiled lives, and how the consequences affected the families. In turn, this will help show the significance of the exile school in the pupils and their families' lives. Most of the misbehaviours were innocent pranks that were delt with accordingly. While studying the sources, I have however come across one serious case.

The records show that at Drumtochty Castle, there were specifically a group of three young boys often finding themselves in trouble, in addition to certain single incidents performed by other individuals during the war years.[126] The most serious single standing event was when one of the male pupils: "[…]forced himself on one of the girls, and the incident was of such a grave

[126] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. Letter to Nils Hjelmtveit from Ivar Benum, Drumtochty Castle 25.05.1943.

and serious manner that all the teachers agreed that [he] was to be expelled from the school for a shorter or longer amount of time".[127] The details of the incident are not further described in the sources. The incident was of such severity that the school council, consisting of the teachers and staff, held an extraordinary meeting. The pupil in question was immediately expelled. The principal at the time, Ivar Benum, travelled with the boy back to his parents to explain the situation, before travelling to London to talk to Hjelmtveit in person.[128]

After this event, the staff held another meeting to discuss a suggestion of whether they should dismiss and send home *all* the oldest pupils, those who were 15 years old or that were to become 15 years old in 1943. The reason for this was that the teachers worried that there would be more scandals like the one that had already occurred, and as summer was fast approaching, it became increasingly more difficult to maintain discipline over the oldest pupils. This was discussed with the following in mind: what would be better for the school? What would the pupils in question lose by being forced to quit school early? After some discussion, the teachers unanimously decided that the oldest pupils had to quit school after Easter the same year.[129]

This shows the decision-making process of the staff: what they focused on, what was important for them in the decisions they made and the consequences that followed. This again reflects what they perceived the school's role ought to be and that the children's safety triumphed the need for education, even though there were no obvious or immediate threat nearby. Imsen's function of school as creating identities, securing personal growth and happiness, seem to have been more present than the school's productive function, providing the children with knowledge to make them useful for society. It also shows the teachers' motive for enforcing a change of plans that could seem quite surprising and drastic, which was the fear of another scandal. The fear of a new scandal outweighed the possible downsides for the oldest pupils leaving the school earlier than planned. Whether or not this decision was put into effect is unclear, as it is not described further in the sources. Probably not, because of what later happened to the boy.

The event between the boy and the girl was reported to be well known amongst the pupils. All the pupils knew what had happened, and therefore it is likely that so did their parents and other Norwegian communities across Great Britain.[130] Obviously, this event must have been

[127] J. Rørvik. Reports from school council meetings at Drumtochty Castle. Tuesday 30.03.1943. The author's translation. Original quote: "[…] hadde forsett seg mot en av jentene, og tilfellet var så pass alvorlig og graverende, at alle lærere var enige om at [han] blir bortvist frå skolen for kortere eller lengere tid."
[128] Ibid.
[129] J. Rørvik. Reports from school council meetings at Drumtochty Castle. Monday 05.04.1943.
[130] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. Letter to Ivar Benum from Nils Hjelmtveit, 09.04.1943.

worrying for the parents of the pupils. Drumtochty Castle was an institution partially made to keep their children safe and secure. Should similar situations occur, it would have been disastrous for the school's reputation. Not only was the school's reputation in danger, but it would also reflect on the Norwegian communities' reputations, as well as the Norwegian government, for not being able to keep the children safe and under control. Furthermore, had the Nazis learned about the incident, they would without a doubt used it for what it was worth to try to weaken the Norwegian resistance and spirit. It was important that the Norwegian school did not put the Norwegians in a negative light, as that could impact multiple aspects of the Norwegian's cause. In turn, how the staff and authorities dealt with situations helps to show what significance the school had for the Norwegian exiled community.

Two months after the event, the boy was allowed to return to Drumtochty under a strict regime, where the first months would be a trial period for him. He was allowed to return after Nils Hjelmtveit personally spoke to the boy and his father and sent a letter to principal Benum at Drumtochty giving him the recommendation to let him return. In this letter, Hjelmtveit highlighted that it was the staff at the school's final decision and that it would the boy in question's responsibility to behave well and show himself worthy of the trust of both the staff and the pupils as well.[131] His return indicates that at least some of the oldest pupils probably had not yet left the school.

As previously described, Hjelmtveit visited Drumtochty regularly. He also visited the school on 5 May 1943 and attended the school council meeting, where the case of the return of the boy was the main topic. Hjelmtveit's several arguments for letting the boy return varied from the true remorse he felt he had seen in the boy, to the school giving the boy the chance for a fresh start in life. Hjelmtveit explained to the Drumtochty staff that the boy would undoubtedly become a 'wreck' if he was to be sent to a compulsory school instead. In other words, the school could serve as a correcting factor for the pupils. Hjelmtveit also argued that the increased difficulties living in exile had had for adults and children alike was another reason for letting the boy return. The staff at Drumtochty, after long discussions, hesitantly agreed to let him return for a strict trial period, where he would be forced to leave for good if he trespassed once more.[132]

[131] RA/S-2066/D/Db/L0002. KUD-London. Letter to Ivar Benum from Nils Hjelmtveit, 09.04.1943. J. Rørvik. Reports from school council meetings at Drumtochty Castle. 05.05.1943.
[132] J. Rørvik. Reports from school council meetings at Drumtochty Castle. 05.05.1943.

Looking back today at the case of the insubordinate boy quickly raises the question: What about the girl? What the girl in question felt about the matter is not described further in the sources. It is also not stated whether she continued living at Drumtochty Castle. The lack of further information about the girl and her point of view can either indicate that she quickly left the school after the incident, although it would have been natural to consider this, or at least mention it while debating further actions. The sources consist of a summary of the discussion at the meeting. Her side may have been mentioned and argued for, but not included in the report.

This case is interesting because it highlights so many different aspects. Firstly, what role the school could serve for the pupils. Secondly, it exemplifies the relationship between the staff at Drumtochty and Hjelmtveit, where the staff felt free to openly disagree and question the judgement of the Minister. This is certainly uncommon in Norwegian history and indicates that the staff did not feel that the social distance to the government was too big. Thirdly, it tells something about the relationship between the staff, the pupils and their families with principal Ivar Benum personally bringing the boy home and talking to his parents. Lastly, the handling of the assault tells something about the relationship between the pupils, their families, and the Norwegian government in exile. The exile government seems to have been an open and accessible institution for the families.

More innocent disciplinary issues were also committed at Drumtochty. One of the pupils wrote in a letter about nightly raids to the turnip fields by the castle, stealing the turnips and eating them together with his roommates during the night. 15 years later, the pupil felt comfortable telling the story to Rørvik.[133] Another tells of the horrific feeling of getting heavily reprimanded by Rørvik for playing on the Castle's old and fragile roof, Rørvik worrying about them falling through the roof and hurting themselves. Seemingly, this only caused the boys in question to play a bit more carefully the next time they snuck up to the castle roof.[134]

In addition to getting reprimanded by Rørvik and the rest of the staff, writing mantras were used as a punishment on a couple of occasions. "I shall not go skiing on the rhododendron."[135] was the mantra one of the pupils had to write multiple times as punishment after skiing down on the rhododendron outside Drumtochty Castle one particularly snowy winter.[136] One of the other

[133] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Letter from "pupil B" to Rørvik, Oslo, 11.02.1960.
[134] J. Rørvik. Letters from pupils. Letter from "pupil L" to Rørvik, Indre Arna, 19.11.1982.
[135] Interview with Informant C, 24.02.2022. The author's translation. Original quote: "Jeg skal ikke gå på ski på rhododendronen."
[136] Informant C, 24.02.2022.

informants also had to write a mantra multiple times after she made a grand escape down to the village to visit her mother when she was supposed to get her hair cut at the castle.[137]

This shows that the children were children after all and could from time to time misbehave. Their punishments were often mild, often nothing more than reprimands, which shows that the staff had an acceptance and understanding for this. The staff presumably did not want or had the ability to keep the children under stricter control than necessary. Some punishments were given after mischief involving jeopardising their safety, as exemplified above. Others could be tied to common disciplinary issues. Overall discipline must have been important to keep everyone as safe as possible, both from themselves and from the other pupils. This also indicates that according to Imsen's functions of school, the most important for school in exile in wartime was school as a way to create identity and not letting their education come at the expense of their safety, growth and happiness.

Exile schools were short-staffed all over Great Britain during Second World War. The resources it demanded to keep everything and everyone under strict supervision day and night can easily be imagined to be impossible to procure. Disciplining the children also had value, thus preparing them to be responsible and free adults in the future, after the war. The establishment of Drumtochty Castle without a doubt succeeded in keeping the children secure from the acts of war. Human interactions can always lead to unwanted or unfortunate actions and incidents. With few exceptions, the government also succeeded in keeping the children safe in general.

3.4 A healthy environment?

As seen in chapter 2, diseases like tuberculosis were ravaging Britain's large cities during the war. The cramped quarters many of the Norwegian refugees resided in in Glasgow and London, caused many of them to become heavily exposed to illness. The health aspect was perhaps the most important agenda of establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school. Did the Norwegian government and the Drumtochty staff succeed in creating a healthy environment for the Norwegian children?

While the infection rates dropped in Glasgow after the children moved to Drumtochty Castle, several of the children had already gone through tuberculosis before or got infected while attending the boarding school. 35 of the children tested positive on the pirquet test when first

[137] Informant F, 26.02.2022.

checked. During their stay, 30 more pupils tested positive on a pirquet test.[138] Several of these got infected after a school vacation in 1944.[139] Considering that the total number of pupils was around 70, the health aspect of the government's arguments of establishing the school was certainly valid. This does not mean that only about five children that attended Drumtochty Castle boarding school did not get infected with tuberculosis. Some pupils quit school early for various reasons, and others replaced them. How many pupils had entered the Castle doors by the time they were tested the second time is unknown. It is still safe to say that many Norwegian children got infected by tuberculosis in Great Britain.

Although the children at Drumtochty were kept safe from the bombings of London, they were obviously not kept safe from diseases like tuberculosis. Some got infected while being home on vacation, and others got infected while staying at school.[140] Some of the pupils were placed at the infirmary at Drumtochty for shorter or longer periods, and one even told that her sister got so ill from the tuberculosis infection she got at Drumtochty Castle that she passed away after the war.[141] Tragedies like that luckily do not seem to have been a repeating incident at the Castle, and they did take precautions trying to prevent any diseases from spreading amongst the children. The precautions mainly consisted of a strict testing regime before being accepted to the school.[142]

Health also includes mental health. By moving to Drumtochty, the children got the possibility of a stronger overall constitution, with large playfields to explore, fresh air and hot meals every day. They also got away from the terrors of the air raids, which must have impacted their mental wellbeing. Although their physical health had the chance to improve, the same cannot be concluded for their mental health. With few exceptions, the children did not have their family around, which in turn left its mark on them. All the informants highlighted the memories of loneliness, emptiness, and longing for their parents.[143] This was regardless of whether they had a sibling present at the Castle or not. The loneliness was not connected to the fact that they lived in exile, but rather the fact that they lived away from their parents. The children enrolled at

[138] Pirquet tests were used to test for immune reactions toward the bacteria causing tuberculosis. RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. Result sheets of pirquet tests presented with prior results, 1 April 1945.
[139] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. Letter to the parents of the pupils by Nils Hjelmtveit, "Ang. Helseforholdene ved internatskolen i høst", 29 December 1944.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Informant F, 26.02.2022.
[142] RA/S-2066/D/Da/L0024, KUD-London. «Det Kgl. Kirke- og Undervisningsdepartement, Kingston House.» Suggestion of examining all residents. Didi Sunde, 3 July 1942, «Dr John Caspersen, Medisinaldirektoratet» schedule of medicinal examinations, 29 September 1942.
[143] For instant Informant F, 26.02.2022.

British day schools would not have had the same issues. Still, Norwegian children at British day schools could have had other issues, like problems fitting in because of not knowing the language or being the only Norwegian there. They could in turn have ended up lonely if they had troubles making friends.

Some reported that having a special caregiver among the staff at Drumtochty helped with the homesickness.[144] It seems as if some of the staff members took a more caring role than others. Simultaneously, the strict discipline was also a common factor in the pupils' description of everyday life at Drumtochty. The discipline was by one former pupil described as so strict that it made their lives there boring, but also described it as probably being necessary.[145] The necessity of discipline is perhaps something that was not all that clear for the pupils while attending the school, but easier to understand in retrospect.

The special caregivers that helped the children get through the days were sometimes staff at the school, sometimes siblings of the children and sometimes roommates, spending the nights telling stories, and helping the others being distracted from the homesickness.[146] Some of the pupils even reported of a special connection with Nils Hjelmtveit himself. One of the informants still has vivid memories of him spending quality time with her.[147] This shows another example of Hjelmtveit's perception of the exile school as some of the most important work he did in Great Britain during the war. It is also another example of Hjelmtveit perceiving the children as individually important and worthy of attention and care, and not only collectively as part of the future Norway.

Another pupil got a special connection with principal Jakob Rørvik and visited him in Risør after the war. This also indicates something out of the ordinary when it comes to pupil-teacher relationships. Even though the pupils and staff got spread out all over Norway after the war, which caused difficulties with staying in touch with each other, there still existed a special connection between them. This connects with the school as having had a function for contributing to creating their identities and that the children and staff integrated their experiences into their own personalities.

In many aspects, the government failed to keep the children healthy, as in free from illnesses. But the effort they put in in the attempt to do so is clear. It is doubtful that the children would

[144] Ibid.
[145] Written memoirs received by Informant F, 26.02.2022. The memoirs are written by another pupil.
[146] Informant E, 25.02.2022.
[147] Informant D, 24.02.2022.

have been healthier living in for instance Glasgow with their families, in crowded apartments. In many cases they would have either way caught illnesses like tuberculosis. Drumtochty did provide a healthier environment, with nutritious food and large outdoor areas, giving the children a stronger constitution and overall better health than they often would have had in the larger cities. Staying with their families would on the other side have spared the children of homesickness and longing but could in turn have produced a different kind of loneliness.

3.5 Preserving the pupils as 'true Norwegians'

The last government agenda to be examined is whether the children's stay at Drumtochty Castle aided in keeping them 'true Norwegian'. The refugee situation was from the start meant to be temporary. A total assimilation of the children with the British communities would therefore be out of the question. Did the government succeed in preserving the Norwegian identity of the children, and did the children maintain the idea of one day going home to Norway?

When the former pupils were asked in the interviews about the significance of attending the school for them personally, some of the informants said that the relationships they built while staying at Drumtochty Castle, as well as the impact the school had later in their lives were coloured by the fact that they knew they were there only temporarily.[148] While staying at the Castle, they were still able to pay close attention to news of the war. Many of them felt like it was only a matter of time before they could go back to Norway, thus hindering them from forming too tightly knit bonds to their fellow pupils, the host nation, or the estate itself.[149] This coincides with the government's agenda of keeping the children true Norwegian.

This can be seen as a temporary diaspora environment that the pupils and staff at Drumtochty were part of. According to Berg & Lauritsen's four requirements, it is evident that the residents of Drumtochty Castle lived in diaspora.[150] The first requirement is met with the fact that the environment is set outside the original homeland. The second one is that they maintained a strong bond with Norway. The school model was as similar as possible, the tuition was being held in Norwegian, most of the staff were Norwegian, pictures of Norway hung on the walls, and Norwegian food was served and so forth. This indicate that the school had a function of being 'reproductive', as the homeland's culture and history were taught to the younger generation.

[148] Informant E, 25.02.2022.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 185

The third requirement of Berg & Lauritsen is the establishment of institutions that reflect the culture of the homeland. With school being an institution, one can say it has already been met. In addition, the celebrations of 17 May can be mentioned, as well as the Norwegian king being the school's official patron.[151] The fourth requirement is connected to a low degree of integration with the host nation. The children at Drumtochty Castle seem, for the most part, to have kept to themselves. Most of them, if not all, were set on returning home to Norway sooner rather than later.

The fourth requirement seems to have been important, though probably an unintentional, factor for some of the Drumtochty pupils. It was perhaps more intended by the government and staff. Equally important was the aspect of going home both hindering them from integrating with the locals, as well as a hindrance in forming tight friendship bonds between the children residing at the Castle. Still, not all pupils claim to have paid attention to the tide of the war, or that they perceived that the war was a conversational topic at Drumtochty at all.[152] This can of course be related both to the age of the pupil at the time, what occupied them at the time, and what they remember 80 years later.

The concept of identity, as described in the introduction, was something that may have affected the Drumtochty pupils as well. The children arrived from all over Norway, but a majority of them seem to have originated from the northernmost areas of Norway, such as Lofoten and Svalbard. Some of the informants talked about a sort of rivalry between the children from different parts of Norway. One of the informants arrived in Great Britain from Oslo and explained that it was not considered a popular place to originate from among the pupils. He felt picked on for being from Oslo as most of the other pupils originated from Northern Norway. His closest friends at the school all came from Oslo as well.[153] There was a form of rivalry between the pupils from different places in Norway. The informant felt exposed because of his local, Norwegian origins, highlighting that it was so noticeable because of the different dialects.[154]

Language and dialects were used as sort of an identity marker between the pupils. Although they were all Norwegian, some of them may have perceived them to have been different types of Norwegian, - northerners, southerners, those from the west coast and so on, sharing more of

[151] Hjelmtveit 1969: 295
[152] Informant F, 26.02.2022.
[153] Informant C, 24.02.2022.
[154] Informant C, 24.02.2022.

the same background, culture, and original identity. That there may have been a tendency for them to stick together with fellow pupils originating from the same areas of Norway is plausible, thus leading to possibilities for conflicts of varying degrees. Although this could have been tough for the individual child that may have felt left out or picked at, it simultaneously indicates that the children kept to their Norwegian identities.

Leaving for Drumtochty Castle was suggested by one of the informants to challenge the pupils' identities, who said that going to Drumtochty empty-handed was tough. She felt at the time that nothing was hers and hers alone.[155] To arrive practically empty-handed was probably the case for many of the children, who escaped Norway with not much more than what they were wearing at the time of the escape. This can be linked to Varvin's concept of nostalgic disorientation, where the pupils got uprooted from their homes, and some of them not even being able to bring any physical memories of where they came from with them to the Castle. This could have impacted their sense of identity, and made the pupils, subconsciously having to figure out the question of their own identity once more.[156]

One of the pupils said that the most important thing he carried with him in his life after the war, were the memories of Drumtochty. He often thought of his time there, and his time at Drumtochty meant a great deal in the formation of his identity.[157] Another pupil said that she had always felt different somehow after her attendance at Drumtochty, and it was something special about it.[158] Although some of the informants did not feel like it altered them in any way, others obviously felt that they would not have been the same persons today, had it not been for Drumtochty.

Despite the rivalry between the pupils, and even though some of the pupils struggled with a feeling of disorientation, none of the informants reported of having a perception of transitioning to become British during their stay at Drumtochty. One of the informants did say that his stay at Drumtochty provided him with a great interest in Scottish history. He also said that attending the school had made a direct impact on his professional life, as the advantage he got from learning the English language had helped him a great deal in his further studies.[159] This connects to the school's function as productive, as it helped him to find a useful place in society. The former pupils' testimonies indicate that the government did succeed in their agenda of keeping

[155] Informant F, 26.02.2022.
[156] Varvin 2015: 172
[157] Informant E, 25.02.2022.
[158] Informant F, 26.02.2022.
[159] Informant C, 24.02.2022.

them true Norwegians. Rivalry, identity confusion and interest in Scottish history are something that did not challenge their Norwegian core. It seems to have been out shadowed by the feeling of the temporariness of the pupils' stay at Drumtochty. To be surrounded by fellow Norwegians and Norwegian culture seem to have left the children with the impression of them being and staying true Norwegians.

3.6 Final thoughts

The Norwegian government in exile set an ambitious goal in the establishment of Drumtochty Castle boarding school. Not only was the school supposed to be a safe haven for the pupils, protecting against the actions of war as well as illnesses such as tuberculosis. Furthermore, the school should provide a better education than what was possible at the British schools, as well as have the pupils stay Norwegian. Did they succeed?

The government in exile does seem to for the most part have succeeded in their objectives behind establishing the school. They probably did manage to provide the children with a better education than what they might have gotten in British schools, mainly caused by the issue of English not being their native language. They also managed to, for the most part, keep the children secure. They were not always safe from internal dangers, but they were sheltered from bombings and other acts of war. The government also succeeded in keeping the children tied to their Norwegian nationality while staying there. Most challenging for the government in exile to succeed with was seemingly the objective of keeping the children healthy and safe from diseases. In some ways, they failed in doing so, but in other ways, one must highlight that their living conditions did improve from what was the case for many of the pupils before moving to Drumtochty and that the children in many cases would have gotten sick either way. All in all, the government in exile did mostly succeed in their objectives behind establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school.

4.0 The perspective of the host nation

It has been estimated that as many as 65 million people in Europe got displaced from their homes during the Second World War due to acts of war.[160] Many of the refugees fled to different nations like Great Britain, Sweden, or the US. There have been several attempts of trying to estimate how many refugees found shelter in Great Britain. One estimation is that at least 150.000 European refugees fled to the British Isles during the war.[161] This made an impact on different British communities, as well as British wartime history.[162] The British authorities cared for the refugees in an orderly fashion. While staying in Great Britain, nations were able to form legitimate exiled governments, like Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and several others did.[163]

From a Norwegian point-of-view, the Anglo-Norwegian relationship has historically been known to be a 'special' one.[164] During the Second World War, Norway in exile had certain benefits the other nations could not claim to possess. For instance, the Norwegian merchant navy was by the outbreak of war, the fourth largest in the world. By the establishment of the state-owned shipping company, Nortraship, in London, the Norwegian government secured control of about 1000 Norwegian ships for the benefit of the Allies. Not only was the Norwegian government in exile practically financially self-sufficient because of their merchant fleet. The importance of the ships under Allied control also secured leverage and influence for the Norwegian government that a small state like Norway would probably never have had otherwise.[165]

Did the Anglo-Norwegian 'special relationship' appear in the matter of the Norwegian exile school? Why and how did the British authorities contribute and intervene with the establishment and management of the school at Drumtochty Castle, and what agenda could they have had for doing so? What was the perception of the general British public, as well as the British authorities on the significance of Drumtochty Castle boarding school?

To answer these questions, I will look for an agenda of two of the most important British institutions in this matter, the British Council, and the British Board of Education. I will also

[160] Imperial War Museum
[161] Conway & Gotovitch 2001: 14. The exact number of refugees in Britain during WW2 is unknown and the estimates have varied. This estimate is used because it is a newer estimate that takes the other estimates into calculation.
[162] Ibid.: 12f
[163] Ibid.: 3
[164] Riste 2004: 181
[165] Ibid.

look for publicity of the Norwegian school at Drumtochty Castle in British newspapers to inspect how it was presented in Great Britain.

4.1 Anglo-Norwegian pre-war cooperation

To better understand the relationship between the British and Norwegian governments and their cooperation in various fields during the war, it is useful to look briefly at their relationship and cooperation before the war. The relationship between Norway and Great Britain had been close for decades before 9 April 1940, and during the war, it grew even closer. Questions of trade, security and politics linked the nations together, both pre-war as well as post-war.[166] For instance, during the 1930s, Scandinavia became Great Britain's largest trade partner.[167] A close connection with the host nation from the start might have eased the establishment of the Norwegian government in exile.

The power balance of the Anglo-Norwegian relationship shifted over the decades. Historian Geir Ketil Almlid described the relationship between the two nations up until 1945 as being regarded "as a special relationship" from the Norwegian perspective, as opposed to being "one of several good relationships" from the British perspective. This can be helpful to have in mind while researching the foreign schools in Britain during the Second World War.[168] After 1945, Almlid argues that the relationship faded to the degree that one can no longer describe it as being a "special relationship" anymore, but rather one of many similar relationships.[169]

The Anglo-Norwegian relationship at the start of the Second World War was difficult. Mutual distrust between the two nations caused various friction and problems. The Norwegian population were on the one side worried that the British considered Norway to be nothing more than a cog in the war machine. The British on their side were dissatisfied with the Norwegian neutrality before Norway got occupied by the Germans and had at the start of the war trouble trusting that the Norwegians were whole-heartedly engaged in the war.[170] Their cooperation improved during the war, as did their mutual trust and general relationship.[171]

[166] Almlid 2020: 12
[167] Ibid.: 9
[168] Ibid.: 11
[169] Ibid.: 2
[170] Riste 1973: 43
[171] Nielsen 2021: 10. Riste 1973: 45, 70.

4.2 British press on Drumtochty Castle

The opening party of Drumtochty Castle boarding school did not go unnoticed by the general British public. The British press were very patriotic during the war, as a way to boost the British morale as well as the morale of the refugees that lived in exile on the British Isles. Newspapers such as *The Press and Journal*, *The Dundee Courier*, *Evening Telegraph* and *Evening Express* were local or regional newspapers from Aberdeenshire and the Dundee area south of Drumtochty Castle in Scotland. These will be analysed in comparison to the nationwide newspapers, *The Scotsman* and London's *Daily News*, to see if the Norwegian school is from the local point-of-view portrayed differently than the bigger, nationwide newspapers. How was the opening party of Drumtochty Castle boarding school portrayed to the British public?

The nationwide Scottish newspaper *The Scotsman* started their article on the opening party of Drumtochty Castle with the line: "One of the numerous war-time links which bind Norway and Scotland was forged yesterday when King Haakon formally opened a Norwegian elementary school at Drumtochty Castle, Kincardineshire."[172] Already from the first line, it gives an impression of perception of the school as a marvellous way to strengthen and further develop the bonds between Norway and Scotland and that the two nations had a tight cooperation.

This is also evident later in the article, with the quote: "[…] the assimilation of Scottish ways was evident from the number of tartan kilts worn by the girls."[173] The article emphasises the Norwegian-Scottish relationship, before moving on to a vivid explanation of how the children reached Great Britain, the dangers they had been through and how bravely the Norwegian pupils and teachers had resisted Nazism in Norway. This could in turn likely deepen the empathy and compassion the Scottish population had towards the Norwegians. The article indicated that it was important that the Scottish population learned that the refugees were trying to adapt to the Scottish communities, although this probably was not completely true, given the fact that integration was not a priority to the exile communities.

The local newspaper *The Dundee Courier* reported of both the opening party, as well as a Christmas party held at Drumtochty.[174] In their article on the opening party, they highlight the gratitude the Norwegian exiles expressed toward the British. This was a good way to boost positive impressions of both the Norwegian exile community as well as a confirmation of the well-executed job done by the British government when helping an Allied nation. Like the

[172] The Scotsman 1942a
[173] Ibid. If they actually wore tartan kilts or if the journalist mistook them from bunads is uncertain.
[174] Dundee Courier 1942b

Scotsman's article, it highlighted the Anglo-Norwegian relations. This can be seen to help strengthen the bonds between the nations and to show the readers that the Allies were unified. The note about the Christmas party highlighted that the children performed a concert all in English, with English guests and friends from different parts of the county.[175] This gives an impression of the children as being well integrated, which may have been a bit exaggerated. As seen in chapter 2, it was very important for the Norwegian government that the children were to remain properly Norwegian. Still, it presents the children in a positive light and gives the impression of the children being well-adapted to the Scottish culture.

The article also reported on the Norwegian school and the bravery of the teacher's stand against the Nazis. In this article, Mackay Thomson of the Scottish Educational Department was quoted by saying that the school was unique, without it being elaborated further in the article. It was unique in the sense of it being the only Norwegian school of that type, but it would have been interesting to know what Mr. Thomson meant. This article also emphasised the perils the refugees had been through and admiration of that the children were taught in practical subjects, like navigation.[176]

The London-based *Daily News* had a slightly different approach than *The Scotsman* on the school and the opening party. Instead of emphasising the Anglo-Norwegian relationship, they rather showed an appreciation of the Norwegian pupil's toughness, with stories of how three of the pupils escaped Norway and a simple walkthrough of the turmoil they went through in doing so.[177] Two out of five paragraphs were dedicated to the Norwegian school system, with an emphasis on the fact that Norwegian pupils were taught navigation at school, as well as that corporal punishment was forbidden. Lastly, the journalist described that the children played with the King with "a freedom like that accorded to a well-beloved grandfather."[178] The article is short but shows a positive perception of the Norwegians and the Norwegian school system and gives the impression of them being a good example for the Allies. This concurs with the Norwegian government in exile's desire to show off the Norwegian school system as an inspiration and role model for the Allies.

Another column in *The Scotsman* had similarities with the *Daily News*-article, regarding the lack of corporal punishment at Drumtochty.[179] Corporal punishment was not forbidden in the

[175] Dundee Courier 1942a
[176] Dundee Courier 1942b
[177] Spence 1942
[178] Ibid.
[179] The Scotsman 1942b

state-owned schools in Great Britain until 1987. The fact that journalists pointed out that the Norwegian school forbade it in at least two of the press coverings of the opening of Drumtochty Castle, is a sign of it being up for debate much earlier.[180] Furthermore, the journalist wrote that corporal punishment was "[…] considered unenlightened in Norway.", and that a teacher had been dismissed for scandalous conduct for doing so some years earlier.[181] This is another indication that the Norwegian school system at Drumtochty Castle could be used by the British as an example for change, as the journalist continued to claim that the lack of corporal punishment had indeed not made the Norwegians "weaklings".[182] This as well was in line with the Norwegian governments wishes to let the Norwegian school be a good example for other nations.

Lastly, the journalist referred to the speech at the opening party held by Mr. Thomson, that the school could be an encouragement to establish various Scottish boarding schools around the rural areas of Scotland so that the pupils did not have to travel far distances to attend day school.[183] Yet again the journalist emphasised what the British school system could and should learn from the Norwegian school. Drumtochty Castle could be used as an example of improvements that needed to be done at British schools.

Several articles were styled in the manner of emphasising the Anglo-Norwegian relationship, the Norwegian gratitude toward the British and the toughness of the exile children. This may be symptomatic of how the British press described the exile communities during the war and indicates how important it must have been for the Allies to show unification and cooperation. The sheltering of thousands of refugees from all over Europe must have taken its toll on many British communities. Some of the refugees must have had trouble adapting to their new exile existence as well, and there may have been turmoil and concerns regarding the refugees like there were in Sweden. Still, after committing a brief search at The British Newspaper Archive, very few of the problems that must have occurred are reported in the newspapers.

The reason for the lack of press coverage regarding the offenses and crimes committed by refugees, may have been due to multiple reasons. The British Ministry of Information (MOI) greatly influenced British press from September 1939.[184] The MOI was among other tasks in charge of news and press censorship and controlled what material the British press reported. As

[180] British Schools Museum
[181] The Scotsman 1942b
[182] Ibid.
[183] Ibid.
[184] The National Archives

previously mentioned, British press was patriotic, and it was important that the Allies appeared unified and that the articles were to strengthen and boost both the morale as well as the relationships between the British and the rest of the Allies.

Another reason for reporting mostly positive news of the refugees was that it was also important to not feed the Nazis with anything they could use as propaganda. If the refugees in Great Britain were having a reportedly hard time, one can easily imagine it would have been picked up by the Nazis and used in every way possible to weaken the Allies' cause. Incidents like that did happen. One example is the Nazi propaganda reports regarding Norwegian sailors that were imprisoned by the Allies at the Isle of Man, made in an attempt to weaken the Norwegian bond to Great Britain.[185]

In the newspaper Dundee Evening Telegraph, a large photo show Crown Prince Olav receiving a flower bouquet from a Norwegian girl in July 1943. [186] This article describes the Crown Prince's visit to the Castle. The article emphasised the Norwegian school system the school was based on, including practical workshops and English tuition. The article also highlighted that the inhabitants of the school were making sure to not forget their national customs and fairy tales. This article gives the impression of a more segregated lifestyle of the pupils than many of the other articles and one more in tune with the agenda of the Norwegian government. The reasoning behind this may simply be that it is what the journalist observed during his visit or the fact that the newspaper wanted the readers to learn more about the exile communities and how they functioned.

In the *Aberdeen Press and Journal*, the article regarding the opening party had many similarities to the other newspapers' coverage. However, one paragraph stands out. The article reports of the close Scottish-Norwegian relationship with a lengthy quote by Nils Hjelmtveit. The quote covers both the deep Norwegian gratitude towards the Scottish people for welcoming them and helping them, and that it cemented their spiritual relationship. They stood together in the fight against barbarism.[187] This highlights a kinship between the two nations, and the importance of them being on the same side. The reasoning for styling the article in that manner may have been to strengthen the overall morale and the relationship and understanding between the refugees and the locals.

[185] Helgelands Blad 1943. Norwegians were sentenced without verdict and placed at internment camps. Hem 2021.
[186] Dundee Evening Telegraph 1943
[187] Aberdeen Press and Journal 1942

The last newspaper report to be analysed is a column in the *Aberdeen Evening Express*. It reported that Scotland had a great reputation for its education methods but could still benefit from learning about the ways of the Norwegian school at Drumtochty. This is similar to the articles by the nation-wide British articles. Further, it says that Scottish educators already took interest in the methods practised at the Castle. Still, the Norwegian had to be grateful for the Scottish architect, Mr Allan, that made the school possible to be used for its purpose.[188]

This article indicates that not only were the Scottish people both involved in the establishment of the school, but they were also in a position where they could and should draw inspiration from the methods practised there. This shows the intention of cultural exchange between the nations. It also shows the importance of bilateral cooperation. The Norwegians were not the only ones that could benefit from the establishment of the school. The Scottish people could also benefit from this, by observing and improving their educational methods. The newspaper showed, in other words, the significance of the school to the general Scottish public. This was an opportunity for them to improve their ways and an excellent chance for cultural exchange.

Several similarities are found in different newspaper articles, regardless of whether they were big, nation-wide newspapers, or regional or local newspapers. They all shared the same enthusiasm for the Norwegian refugee school. Some of them described the deep gratitude of the Norwegians toward the British, others emphasised what the British could learn from the Norwegian school system. The same kind of publicity cannot be as easily found in the British newspaper archives regarding exile schools of the other nations.[189] This is peculiar and may be coincidental. It may be that the other schools did not throw a grand opening party with prominent guests, like the Norwegian King and other celebrities from both nations. It may be possible that they did not throw any opening party at all. It may also be that the Norwegian exile government did a good job in advertising for the school, as a continuation of their advertising for Norway as a nation.

A Scottish informant from the nearby village of the Castle said that he went to the opening party of the Castle. It was perceived as an exclusive event, and the reason he was invited was probably because his family rented out a room to one of the teachers and his wife at the school. On a day-to-day basis, they did not see much of them, not even at dinner, as they spent all day at the Castle. He still had some memories, of amongst others being given a drink that tasted like sour

[188] Aberdeen Evening Express 1942
[189] There might exist similar press coverage on other nation's exile school, but I could not find any with a brief search. If similar press coverage exists, it is likely to a much smaller degree than what coverage Drumtochty got.

milk.[190] In general, there was very little interaction. Their English was very bad, if existent at all. The informant highlighted that the children were well-dressed and well-equipped and remembered that they went skiing while the local children had sledges. Mostly the Norwegians kept to themselves, both the teacher and his wife, as well as the children at Drumtochty.[191]

The information provided by the Scottish informant indicates that the integration of the children could have been more limited than what the newspaper articles portray. This is also supported by what the Norwegian government in exile was working for. The pupils may have kept mostly to themselves due to many factors. It might have been caused by the concern of the pupils' safety, that they were easier to monitor if staying close to the Castle. The nearby village took some time to reach by foot, so it is plausible that it for practical reasons was difficult to regularly visit the local Scottish community. It can also be reasoned by the government's agenda of keeping the children 'true Norwegian', and that regular interactions with the locals could endanger this. The informant indicates that the opening of the exile school was not significant at all for many of the local Scottish people, and something that did not regard them much or made much of a difference in their lives.

4.3 The British Council

As we have seen, the British Council was an important ally and partner for the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Church Affairs during the war. The British Council was established in 1934 under the name *The British Committee for Relations with Other Countries* under the Foreign Office and was established as a counterweight to the propaganda of fascist powers that arose in Europe.[192] Other nations, like Italy, France, Germany, and the Soviet Union founded similar institutions as well, although they did not necessarily have the same reasons and intentions as they did in Great Britain.[193] Great Britain as a world power was dwindling. It was important to be able to influence other nations, so they spread the British ideals through hidden propaganda.[194]

Diana Jane Eastment wrote in her PhD thesis from 1982 that the Council had a unique way of disguising their propaganda and politics towards the other nations, in favour of the more effective method of leading the target to believe that any conclusions made was the target's and

[190] Some Norwegians still drink sour milk today.
[191] Informant G, 10.05.2021.
[192] Eastment 1982: 2
[193] Ibid.: 1
[194] Ibid.: 3

the target's alone.[195] The reason for this was of the negative undertone of the word propaganda that had started to emerge after World War 1.[196] This was especially important when the Council worked with foreign nations in the fields of education and culture, as well as with their governments.

Eastwood wrote that the Council at this time often described their work as cultural propaganda, by encouraging a pro-British motion intended to yield political and economic benefits, and therefore with a political intent.[197] This is opposed to what Edward Corse wrote in his book *A Battle for Neutral Europe. British Cultural Propaganda during the Second World War* (2013). In the book, he claimed that the Council, with Chairman Sir Malcolm Robertson at the frontline, detested the word propaganda and avoided using it to describe their work. Chairman Robertson rather felt their work was the opposite of propaganda, due to the longevity of their vision and the mutual exchange of their ideas with the other nations.[198]

In a speech by the secretary of the British Council, Mr H. Harvey Wood, quoted by *The Scotsman*, he addressed the work of the Council. He explained that the British Council was primarily an educational institution abroad set up by the Foreign Office in 1934. Their agenda was according to Harvey Wood to: "[…] counteracting Nazi Kultur wherever possible by our own culture, our own speech, and our own way of life." [199] He continued by claiming that for instance, the resistance and loyalty of the Greeks to the democratic idea were mainly to be credited the British Council.[200]

As the war progressed and work abroad got more and more difficult, the focus of the Council shifted from working mainly abroad to the work they could do at home in Great Britain, which grew increasingly important. They kept in touch with representatives from the Allied nations in the country, and sponsored, subsidized, and supported different Allied schools in Great Britain, such as Polish and Belgian schools, as well as the Norwegian school at Drumtochty Castle.[201] The effort put in for Drumtochty Castle and the other Allied schools in Great Britain during the war can be seen in context to the effort the Council made abroad before the war, to counteract Nazism and work for the democratic idea. Being closely connected to and doing their best in aiding to establish various Allied schools in Great Britain during the war was probably

[195] Ibid.
[196] Corse 2013: 5
[197] Eastment 1982: 3f
[198] Corse 2013: 5
[199] The Scotsman 1943
[200] Ibid.
[201] Ibid.

perceived by the Council and the Foreign Office to be a great way to spread their British ideas and ways of life to different cultures in exile.

The act of seeing this long-term as opposed to short-term is something that according to Corse separates this form of cultural propaganda from political propaganda, which is characterised by a larger sense of immediacy.[202] Not only could they try to make a pro-British imprint on the schools themselves, but equally important was perhaps the cooperation and networking with the foreign nation's governments and educational ministries. What that cooperation and networking consisted of, will be treated in a later chapter.

This was important through the years of war but can also be seen as a preparation for a post-war era, where Great Britain would still want to be able to influence their ideals where possible. The help and cooperation they provided during the war years did grant the British Council prestige post-war. In Norway, the Council's representative got a close relationship with the Minister of Education and was described in 1947 as 'the unofficial adviser to the Ministry of Education', with most of the Council in Norway's costs paid by the Norwegian government.[203]

The British Council to this day still holds office in Oslo. While they did not know what the outcome would be when they started working with the exiled Norwegian government and other exile governments during the war, they did lay the foundation of close cooperation and relationship that they could come to use after the war. Having education as one of their main fields of work, it is obvious that British Council perceived school to be of the highest significance, and a great way to spread their ideas and culture to different nations. This does not mean that they also found the idea of exile schools to be as important as the government in exile did. The exile schools were probably more of a platform that the Council could advise and have an influence on for future benefits. During the war, they could to a larger degree do this from 'home', while simultaneously lay the groundwork for post-war cooperation between the nations.

4.4 The Board of Education

Richard Austen (Rab) Butler was the President of the Board of Education in Great Britain from July 1941-May 1945. He was a prominent politician who accomplished much in his years, amongst others the Education Act of 1944, also known as the "Butler Act". As shown in a later chapter, Butler was one of the leading figures in the establishment of the Inter-Allied Ministers

[202] Corse 2013: 6f
[203] Eastment 1982: 235

of Education's cooperation during the war and served as the Chairman at the conference until he resigned his Ministerial post in May 1945.

Butler interestingly never mentioned the work his Ministry and himself did for the exile schools or the Inter-Allied cooperation in his memoirs from 1971.[204] This indicates that for Butler himself, the questions of the exile schools and the cooperation between the Ministers of Education in exile were probably not that important. Not in the light of everything else that happened during and after the war. His position as the President at the Board was still something he had been eagerly awaiting, and he wanted to use this chance to influence the future of Great Britain.[205]

The Board of Education was eager to assist the various Allied schools during the war. They wanted to be kept informed of what was going on at the different exiled schools and sent inspectors to visit them in 1942/1943 to get a better understanding of what they could do to help. The exile schools located in Scotland got inspections by the Scottish Education Department.[206] Later correspondence shows that the Board was unsure of what to do with the information they gathered when visiting the schools. They concluded by taking no further actions.[207]

This shows multiple aspects. Firstly, there was cooperation between the Scottish Education Department and the Board of Education, which is not surprising. Likewise, they cooperated in inspecting the Allied exile schools. Secondly, the mere fact that the Board of Education took the time and trouble to visit different exile schools in Great Britain is also interesting. According to Butler, half a million of British school children were not receiving any tuition at all in January 1940, due to the war.[208]

The Board could probably have spent the rest of the war sorting out the problems of the British schools, making them as functional as possible. Instead, they involved themselves with the different exile schools, without having much of a plan, other than to establish friendly contact. This can indicate that they saw the opportunity of getting more acquainted with the other nations' educational plans, as well as create bonds for further contact and cooperation in the future. The British' government involvement with the exile schools can in addition also indicate

[204] Lord Butler 1971
[205] Ibid.: 87, 90.
[206] NA/ED 42/15. Letter to Mrs. Parkes from W.R. Richardson, 17th December 1942.
[207] NA/ED 42/15. Letter to Parkes from S.W.I. 3rd June 1943.
[208] Lord Butler 1971: 92

that for the British government, it was important that the refugees were to leave after the war was over. Facilitating and supporting exile schools could increase the chances of the refugees going home as soon as possible.

4.5 Final thoughts

The Norwegian refugee children got a special treatment from the host nation regarding the publicity of the opening of the school. It was used to show the Allies' unification and cooperation, strengthening the bonds between the nations. Similarly, school was considered an important platform to influence other nations into British ideals and culture. The exile schools themselves seems to not have been very important for the British government, even though they did spend resources and time on establishing and aiding the various exile schools. The Norwegian exile school was perhaps not significant to the local British people either, although that claim could use some more research. Instead, one can see the British Council took advantage of the situation, trying to influence both the young Europeans as well as their exile governments with admiration of the multiple aspects of British culture. This includes everything from their ways to govern, the importance of democracy, as well as their helpfulness toward the refugees. Thus, creating a solid foundation for future cooperation and pro-British emotions across Europe.

5.0 Exile schools in Great Britain during the Second World War

Several European governments sought refuge in Great Britain when their countries were occupied by the Nazis during Second World War. By 1942, there were eight European governments in exile in London, along with other 'free movements' like the Free French. The largest exile group came from Belgium, followed by Poland.[209] As the former had the greatest number of schoolchildren, the latter had a different composition of refugees. The Polish refugees consisted of an overwhelming number of armed forces and politicians, where only 1170 out of 24.352 were registered as civilians.[210] Thousands of the other European refugees were children. Thus, several exile schools from various nationalities were established in Great Britain during the Second World War.

What exile schools, other than the Norwegian schools, were established in Great Britain during the Second World War? What kind of schools were they, and how did they differ from each other and from the Norwegian boarding school at Drumtochty Castle? How did the British authorities facilitate the establishment of the exile schools?

5.1 The rising generation

John Hay Beith, Director of Public Relations at the British War Office during the Second World War, was perhaps better known as a historian and novelist that wrote, as mentioned, under the pseudonym of Ian Hay. He published the book "Peaceful Invasion" in 1946, which he characterised as: "[…] the story of the invasion and occupation of our country, not by our enemies but by our friends".[211] The book is written vividly, depicting situations and conversations that are entertaining and provides insight of his points of view, but can be hard to verify. After examining the chapter that evolves around the Norwegian exiles, it shows that most of the factual information written about them are verifiable in other, more traditional research literature. This does not automatically mean that everything else in the book is verifiable and 'true'. Yet, given the author's role at the British War Office, the descriptions given of the different exile communities are valuable for painting the picture of how they could have been perceived by the host nation and how the host nation handled the different exile nations in comparison to each other.

[209] Jakubec 2020: 465
[210] Conway & Gotovitch 2001: 187
[211] Hay 1946: 5

The French Lycée

The Lycée was a French school situated in London which opened its doors in 1915, long before Second World War.[212] It was a mixed school that both girls and boys attended. The school was evacuated from London in 1939 after advice from the British Government and eventually ended up in Ullswater.[213] This shows that the British Government guarded the exile school similarly to how they guarded the British schools, providing advice and warnings, and helped with the evacuation when acts of war seemed unavoidable.

Beith highlighted the rivalry between the sexes at the school, and how the girls' intelligence outmanoeuvred the boys. He described in his book a French history class, which was characterised by the teacher and headmistress at The Lycée as the most important class of them all: "[…] especially in our present circumstances. The children know so little of their own country. […] They are going back to France one day, and when they do they must know *what* they are going back to."[214]

The headmistress of the Lycée saw the possibility of connecting the history lessons to the pupils' homelands' backgrounds, to help bridge the children back to their origins, closing the gap from the past to the present.[215] In context of Imsen's functions of school, it is evident that staff at the Lycée had a strong perception of school as what Imsen terms as a 'reproductive function'. School could be used as a platform to teach the new generations about the French history and culture, in order for the history and culture to be transferred to the generations to come. It can also be seen as an attempt to preserve and maintain the pupils' identity as French, and not as immigrants trying to integrate into British society. If integration or assimilation had been the agenda, they would probably not have attended, or for that matter established, a French school in the first place.

The aforementioned statement also indicates that the children had a severe lack of knowledge of French culture and history, even though they were supposed to return to France one day. This coincides with what the Norwegian government in exile's concerns regarding the Norwegian refuge children, and what they were trying to avoid when establishing the boarding school. The French example could have been caused by the young age of the children and that they had already lived a large percentage of their lives in exile, thus already forgot a lot of where they

[212] Lycée Français Charles de Gaulle de Londres
[213] Hay 1946: 158
[214] Ibid.: 161
[215] Zerubavel 2003: 40

originated from. It is unknown whether the French children went to British schools before going to the Lycée. Obviously, the Lycée did their best to remedy this lack of knowledge of the French history within the pupils. If the children had attended British schools throughout the war, the mending of their knowledge would probably have been more challenging.

Beith continued to comment upon the differences between the French and British educational systems, more specifically on the fact that while the British educational system combined teaching and guardianship, the French made sure to keep the two elements separate. It was a teacher's job to teach, not to act in the place of a parent.[216] In other words, the French school did not perceive the function of school to be equally identity-creating as for instance the Norwegian school, but more productive and reproductive, according to Imsen's terms. At the Norwegian exile school, various staff members took extra care of the pupils, in what almost seems like a paternal way. This shows the Norwegian school as more concerned with teaching the children different norms and values and the children's upbringing, which directly speaks to Imsen's function of school as identity-creating. The difference between the two nations' schools may have been a difference between Norwegian and French culture, and not specifically regarding the exile schools.

Other domestic issues were raised as well, as the French tutors complained about the difficulties of obtaining enough food, staff, and the bad relationships with the locals.[217] The practical challenges coincide with the Norwegian difficulties as well as other schools in Great Britain at the time, where the war made various materials, food, and staff scarce. The bad relationship with the locals had improved slightly throughout the war but were still not good.

The headmistress at the Lycée complained that France was often overlooked and ignored by the 'Big Four', and as a great nation with a proud people, their feelings should be considered by the rest of the Allies.[218] This is different from what the Norwegian staff at Drumtochty seems to have been concerned about. The reason for this can simply be that Norway is and was a small state. The author decided to dedicate a substantial amount of space for the discussion regarding French-British relations, even though this chapter in his book was supposed to be about the different exile schools. It is obvious that the French-British relations were something that engaged, and that it was a matter with multiple and varying opinions, many of them represented

[216] Hay 1946: 161
[217] Ibid.: 162f
[218] Ibid.: 163

in the book. Even though the relationship seems to have improved during the war years, it is obvious that there were still issues, and issues that were not easily cured.

The Belgian Athenaeum in Braemar

The Belgian exile group was the most numerous in Great Britain during the Second World War, as well as the exile nation with the most children and schools.[219] By 1942, there were more than 2000 Belgian school children in Great Britain.[220] The exile school *Belgian Athenaeum* was situated in Braemar, a village located at the Deeside in Aberdeenshire in Scotland and was one of 23 Belgian schools established for Belgian children scattered across Great Britain.[221] Some of these schools were placed in different English establishments, like for instance as Belgian sections at various English schools. There were also two professional and technical schools, and in addition more than 40 Belgian pupils went to the French Lycée previously mentioned as well.[222]

The vast number of Belgian schools, combined with the fact that they could also have Belgian departments at other British and French schools, can indicate a larger degree of integration by the Belgian children, both with the host nation, but also with the other exile communities than the Norwegians had. The Belgian government in exile seemingly did not feel the need to gather the Belgian children in bigger, exclusively Belgian schools, but rather established schools or classes scattered around Great Britain. This sounds beneficial in the way that the children could probably often stay with their families, or at least visit them more often than many of the other nations' refugee children. It is uncertain how and if it influenced the quality of education.

Conway & Gotovitch highlights that the Belgian exile government were troubled with similar worries as many of the other exiled governments in Britain at the time, - the fear of the return to the homeland, and therefore did their best to prepare the return with care. This was a fear caused by not only worries of material problems, but also that the government's authority would be undermined and challenged by the population after the liberation. [223] The establishment of the different Belgian schools must be seen in light of this. The safety and well-being of the Belgian youths were of great importance not only as a matter of its own but also to show the rest of the Belgian population that the government managed to take care of their young ones.

[219] Jakubec 2020: 465
[220] NA/ED 42/15. Belgian Schools in Great Britain.
[221] NA/ED 42/15. List and addresses of Belgian Schools in Great Britain. 1.10.1942.
[222] NA/ED 42/15. Belgian Schools in Great Britain.
[223] Conway & Gotovitch 2001: 5

This coincides with the Norwegian government's desire to show that the Norwegian youths were taken well care of as well.

By 1941, the Athenaeum housed around 120 Belgian pupils of both sexes and all ages up to 18. The pupils originated from different places in Belgium, and the tuition was by Belgian law held in two different languages, French and Dutch, which created frustration among the teachers that had to do double the work. Beith described that the headmaster solved this by using English as well, as all pupils spoke English fluently.[224] If this was actually the case is uncertain. Still, it is remarkable that they reported being able to use the host nation's language as the common language, whereas their own two languages could create misunderstandings and problems.

The use of English as the common language indicates a great degree of integration with the host nation than the other exile schools, including the Norwegian. In addition to it indicating a great level of integration, it also indicates that the integration was at the expense of their own homeland. Further, it indicates that the Belgians perhaps were not as oriented towards returning home as some of the other nations' refugees. Surely other nations learned English as well, and to a larger degree than they would have had they not escaped their homelands. Still, no other exile school in Great Britain at the time reportedly claimed English as their preferred language. In Imsen's terms, it indicates that for the Belgian exile school, schools function as being 'reproductive' of the nation's history and culture was not such a big priority that it was at the other schools.

Even if the claim of English as the common language is exaggerated, it still shows Beith's positive view of the Belgians. This view could have been shared among the British War Office and the rest of the British nation. Not only did the Belgians interact well with the other exile communities, but they also showed gratitude and admiration toward their British hosts. The rest of the report from the Belgian school confirms this gratitude. Imsen's term of school as a function of creating identity were perhaps a bigger priority for the Belgian school, where the pupil's happiness was of a bigger importance than maintaining the pupil's as 'true Belgians'.

The education of the Belgian pupils in Great Britain was bilateral cooperation between the Belgian government in exile and various British authorities and organisations, with the agenda of both keeping the children comfortable and safe, as well as strengthening their morale and the links between Belgium and Great Britain. [225] Several of these objectives show similarities to

[224] Hay 1946: 165
[225] NA/ED 42/15. Belgian Schools in Great Britain.

the Norwegian government's agenda of establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school. The biggest difference is that the strengthening of the Anglo-Norwegian bonds is not emphasised to the same level as it was for the Belgian exile school. Another difference is the aforementioned maintenance of keeping the Norwegian children 'proper Norwegian', which again does not seem to have been a priority for the Belgians.

The British authorities that aided in the Belgian exile education were the Central Bureau for Refugees, the Home Office, the Board of Education, the Ministry of Health, the British Council and lastly the International Commission for War Refugees in English Schools. The Dutch Government also helped provide Dutch textbooks to the Belgian pupils.[226] Several institutions were involved, and the Dutch government aided them with teaching materials. In addition to this being another example of Belgian integration with both the British communities as well as other exile nations' communities, it exemplifies how cooperation between the exiled nations could manifest.

The headmaster at Braemar described the challenges of living with many adolescents, challenges that reportedly was caused by the school being restricted to keep to themselves. The boys and girls could easily become too conscious of one another, so the teachers had to stay alert and give lessons in good manners and behaviour towards one another. This is another similarity that reminds of the disciplinary problems at Drumtochty Castle, with the boy that forced himself on one of the girls. Even though the Belgian school were isolated, the relationship with the local Scottish communities was described to be excellent. The isolation of the Belgian children was seemingly caused by practical reasons. It was due to the mere distance between Braemar and Aberdeen that made interactions on a regular basis troublesome. Their isolation was not due to the local communities not wanting to get themselves involved with the school, but the distances made it difficult.[227]

The headmaster praised the local Scots for the kindness they showed towards the Belgian pupils. The local authorities, such as the Aberdeen Committee of Education supplied the school with textbooks and equipment, and the municipality offered Holiday Courses where the pupils went on mass excursions to different points of interest in and around Aberdeen. The staff also attended a course of instruction on the Scottish Educational System, along with the Norwegian staff at Drumtochty Castle and the Polish Girls' High School at Pitlochry.[228] This shows

[226] Ibid.
[227] Hay 1946: 165f
[228] Ibid.: 166

cooperation and integration not only between the refugees and representatives from the host nation but also between the refugees from the different European nations represented in Great Britain.

The bilateral and multilateral cooperation together with different lectures and social exchanges was described to provide a happy and healthy environment in Scotland, between the locals and the exiled communities.[229] If this description was completely accurate is unknown. It would not have been strange had the relationships between the locals and the exiles been somewhat tested and strained from time to time, which also the staff at the French Lycée described. That it was overall a good relationship between the locals and the Belgians may have been true. It seems as if there was a higher degree of social interactions and thus integration between the Belgian and the Scottish than there were between the French Lycée and the Norwegians at Drumtochty, with the British. This may have been coincidental, due to practical or cultural reasons. Conway & Gotovitch stresses that the relationship between the Belgian exiles and the British was surprisingly good and that the British system as a hosting nation was remarkably smooth.[230]

On a question of whether the children had settled down or not in Braemar, the headmaster replied that it depended on how long the different children had been in Scotland. Some of the pupils that had stayed the longest amount of time were almost too integrated with the British society, which could result in difficulties when returning to Belgium.[231] This corresponds with Berg & Lauritsen on the sense of *time* as an aspect for exiles' identity in a foreign nation, where the younger the child and the longer the stay, the more complex could the question be for the exile on their sense of belonging.[232] This is again connected to the question of identity in itself, and that it can be dynamic and changing.

That it could be difficult for Belgian children to return to Belgium after a few years in Great Britain is understandable if what Beith claims is correct. If they did not receive proper training in the languages used in Belgium, thus causing loss of the Belgian culture, it surely must have impacted their sense of belonging and identity. Furthermore, it could cause them to be less prepared for returning home after the war. It seems like the staff at Braemar were aware of this. If the Braemar staff took any actions to try strengthen the Belgian identities within the children is unknown, but not unlikely.

[229] Ibid.
[230] Conway & Gotovitch 2001: 4
[231] Hay 1946: 167
[232] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 177

The Czech State School in Whitchurch, Shropshire

The Czech School was divided into two buildings sorted by the pupils' age and had around 200 pupils attending. Beith highlighted that compared to the French and Belgian schools, this school was filled with joy. The children were happy and trusting and showed him affection immediately after he entered the building. This directly coincides with Imsen's term as school as a function to create identity, linked to children's happiness and personal growth. The Czech school consisting of young children, none more than 14 years old, and very few of them remembered their homeland at all. This meant that they did not carry the grief of the destruction and loss of their homeland.[233]

This coincides with several of the aspects mentioned by Berg & Lauritsen; *time* had yet again played a role with the young exiles, orienting themselves towards their new identities. It is also plausible that the feeling of loss and grief for their homeland was not something that troubled them to a high degree. This could also be because of their young age when escaping Czechoslovakia, which in turn caused them to not remember much or anything at all. A bigger percentage of Czech children's lives were spent in exile, making it easier for them to come to terms with their new identity.

The Czech school followed the same domestic idea as the French. The teachers were there to tutor, not to raise them into responsible adulthood. The Czech had an own 'House-staff' for taking care of the children.[234] This separates them from the Norwegian boarding school. The Czech children were also often able to visit their families during holidays, something several of the children in exile did not have the opportunity to do. This was because their families were in exile too and did not remain in their homeland while sending their children away to safety.[235] This was similar for the Norwegian children, whom also, mostly, had their families present in Great Britain. To be able to see their families regularly must have had an easing effect on the children's sense of loss, or more specifically, their lack of sense of loss, and in turn made the adaption to life in exile easier.

Out of all the exile schools, the Czech school kept the most noticeable focus on rehearsing the pupils in their language and teaching and reminding them of their own country and its' traditions. This was allegedly something that all the exile schools in Great Britain were

[233] Hay 1946: 169
[234] Ibid.: 170
[235] Ibid.: 169

encouraged to do by their exiled governments.[236] The exile environment was supposed to be temporary and to ease the return to their homeland, it was important to prepare the pupils for what was coming when the war was over. Imsen's function of school as being 'reproductive' of the Czech culture and traditions.

This claim indicates that for the British authorities, it was important to show respect and encouragement to the culture of the exiled communities, and not expect them to assimilate too much to the British way of life. Simultaneously, the British authorities were taking care of the refugees in different ways. Not only did the British authorities facilitate and aid in establishing various exile schools, but they would also follow them up, and make visitations to see that everything was okay and if they could do anything to help them further. Beith's visit speaks of this, as well as inspections made by the British Board of Education to several of the exiled schools located in Great Britain during the war.[237] The inspections intended to help the schools where they could, as well as observing different educational methods.[238]

The Czech school was in addition to its' mission of safekeeping the children, probably also the place where the preparation for the return to Czechoslovakia could be done more systematically. If it were merely left in the hands of their families for when the children were visiting, there would have been great variations as to what the different children knew and expected of and when they were to return home. Keeping the children prepared for the journey home was important to help make the transition as easy as possible. It would also help the children get back into safe and calm routines after returning to Czechoslovakia as soon as possible. The preparation was for the future, both for the children and their nation. Thus, the exile school was vital for the preparation of future Czechoslovakia.

The Polish refugees

As the Polish refugees in Britain had a composition consisting of mainly armed forces and government's officials, the number of children seeking refuge in Britain was lower than one could expect from the second largest refuge nation in Britain at the time. According to Zamojski in Conway & Gotovitch, the Poles had an understanding of their Polish identity being tied up to their language and their culture, whose maintenance was of the greatest importance.[239] Once more, this coincides with Imsen's function of school of being 'reproductive' of the nation's

[236] Ibid.: 170f
[237] NA/ED 42/15. Letter to Mrs Parkes about inspection of the exiled schools. 17th December 1942.
[238] Lloyd 1979: 151
[239] Conway & Gotovitch 2001: 193f

traditions and history. This directly impact on how the Polish refugees perceived culture, education and the publishing of books while being in exile, and there were several initiatives to make sure that these matters were prioritised.

British authorities and institutions aided the Polish refugees in the educational endeavour, both economically as well as advisory.[240] As the Poles had suffered a significant loss to their scientific and academic environments after the Nazi occupation and everything that followed, the Polish exiled government's priorities lied mostly on higher education. This was also due to what they considered would be the most valuable knowledge after the war, and several Polish departments were established at various British universities.[241] The main priority of the Polish government in exile seems to have been on the post-war era, and how to easiest rebuild and restore what was lost during the war. This connects to Imsen's school as a productive function, teaching the youths useful and necessary abilities for society.

Although the Poles had few civilian refugees and even fewer refugee children represented in Great Britain during the war, several institutions and classes were being held around the country. By the summer of 1941 in Scotland alone, seven different centres in central Scotland held classes for Polish children in their native language, teaching them the Polish culture, language, and religion. A year later, several institutions served the role of educating Polish children and youths in a wide range of classes around Scotland.[242] This is another example of a school's function of being 'reproductive', which seem to have been a big priority for most of the schools in exile.

The increase of the Polish tuition can indicate better coordination and organisation of the Polish refugee communities, as well as perhaps a shift in the Polish exiled government's priorities. As the Polish refugees mostly consisted of soldiers, and the number of Polish refugee children was so low in Great Britain, providing for their education was perhaps not the biggest priority of the Polish government in exile. They were eventually able to facilitate for the children, with the emphasis lying on the preservation of the Polish language and culture for the future.

The management of the exile schools

The big variety of exile schools in Great Britain indicates that there were big similarities between the different exile schools. All of them were focused on preparing the children to one

[240] Ibid.: 194
[241] Ibid.
[242] Lloyd 1979: 150

day leave Great Britain for the sake of their homeland. Their stay in Great Britain was intended to be temporary. In doing so, it was the different schools' mission to make sure that the children knew their native language well, - perhaps except for the Belgian school, if we were to believe Beith's claim in this matter. Furthermore, it was important to make sure the children remembered their homeland's culture. The transition from living in exile to living in peace in their homelands was to be made as easy as possible. For some of the exile schools, the most important function of the school, seems to have been that it was to have a 'reproductive' function. This was important for when the children were to return to their homelands, rebuilding their nation after the war.

The British Council worked closely with the various exiled governments to help the refugee children. In a report of the first quarter of 1942**,** the Council reported aiding several children from the Netherlands, Belgium and Czechoslovakia with school fees and distributed scholarships. Further, they reported helping the Norwegian government in finding premises suitable for the boarding school that was to be established.[243] In 1943, the Council reported to the Board of Education what kind of assistance they had provided for the various Allied schools around Great Britain.[244] The nations that got the most assistance, were the Polish and the Belgians. These nations also had the largest number of refugees, thus the most educational institutions.

The Polish establishment got assisted by the Council in several aspects. The Council supplied them with large amounts of equipment and materials and helped with acquiring and funding members of staff. Further, the Council also initiated and helped fund a Polish hostel in Edinburgh. The Council also covered the fees of various University courses. The Council supported the Polish schools heavily, particularly when it comes to the financial aspect. This separates them from the other exiled nation's schools.[245]

The Belgians, that were the most numerous civilian refugees, also received a lot of support from the host nation. The British Council aided them in staffing the schools and teaching the children English, as well as supplying them with books and equipment. They were also deeply involved with aiding in the evacuation of the Belgian pupils when this was needed. Except for the regular scholarships provided for some of the pupils, financing by the Council seems to have been less

[243] NA/ED 42/1. "The British Council. Report for the first quarter, 1942." April 1942.
[244] NA/ED 42/15. «British Council assistance to allied educational establishments in the United Kingdom."
[245] Ibid.

than what was the case for the Polish pupils.[246] This may indicate that the Belgian government in exile was in a better financial situation than the Polish.

The Norwegian school at Drumtochty Castle got less attention than the Polish and Belgian schools in the report made by the British Council. Because of the number of Norwegian children in Great Britain was lower compared to the other two nations, this is to be expected. The reports tell that the Council assisted in finding a suitable placement for the Norwegian school, as well as helped the Norwegian government with various legal questions before they were able to open the school. The salary of the English teacher was reported to be split between the Norwegian government and the Council, but the teacher had been appointed by the Council.[247]

This indicates that the Norwegian government were more self-sufficient and independent than especially the Polish government in exile. Norway had financial benefits because of, most importantly, their merchant fleet, which also impacted their ability to manage the schools more independently than some of the other nations. The help they received from the British Council seems to a large degree be limited to practical assistance, - as legal assistance and acquiring an English teacher, as well as local knowledge of possible locations of the school and acquiring various equipment and materials.

5.2 Jewish-German exile schools in Great Britain during the Nazi regime.

Although many of the non-British schools in Great Britain during the Second World War were established by various European governments in exile, this was not true for all of them. A substantial amount of the exile schools and refugee children were either Jewish or German or both. A common factor is that they had fled Germany while they still had a chance, some with their families, and some with for instance their school class. Some of the escapes were dramatic, made possible by heroic educators, who risked everything to save their pupils from the Nazi regime. How did these differ from the schools established by the exiled governments?

After Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, German teachers of Jewish ancestry or other political beliefs than the National Socialist party sought refuge around the world. The exiled German educators founded more than 20 schools worldwide, most of them boarding schools. At least seven of them were placed in Great Britain and differed in several ways, but all had a common goal: to support the refugee children they had in their care and help them

[246] Ibid.
[247] Ibid.

adapt to the foreign environments.[248] Most of the German refugee children in Great Britain did however individually attend various British schools, which had the benefit of them learning the English language quicker, but also negative aspects such as integrational problems.[249]

Two of the Jewish-German schools in Great Britain have been analysed by Hildegard Feidel-Mertz and Andrea Hammel in their article from 2004, *Integration and Formation of Identity: Exile Schools in Great Britain*.[250] In the autumn of 1933, Anna Essinger moved her boarding school establishment from Herrlingen near Ulm in Germany to Otterden in Kent, with around 70 children and some of the staff.[251] The institution was first called Country Home School, New Herrlingen, but changed the name to Bunce Court School in 1936. The social scientist Hilde Lion established a new school in Surrey called Stoatley Rough School.[252]

The schools depended on charitable organisations to help fund them. Normally, the children's families would pay school fees for their children to go to the boarding school. During the war, many of the families remained in Germany, thus preventing them from financing their children's education. The Quakers and their organisation *The Society of Friends* did not only help to rescue the Jewish children through the Kindertransport in 1938 and 1939, but also played a significant role in the management of the exile schools. *The Society of Friends* had a particular impact on both Bunce Court School and Stoatley Rough School, who adopted some of the Quaker ideas of tolerance and humanitarianism.[253]

The two schools had common basic ideas of their establishments that centred around the identity of the children and their integration into British societies, but the priorities between them could vary. The ground ideas were to preserve the German language and culture for the children, the acquisition of the British language and culture and lastly, to teach the Jewish tradition and history to the children.[254] Preparations for returning to their homeland does not seem to have been a big priority for them.

The ideas of the schools show that integration was a significant agenda of the founders, where adaption to the new culture was highlighted as one of the most important elements, while still remembering where they came from and maintaining a mental bridge to their homeland. This

[248] Feidel-Mertz & Hammel 2004: 71
[249] Ibid.: 73
[250] Ibid.
[251] Ibid.: 75
[252] Ibid.: 72
[253] Ibid.: 74
[254] Ibid.: 75

form of bridging can be used to create a continuity in the children's individual history and identity, thus making it easier for them to adapt and accept their present.[255] The German-Jewish schools also, compared to the schools of the various exiled governments, seems to have been more immigrant schools than exile schools due to them not having the same sense of temporariness as the other exile schools. This is not to claim that the German-Jewish children were not refugees or exiles. They were, given the fact that they were children who did not have much of a choice on where to live, and because of the life-threatening dangers in their homeland. But the way their schools were managed, seems to have been more like immigrant schools rather than exile schools, since they did not prepare to go home.

The pupils appreciated the versatileness of the schools, and one of the pupils described it as: "It was a haven and a port, open to all parts of our world."[256] Meaning, not only the 'old world' from where they originated but also the new world they were to fit into. This is connected to and separates them from the other exile schools. Not only did they emphasise their homeland's language and culture, but they also focused on *three* different ones. Their homeland, Germany, the Jewish culture, and the British language and culture. This, similar to most of the other exile schools, indicates a priority of the school's function of being 'reproductive' of the traditions. Although the other exile schools learned more about the British language and culture than most of the children remaining in their homeland would, it was not an outspoken objective of the different governments in exile.

Especially Stoatley Rough boarding school was adamant about the integration of the pupils into the English environments and had a wider focus on socializing with the locals. Several long-lasting friendships were made that in some cases led to the pupil's families emigrating to Great Britain as well.[257] This shows that there were strong transnational relations between the exiles towards their homeland. Transnational relations are commonly found in exile communities and can be defined as a process where social fields are constructed and actively maintained across nation-state borders and consist of relationships that tie the exile or immigrant to their host nation, their homeland and other exile communities.[258]

International organisations repeatedly showed their support to the establishment at Stoatley Rough. The school got regular visits from representatives from the Workers' Education

[255] Zerubavel 2003: 40
[256] Feidel-Mertz & Hammel 2004: 84
[257] Ibid.: 77
[258] Berg & Lauritsen 2009: 167

Association and the League of Nations Association, that came to watch cultural performances and simultaneously helped with the funding of the school.[259] This helps in showing that various international organisations other than the Quakers also perceived the significance of supporting the school and exile communities as important.

The deep involvement of the Quakers and other organisations is also something that separates the German-Jewish schools from the other exile schools. The other exile schools often had other means of funding their schools, like for instance the Norwegian school that was largely funded by the Norwegian government in exile. This was not possible for the German-Jewish exile schools, since their government was not in exile. Obviously, the German government would not have been interested in funding a Jewish exile school, being the reason the children escaped in the first place. Many of the German-Jewish children did not either have their parents or other family members present in Great Britain, which made financial support from them difficult, if not impossible. The schools had to rely on help from others to keep the wheels turning.

Most of the German-Jewish pupils remained in Great Britain after the war.[260] In a letter from one of the former pupils, he wrote that Stoatley Rough acted like a bridge the pupils could use in both directions, introducing them to their new home while simultaneously never denying them to remember where they came from.[261] The German exile schools in Great Britain, in other words, functioned both as a transitional institution towards their new homeland, as well as a link to their old homeland. This reflects on the multitude of cultures and languages taught at the schools, which opened the possibilities for the children. With aid from the different charitable organisations, they could help children adapt to the new environments while achieving their most important goal; protecting them from suffering and develop into harmonic human beings.[262]

5.3 Final thoughts

As different as the various European states were in 1939-1945, both in size, power, culture and tradition, similarities occurred in how they organised their schools in exile. There are traces of multilateral cooperation between the different nation's schools, both with the lending of textbooks, as well as in courses and interactions. A common denominator for all the exile

[259] Feidel-Mertz & Hammel 2004: 78
[260] Ibid.: 83
[261] Ibid.: 84
[262] Ibid.: 83

schools that had their exiled governments present in Great Britain, is that their stay in Britain was supposed to be temporary. The agendas of the schools were set accordingly.

It was important to remind the children of their identity, as Polish, French, Czech, Belgian, and so on. This was often to ease the return to their homeland, so that the children would have a better understanding of what they could expect. Simultaneously, it seems to have been an important factor for the schools to secure a good relationship with the local British communities, as well as the British authorities which helped facilitate them and continued to observe them, in case they needed help.

What separates the exile schools that had their exiled governments present in Great Britain from the German-Jewish schools are mainly two things. Firstly, the German-Jewish schools had a much bigger focus on integration into the host nation than the others and had a big focus on educating the children in the British language and culture. Perhaps even to the degree of being equally important as teaching, and reminding, the children of the culture of their homeland and the Jewish tradition. Thus, most of them remained in Great Britain after the war.

The second big difference is the funding of the schools. Without the government or family members present, the German-Jewish schools depended on other funding and had to among others rely on donations from various organisations. This also indicates that the pupils from the German-Jewish schools had more integration with various British organisations and institutions, as their interactions naturally must have been more frequent than what was the case for the other schools.

6.0 The continuity of international cooperation

During the post-war era, organisations such as the *European Coal and Steel Community* (ECSC) and the *European Union* (EU) gave the impression that their organisations symbolised a radical change in European history. The new organisations were presented as to lay the foundations of a new and for the first time properly organised Europe, as opposed to the former Europe that was characterised by severe division and nationalism.[263] Modern research contradicts this and rather argues that there was a continuity in the cooperation between the European states in several fields before the war.[264] This chapter will highlight that there was a continuity in international cooperation also in the field of school and education which developed throughout the war, even pre-war, which continued after 8 May 1945. The international cooperation in the post-war era was thus a result of the work done during the war instead of a break in continuity.

Not only did various organisations develop broader cooperation during the war years that lasted in the post-war period. Pavol Jakubec in his article from 2020, *Together and Alone in Allied London: Czechoslovak, Norwegian and Polish Governments-in-Exile, 1940-1945*, pointed at the new and unique relationships that emerged between the small power states that were exiled in Great Britain during the Second World War.[265] The exiled governments of the occupied states cooperated throughout the war years, with the result of Norway becoming less isolated and significantly more integrated into the European and international communities.[266] Looking at the field of education, it is evident that transnational cooperation emerged during the Second World War, and most noticeably with the establishment of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME). What role did the exile schools play in this cooperation?

6.1 The Conference of Allied Ministers of Education

From 1942 and throughout the war, the Ministers of Education from the Allied, exiled governments in Great Britain held meetings in London, called the *Conference of Allied Ministers of Education* (CAME). Similar conferences among the Allies were established in various fields throughout the war.[267] The questions CAME discussed were tied both to the exile schools during the war and also to the planning of rebuilding the educational systems after the war was over.[268] This shows a continuity of their cooperation, that they planned for further

[263] Patel & Kaiser 2018: 165
[264] Ibid.: 182
[265] Jakubec 2020
[266] Ibid.: 465f
[267] Rosendahl 2017: 108
[268] Sirevåg 1980: 38

cooperation in the future as well. It also indicates that the exile schools established by the different exile governments enabled close-knit multilateral cooperation in the educational field.

The conference meetings were held bi-monthly, and the British Council was heavily involved, providing the secretariat and chairing commissions.[269] Observers from other Allied nations, such as the US, Soviet Union and China, eventually joined CAME. Regular delegates formed an inter-Allied bureau, that subsequently was a direct cause for the establishment of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1945.[270] The regularity of the meetings made sure that the different educational ministers from the different nations lay further foundations for cooperation in the years to come.

28 October 1942, the President of the Board of Education, R.A. Butler, invited the different Ministers of Education of Allied governments and national councils situated in Great Britain to what was to be the first official meeting of CAME on 16 November 1942.[271] In addition to the agents already mentioned, Butler had asked British Council for their cooperation in this, as they were already in close connection with the various educational departments in exile.[272] The British Council already aided the exile nations with the establishment of the exile schools, thus were an important institution to implement in with the work of CAME as it would probably ease the cooperation between them. As several British institutions were involved early on, it is evident that Butler wanted the conference to be securely anchored in the British government.

The objective of establishing this conference was according to the invitation to have periodic meetings with the different Allied ministers of education where educational questions affecting the Allied countries during and after the war could be addressed.[273] How the conference developed throughout the war, and how it developed from CAME to UNESCO, can contribute to showing both the agenda and motifs behind this, how organisations at this time were established, as well as how international cooperation gained momentum in the educational field. To assess how the Conference developed throughout the war, it is useful to briefly compare the first official meeting with the last meeting in wartime.

The agenda of the first meeting was to discuss more general questions of what would be valuable to address during their future meetings. Already from the start, the Conference was

[269] Eastment 1982: 225
[270] Ibid.
[271] NA/BW 74/1. Invitation to 1st Meeting 16th November 1942.
[272] NA/ED 42/1. "The British Council. Report for the first quarter, 1942." April 1942.
[273] NA/BW 74/1. Invitation to 1st Meeting 16th November 1942.

planning for it to become a long-term institution based on multilateral cooperation. The Board of Education and the British Council had already in the invitation suggested that the topics of the Conference should be two-fold: The present and the future. The present consisted of the Board of Education invited the Allied ministers to study and visit the different British educational institutions, as well as the importance of keeping the Board of Education fully informed of the various Allied schools in exile.[274]

As seen in chapter 4, this was to ensure that the exile schools received as much support as possible, as well as giving the Board of Education the advantage of being able to study and take experience from the various institutions. From both the British and the other nations' perspectives, one can see this as an expression of realism. Intending to maximise their own state's advantage, the different nations decided to take part in this institution. This form of realism is useful for explaining different international relations that emerged in the 20th century.[275]

The CAME-initiative was clearly in the spirit of the British Council and the cultural exchange they worked for daily. The questions the conference should treat regarding the future consisted of the provision of books, - and especially textbooks, the provision of trained personnel and reports from unofficial organisations.[276] This had nothing directly to do with the exile schools, but pragmatically evolved around equipment and personnel. It did not take long before the ambitions for future cooperation evolved into something much grander than pragmatic needs.

CAME's first meeting was held on 16 November 1942 in a conference room at the office of the Board of Education in Kingsway. The British representatives at the meeting consisted of the President of the Board of Education, R.A. Butler, the Chairman of the British Council, Sir Malcolm Robertson, four additional representatives from the Board of Education, three additional representatives from the British Council, and one representative from the Scottish Education Department and Foreign Office. The Allied governments were represented by eight different nations, mainly ministers of education, from Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia.[277]

[274] NA/BW 74/1. Invitation to 1st Meeting 16th November 1942.
[275] Stachurska-Kounta 2017: 20
[276] NA/BW 74/1. Invitation to 1st Meeting 16th November 1942.
[277] NA/BW 74/1. The British Council. Draft Report of a Conference held at The Board of Education on Monday, 16th November, 1942, at 3 p.m.

The last ordinary meeting with CAME before the war was over was held on 11 April 1945 and was the 17th meeting. There were 7 British representatives attending the last meeting in wartime, in addition to 1-2 representatives each from various commissions that had been established by CAME. Most of the other Allied nations were represented by two delegates each.[278] The British representatives were numerous in comparison to the representatives sent by the other Allied nations and continued to be over-represented for the duration of the war. It may be because of practical reasons, and that the British, being in their homeland, had more available resources that could contribute to the organisation. It can also indicate that there were internal disputes within the British government on who was to take part in the conference. Even so, the British government continued to have the leading role of the cooperation until the war was over.

CAME established several commissions during the war.[279] These show mainly three things. Firstly, what areas of the educational and cultural department the members of CAME saw as particularly important and necessary to dedicate time to. *The Films and Visual Aids Commission* was for instance a commission whose tools can easily be tied to propaganda, as pictures and films are and were powerful tools to wake emotions and influence mindsets. Secondly, it shows the width of the work they considered to be their mandate and in continuation of this, just how much the conference expanded during the war years. Thirdly, it shows that even though CAME had been established partly because of the exile schools and the cooperation needed in securing a decent education for the exiled children, there were no commissions designated to handle problems regarding those.

This indicates that there perhaps was no need for a special commission regarding the exile schools and that they coped with what they already had. It can also indicate that the exile schools were not as important for CAME in this setting anymore. What mattered was merely the future cooperation between the nations. In that case, it could mean that it was important for the different agents present to make sure that their voices were heard and that they secured a place in the future organisation. One could imagine that a platform like CAME would secure tighter and more regular cooperation between the exile schools as well, but that does not seem to have been the case.

[278] NA/BW 74/1. Draft Report of the 17th Meeting of the Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Allied Governments, held on Wednesday, 11th April, 1945, at 2.30 p.m.
[279] The National Archives. A full list of the commissions and subcommittees established by CAME can be found in the catalogue description.

At the last meeting during the war, fifteen different nations were represented in addition to Great Britain. In addition to the eight represented in the first meeting, there were also representatives from Australia, Canada, China, Luxembourg, New Zealand, the USA, and the USSR.[280] It is evident that in the 2,5 years that had passed from CAME's first meeting to their last ordinary meeting in wartime, there had been a development of the conference. It had expanded from being an all-European conference to an international one, with representatives from several of the big powers of the world. This also indicates that the significance of the idea of *school* had grown and developed during the first years of the war. International cooperation in this regard had shown itself beneficial to all corners of the world. It also further proves that the case of the exile schools was no longer high up in the agenda of the conference, as several of the new representatives did not even have any special experience or knowledge of exile schools at all.

6.2 From CAME to UNESCO – the importance of education

From the very start, one of the conference's focal points was the future. By the future, the conference meant the post-war era. Questions of how to solve issues regarding, amongst others, books and personnel were of vital interest and cooperation between the Allied nations could in this regard be beneficial for all member states. The establishment of CAME had helped the agents in seeing what possibilities lay within the cooperation that developed through the war: "The gathering in London of the representatives of so many of the Allied Governments, however much we deplore the reasons for it, has had some results which strike the imagination, and which are pregnant with possibilities for the future."[281] This statement is taken from a draft for a factual pamphlet that were to be published, but still follows the same kind of arguments and causal explanations given by the different agents in CAME regularly throughout their meetings.

The Under-Secretary of State at the Belgian Board of Education, Monsieur J. Hoste, wrote a report that was circulated amongst the members on the intellectual relationship between Great Britain and the European continent before CAME's second meeting on 19 January 1943.[282] In this report, Hoste mentioned the *International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation* (IIIC) established by the League of Nations. The IIIC was established in 1924 and was shut down during the war. After the institute officially dissolved in 1946, UNESCO inherited both its'

[280] NA/ED 121/270. Suggested Paragraph to be inserted as Paragrah (1) of Explanatory Note addressed to United and Associated United Nations not so far connected with the Conference.
[281] NA/BW 74/1. Draft for a pamphlet to be published by U.N.I.O. 10th meeting, 10.01.1945.
[282] NA/BW 74/1. Report on Intellectual Relations between Great Britain and the Continent by Monsieur J. Hoste.

archives and parts of their mission.[283] Hoste highlighted that the IIIC had aided in strengthening the intellectual bonds among the nations, and simultaneously pointed out the inadequacy of the IIIC and how it could be improved for the future.

The different agents of CAME had a long-term view of the organisation and wanted it to be a new and improved international cooperation, learning from the inadequacies of the IIIC, focusing on the current and future issues they were dealing with. The aforementioned pamphlet draft sheds light on the Allied nations' common perception of the significance of school in general, and why it was important for international cooperation to take place. It pointed at the destruction done at both the physical schools and their equipment in the occupied countries, as well as their educational programs.

To have an established and well-functioning organ to aid the local administrators in the reconstruction so that 'normal life' for the children and youth could start as quickly as possible was of the greatest importance to lessen the injury and further secure lasting peace. After the rehabilitation after the war was complete, the representatives of CAME saw numerous possibilities where the organisation could be beneficial, - for visitations, various exchanges, and transnational knowledge could all accumulate in common allegiance and a constructive international perspective.[284] Even though there were no longer need for exile schools, it is obvious that the cooperation that was initiated with the conference and the exile schools were to continue going forward.

Several experiences and valuable lessons were made after World War I, and the most motivating factor for the different agents involved with CAME appears to be the one to secure lasting peace. An important factor for peace was perceived to be education. The peace after World War I was *not* lasting, so changes had to be made from the original organisation established by the League of Nations. In addition, during World War II, several Allied governments were exiled in London, which led to several exile schools being established. This provided the exiled governments with a unique opportunity to establish and start developing cooperation that could continue into the post-war era. Cultural and educational exchanges, and learning from other nations' methods and traditions, could all develop and increase mutual respect, tolerance, and kinship, which in turn could diminish the risks of a new war. The exile schools were perhaps not vital for the cooperation between the Allies but worked as a link

[283] United Nations archives
[284] NA/BW 74/1. for a pamphlet to be published by U.N.I.O. 10th meeting, 10.01.1945.

between the past and the future. The exile schools in Great Britain eased the cooperation between the Allies and ensured a smooth transition.

12 April 1944, an open meeting for participants of CAME was held to discuss the possibilities of establishing an educational organisation under the new international organisation, the United Nations.[285] It was hoped that the educational organisation would include all United Nations, and that CAME would serve as the foundation. Specifically, that CAMEs representatives would continue in this new organisation.[286] It is difficult to determine the agenda for this, whether it was mostly out of personal interest or if CAME had any specific, more factual reasons for the importance of their own continuation and the continuity and further development of the work they had already started. Perhaps it was a bit of both.

The official agenda of establishing the new organisation under the United Nations was peacebuilding, through the means of education, cooperation, and international exchanges. Cultural exchanges and unrestricted education around the world were vital. [287] This shows that the idea of school was perceived as extremely important for the different agents. Unsurprisingly, since many of them were ministers in the field of education. However, it also shows the perception of the importance of educational and cultural exchanges and that peace could not last without it. Hence, even though the exile schools as a question on its own had not been given much attention by them, the lasting peace would, in their minds, be unattainable without an organisation like CAME.

CAME would not have existed in the way that it did, had it not been for the exile schools. Likely, there would still have been a form of cooperation between the ministers of education in London during the war. But the groundwork of the cooperation at CAME was built on cooperation regarding the exile schools. Both between the exile schools, the exile government that worked to establish their schools, and the cooperation between the exile schools and their government toward the host nation. As previously seen, the British Council was deeply involved with CAME, because of their direct experiences with cooperating with the various exile governments on the questions and establishments of the exile schools. The new organisation under the United Nations would thus have had a very different, and perhaps more fragile, foundation had it not been for the exile schools.

[285] NA/ED 121/270. Letter to Mr. Richardson from Ms. Parkinson, 7 April 1944.
[286] NA/ED 121/270. Suggestions for the development of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education into the United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction. 12 April 1944.
[287] NA/ED 121/270. Suggestions for a United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction.

Up to the establishment of UNESCO, the representatives of CAME experienced the uncertainty of whether the suggested organisation would be adopted by the United Nations, and they worked intensely to improve their chances.[288] One of their main concerns was that the former League of Nations organisation, the IIIC, was to be re-established or transferred to the organisation that CAME wanted to establish under the United Nations. This concern was shared by the Foreign Office, who kept themselves well informed of the work of CAME, attended the conferences, and spoke CAMEs case at meetings regarding the United Nations where CAME could not attend.[289] The heavy involvement of the Foreign Office shows that even though several big powers from around the world had joined CAME, the British government still held on as the leading agent of the organisation.

The concerns CAME and the Foreign Office shared about the re-establishment of the IIIC, were that the organisation was founded on an 'unsound basis'[290]. They were also sceptical about it being funded and influenced by the French government, as it was placed at the Paris Institute. Their concerns for the re-establishment of the IIIC were not without cause as the French government had made enquiries to the American State Department of reviving the IIIC. The French government had also voiced their reservations when replying to the draft constitution of the new organisation with regard to the position of the IIIC. The French government's wishes were opposed by several agents from various American institutes as they wanted an organisation with a broader international perspective.[291] The French representatives at CAME repeatedly emphasised in the discussions at the later meetings that France was not to be forgotten, and that the resolutions agreed upon had to be written in consideration of France. [292]

The support for a worldwide cultural and educational organisation was immense in the US. In April 1945, 500 American University presidents and chancellors signed a memorial calling for an international educational bureau. Similar memorials were to be made available for educators from other nations to sign as well. Furthermore, a poll held in America showed that 84% of the population were positive for an organisation like that. 87% were in favour of having the American textbooks examined to make sure that they were not unfair to other nations.[293] This

[288] NA/ED 121/390. International Education and Cultural Organisation.
[289] NA/ED 121/390. Letter to Mr. Owen from R.A. Butler, 4 April 1945.
[290] What they meant by it being founded on an unsound basis is not clear in the sources. However, it likely involved being based and heavily influenced by the French Government, instead of a more international perspective.
[291] NA/ED 121/390. International Education and Cultural Organisation.
[292] NA/BW 74/1. Draft Report of the 19th Meeting of the Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Allied Governments, held on Thursday, July 12th, 1945, at 2.30. p.m.
[293] Hulme 1945

shows a remarkable openness and willingness for international cooperation in the American population. This openness could inspire and motivate the population of other nations that perhaps had not developed as far on the subject as Americans had, thus making it the lead engine of the new philosophy of international unity.

The American educators' arguments for establishing such an organisation were to improve education around the world, as well as obtain a better understanding between the nations. It was a consensus among the educators that while military, political and economic factors were of great importance for peace, the vital significance for a long-lasting peace lay within the field of education.[294] This was in line with the official ideas of CAME, which the main agenda of establishing an international educational organisation was to secure and preserve lasting peace. Considering that the US was not involved in CAME from the beginning, the probable cause being that the US Government was not exiled in London, this shows that the philosophy of CAME could have been widespread across the democratic nations even before the establishment of the Conference.

From 1-16 November 1945, a United Nations conference took place in London after the initiative of CAME, with representatives from 44 different nations. Here, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, was established.[295] During the opening speech, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom at the time, Mr Clement Attlee, spoke the words that UNESCO still cites in their Constitution and at their website: "The Governments of the States, parties to this constitution on behalf of their peoples, declare that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed."[296]

The purpose of the cooperation was to build trust and kinship among the nations, greater than ever before. The means to do this had to, in their perspective, go through knowledge and a common philosophy and mutual confidence that they would not take up arms against each other. The methods of achieving this international trust and understanding were more than just an exchange of students and books, but also through culture and mass media, ranging from press releases and films to science and paintings. This culture was to be made internationally

[294] Fine 1945. Accessed through NA/ED 121/390.
[295] NA/BW 74/1. Draft Report of the 19th Meeting of the Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Allied Governments, held on Thursday, July 12th, 1945, at 2.30. p.m.
[296] Hulme 1945

available, thus creating the bonds and tolerance necessary to remain peaceful towards each other.[297]

This belief in the new organisation can be connected to internationalism. Marta Stachurska-Kounta uses Gram-Skjoldager and Tønnessons definition of internationalism in the years 1914-1921:

> *The liberal-inspired belief that it is possible to establish a new and qualitatively different, legally regulated international system, based on sovereign states, in which peace and security will prevail, and that this can be achieved through the development of law, organisation, exchange and communication.*[298]

Stachurska-Kounta connects this to explain Norway's and Scandinavia's roles in the League of Nations. This definition of internationalism can also help explain all the other nations' involvement with CAME and UNESCO. The organisations were to be based upon sovereign states which through certain developments could create something different. Through transnational communication and exchanges, the new system could ensure peace and security. The system of more integrated sovereign states cooperating could lead to a peaceful and harmonic new world.

6.3 The International Labour Office

The history of CAME, being a small, yet very important history of the continuity of international cooperation in education and culture, had various supporters. The supporters aided in both the establishment of the organisation, the creation of their constitution and influencing wherever possible to make sure that the organisation got adopted by the United Nations. One of their most important, international allies was the International Labour Office, the secretariat and focal point of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The ILO was founded under the League of Nations at the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and was still going strong.

The ILO accepted CAME's invitation to act as observers at their meetings and recipient of papers on 29 March 1944.[299] The reciprocity of their relations was important to CAME, which suggested that they ought to be invited to ILOs meetings as well, to be acquainted with their

[297] Ibid.
[298] Stachurska-Kounta 2017: 21f
[299] NA/ED 42/19. Letter to N.B. Parkinson from E.J. Phelan, 29th March, 1944.

work.[300] The idea behind this cooperation was that it could be beneficial to both organisations. ILO could benefit from being connected to an educational organisation with regard to both their workers and their employers. CAME could benefit from ILO's experience, both as an organisation, also in their knowledge of vocational and technical education.[301]

When CAME started drafting the proposed constitution for the new organisation, the ILO was greatly involved. CAME adopted their constitutional practice, and ILO cooperated with CAME throughout the drafting process, submitting redrafts and suggestions to the different paragraphs.[302] Legal Adviser to the ILO, Mr C.W. Jenks also attended a Drafting Committee meeting based on the commentaries made on the draft constitution by ILO, as the only non-CAME representative.[303] This shows how close the relationship between the two organisations developed, and how much time and effort was placed by the ILO to help CAME develop into the new education and culture organisation under the United Nations.

The connection between the ILO and CAME shows continuity back to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Why the ILO was so involved with CAME is probably something that surpasses both the wish for wanting to help, as well as the important network in education CAME and the new organisation could provide for their workers and employers. As UNESCO was founded on the idea of that international understanding and education were vital for lasting peace, ILO similarly was based on the idea that a lasting peace had to be based upon social justice.[304] An equal right to quality education can easily be placed in the field of social justice, as education itself could help relieve poverty and economic hardship.

ILOs perspective of the significance of school can therefore be claimed to be right at the core of the ILO Constitution, - a way to defeat social injustice, and social injustice was a feature that would make a universal and lasting peace impossible. To give their aid to CAME where possible, to observe and advise, and let CAME observe the ILO, would help serve the ILO as well. In turn, this would help ILO in reaching its ultimate goal of defeating social injustice and thus creating lasting peace.

[300] NA/ED 42/19. Letter to the Acting Director of the I.L.O. 14.3.44.
[301] NA/ED 42/19. Letter to R.A. Butler from Mr. Bevin, 30th November, 1943.
[302] NA/ED 42/19. Invitation to The President, Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, from the Assistant Director G.A. Johnston, Aug 21 1945. NA/ED 121/389. Letter to W.R. Richardson from Mr. Jenks, 23rd January 1945.
[303] NA/ED 121/389. Record of the 1st meeting of the Drafting Committee to consider the comments made on the (Tentative) Draft Constitution by the International Labour Office.
[304] International Labour Organization

6.4 Final thoughts

The establishment of UNESCO not only shows a continuation throughout the Second World War but also makes visible lines back to the end of World War 1 and the Treaty of Versailles. There was a continuous line that started with the creation of the IIIC, as well as the ideas of for instance the ILO. The establishment of UNESCO was not a revolution, but an evolution of already established ideas and philosophies applied in the Treaty of Versailles. These ideas evolved throughout the Second World War, before finally ending up as UNESCO. Studying this evolution shows the process of how international cooperation could contribute to develop worldwide organisations during this era, as well as how the idea of the significance of school and education grew more important in all corners of the world as the war progressed. Education was in the end acknowledged as vital for lasting peace.

It did not take long before the agendas of the meetings of CAME were mainly regarding the future and not the exile schools. The exile schools as a question on its own does not seem to have been very significant for CAME. Rather, the questions of the exile schools enabled the different agents to come together and smoothly start cooperating. If there had been no exile schools, CAME would have had a different foundation. In turn, this could have influenced the development of UNESCO.

7.0 Conclusions

While analysing the significance of schools in exile during the Second World War, mainly through a study of the Norwegian school at Drumtochty Castle, it has become obvious that the exile schools were very important in certain areas, and in others, not so much. In this final chapter, I will attempt to draw conclusions as to what perception the different agents had of the significance of school presented in this thesis. Different key people and agents had different perceptions of school and school in exile, and emphasised differently as to what the function of school should and could be. Imsen terms the functions of school as being productive, reproductive and identity-creating. What did the different groups and agents perceive the function of the school to be?

7.1 School as a productive function

The Norwegian government in exile had multiple objectives for the Norwegian school in exile. One of their objectives was to give the Norwegian refugee children a good education, thus being better prepared to return home after the war and take their part in the rebuilding of Norway. The tuition that the Norwegian children received in Great Britain at the start of the war was quickly perceived as not good enough. The children were sometimes enlisted at British schools, without speaking or understanding English. Further, some of the Norwegian children were home-schooled. Others had no schooling at all. A few went to small, Norwegian schools established at Buckie, Glasgow and in London.

The gathering of practically all the Norwegian children in Great Britain in one school was perceived to be the best solution for the Norwegian government in exile. Simultaneously, the British school system was perceived to be very different from the Norwegian. It was considered beneficial for the Norwegian exile government to make sure that the Norwegian boarding school was founded on the Norwegian school system, and that the tuition be held in Norwegian. This was to ensure that the tuition would be as good as possible for the exile children.

The former pupils, on the other hand, did not seem to emphasise the productive function of school very much. Expectedly, the memories the pupils had several decades after the war, evolved more around the social aspects of the school. This is normal. Whether one has attended a boarding school or a regular day school, the strongest memories that one is left with often evolve around various social aspects. This does not necessarily say anything about the quality of the education, but rather what memories seem to make the most impressions on pupils.

Whether the Norwegian government succeeded with their agenda of providing the children with a better education is impossible to say for sure, although most likely, they did. The reason for this conclusion is mostly based on the problems that would have occurred if the Norwegian children had been going to British schools instead. Language would have been a barrier to communication. Also, the children at Drumtochty got tuition in the same style as they were used to, with a similar curriculum that many of them had already started in Norway.

The Polish refugees differed a bit from the rest of the exiles in Great Britain during the Second World War. The group composition of the Polish refugees was vastly different from the other exile groups, with very few civilians, and many soldiers and officials. The objective of the Polish government in exile also seems to have stood out compared to the other exile governments. The Polish government had perhaps a more direct and hands-on approach than the other exile governments regarding school. Their main emphasis lay on higher education, not on the younger children. The reason for this was because that is what the Polish government believed Poland would have the most use for after the war. School was, similarly to the Norwegian government's view, a tool to provide the population with the necessary knowledge they found important for the nation after the war was over.

7.2 School as a 'reproductive' function

Imsen terms the school's reproductive function to be the passing of a nation's culture, history, and traditions to future generations. This was an agenda for all the exile schools in Great Britain. Still, some emphasised it more than others. The Norwegian government prioritised keeping the Norwegians as 'true Norwegians'. This was important to ease their return to Norway after the war. To ensure this, the Norwegian boarding school was perceived and managed as a small piece of Norwegian territory.

At Drumtochty, all the teachers were Norwegians, except for the English teacher. The classrooms had enlarged photographs of different parts of Norway. They celebrated the Norwegian Constitution Day, 17 May. The Drumtochty diet was mainly traditional Norwegian food. Even the outdoor activities were Norwegian, where the Norwegian children went skiing while the local Scottish children had their sleighs. The tuition was as mentioned in Norwegian, and they were taught Norwegian history and language.

The 'reproductive' function of school was also an emphasis to other nations' exile schools, like for instance the Czech State School, the French Lycée and the Polish schools. For the children to remember where they came from, their nation's history, language, and traditions, were of the

most vital importance to both the staff and the respective governments. The exile school served as a perfect way to manifest this in the children. By teaching the children about their homeland, the teachers bridged a bond between the children and their homeland, making sure that children did not forget who they were and where they came from. Simultaneously, it made sure that the children were ready and motivated to leave Great Britain when the war was over, to go home and do their duty for their homeland.

For the British as well, making sure that the exile children were ready to leave when the war was over, may have been a priority. About 150.000 refugees escaped to Great Britain during the war. If the British government would have wanted them to stay, they would probably have attempted to make sure the children attended British schools and learned more about the British culture and way of life. Instead, the British government heavily supported the various exile schools and provided them with what the schools needed, and what they in turn were able to give.

There are indications that the Belgian exile school does not seem to have had the school's function of being 'reproductive' as their main priority. Integration and learning the British language and culture seem to may have been a bigger priority to them than learning their own nation's language and traditions. At the very least, it seems to have been a more outspoken priority to approach the host nation's culture, rather than keeping the children 'true Belgians'. By the establishment of the exile schools, the respective governments may have attempted to remedy this.

The German-Jewish schools differed from all the other exile schools. Their agenda and form of management differed greatly, and so did the result on what happened to the children after the war. While most of the other exile schools were fixed on returning to their homelands after the war was over, the German-Jewish exile school were not. Most of the pupils never returned. The German-Jewish exile schools were more like immigrant schools than exile schools. They were taught about the British traditions and way of life in an equal manner as they were taught about their homeland. Their tuition was founded more upon teaching them how to adapt to and thrive in British society, rather than preparing them to go home.

The German-Jewish exile schools were based on the tuition of three different traditions, languages, and cultures. In addition to the German traditions, they were equally taught about their Jewish culture and the British way of life. The objectives of the schools do not seem to have evolved around keeping the children 'true Germans' in any way. Rather, it was taught as

a way to make the children remember where they came from. These memories were to be used as a bridge toward the future, where the children were given tools to make do wherever they chose to settle down after the war.

7.3 School as a function for creating identities

School can have a function for creating identities by facilitating the pupils' personal growth and happiness. Further, school can be used as an institution to teach children about the morals and values which are desirable in society. All of this is included in the term of school as a function for creating identities. Schools often have the function of raising the pupils, teaching them good behaviour and important norms. In a boarding school, this is more obvious than in a day school, with the pupils living at the facility. Still, this function can be found in both types of establishments.

One does not always find the paternal view at schools, meaning a view of school as being an institution to raise the children. Neither the French Lycée, the Belgian Athenaeum nor the Czechoslovakian State School agreed that the teachers and educators also had a responsibility to provide the children with an upbringing and teach them norms and values. Their sole responsibility was to educate the children. The upbringing was for other designated staff members or the children's families to provide.

This is something that separates the French, Belgian and Czech exile schools from the Norwegian school. The residents at Drumtochty Castle referred to themselves as being a family. The teachers often took special care of the pupils. Unavoidably, the pupils still often suffered from homesickness and longing for their parents. Even though the pupils had paternal figures among the staff members at the school, homesickness was to be expected. This could have been remedied by the children not attending the boarding school at all, but rather being enrolled at a British day school situated nearby the parents' exile homes.

One of the main agendas of the Norwegian boarding schools was to provide the children with a happy upbringing, teaching them good morals and democratic values. These were values that were important for the children to bring back home to Norway when they were to return after the war. Obviously, the Norwegian government in exile perceived the institution of school to be a significant contributor to providing the children with happiness and growth. It was an important task to prepare the children for adulthood, teaching them consequences and to separate right from wrong. Their handling of the disciplinary problems at Drumtochty Castle is proof of this.

The Norwegian boarding school was unable to provide the children with pure happiness at Drumtochty, due to their longing for their families. Still, the memories the former pupils are left with today often involve the boarding school as being an identity-creating function for them. Some of the former pupils remembered the various consequences of their own mischief, other remembered the close bonds they formed with staff members. Yet others remembered what staying at Drumtochty did do them, in terms of influencing their identities and the general impact it may have had on their lives.

7.4 School as a function for maintaining good health

School in exile during the Second World War was based on different circumstances than normal. Norwegian children that often originated from small towns and villages in rural parts of Norway, were suddenly living in overcrowded apartments in large, British cities. Diseases like tuberculosis were ravaging the population and Norwegian refugees of all ages were infected, sometimes with fatal outcomes. The situation was very serious, and the Norwegian exile government knew that something needed to be done. To remedy this was perhaps the most important agenda of the Norwegian exile government for establishing Drumtochty Castle boarding school.

By establishing the boarding school, the Norwegian exile government improved the children's chances of avoiding infections. Simultaneously, the rest of the Norwegian exile communities improved their chances of avoiding infections as well, as the apartments and houses got less crowded with the children gone. Apparently, the Norwegian government were successful in this endeavour. The infection rates in Glasgow reportedly dropped after the opening of Drumtochty Castle boarding school. If this was due to the school alone is unknown, but it was perceived to be an important factor.

Tuberculosis was not a phenomenon solely in the Norwegian exile communities in Great Britain. Although not specified in the literature and sources researched in this thesis, it obviously must have been a serious problem in all exile and British communities as well. The establishments of the various exile boarding schools likely had an agenda or at the very least hope of trying to improve the situation by removing the children from the big and crowded cities. Segregating the children in boarding schools often placed in rural areas of Great Britain must have had an effect on the infection rates among the children, and perhaps the rest of the exile communities as well.

It is difficult to state whether the Norwegian government's agenda of providing the children with better health succeeded. In some ways it did. The children at Drumtochty were able to play outdoors every day in fresh air in the Scottish countryside, instead of for instance in the smoggy streets of London. The diet at Drumtochty was also characterised as being healthy and nutritious. This could contribute to give the children a stronger constitution and help their overall health and resistance if they were to become ill from diseases.

Despite the efforts from the Norwegian government and staff members, to thoroughly test the residents of Drumtochty before they travelled to Drumtochty, several children got infected by tuberculosis during the war. Some of the children for instance got infected while visiting their families during holidays and brought the infection back to Drumtochty. Still, many of the children would have gotten infected either way, as the infection rates around Great Britain were extremely high. It is therefore difficult to blame the school or the government for this.

The government and the school staff seem to have tried their best in sheltering the children from the disease. The obvious alternative they could have done to avoid any infections was to either deny the children to leave the school. This would have brought more emotional stress to the children, who then would not have been able to meet their families. The other possibility would have been to test everyone that was to enter the school, including returning children after any holiday. Why they chose to not test the children after each holiday is unknown, but probably a combination of if it was practically possible with the time aspect in mind, as well as the costs for doing so. Importantly, removing the children from air raids and bombings of the large, British cities must have had a positive impact on the children's mental health, as well as on their physical health.

7.5 School as a function for secure environments

School during the war had different considerations to take than school during peacetime. The war inflicted various problems on the different schools and pupils. By January 1940, half a million British schoolchildren did not receive any tuition at all, because of the war. The war also caused countless children situated in Great Britain, to evacuate to safer surroundings. Both British children and refugee children alike. Bombings of the large cities in Great Britain created an urgent need for various governments to secure their children. The British government evacuated their own children, while simultaneously aiding the different Allied governments in exile to move their respective children into more secure environments, far away from the German air raids.

In the case of Norway, the gathering of the Norwegian schoolchildren in the Scottish countryside at Drumtochty Castle seems to have succeeded in keeping them safe from external dangers. German bombers never found Drumtochty, and the children were kept away from acts of war. Some of the children even described their time at Drumtochty as being boring. One former pupil informed that the sole reason for him to move to Scotland was because of the German V-bombs in London frightened his father enough to take immediate action and leave.

Although the Norwegian school at Drumtochty was a safe haven for the children from the acts of war, it was not always possible to shelter the children from internal danger. The most serious incident was an assault on one of the girls, made by one of the boys. Also, the Belgian exile school reported that it was challenging to make sure that the Belgian boys and girls did not engage in any misconduct toward each other. The Norwegian case was taken seriously by the school staff and the Norwegian government as well, and both took immediate action. It is difficult to imagine what the government or staff could have done to prevent any incidents like the assault to occur, while simultaneously knowing how short-staffed the schools in Great Britain were. Despite this incident, the Norwegian government did succeed in keeping the children, for the most part, secure.

7.6 School as a function for motivation

The exile schools were perceived to be excellent tools for motivating the rest of the exile communities as well as promoting inter-Allied unification. The Norwegian government in exile made sure to display the Norwegian boarding school to the rest of the Norwegian exile communities. Idyllic photographs and descriptions of Drumtochty Castle in the Norwegian exile newspapers served as a reminder for any potential war-weary Norwegian soldier or sailor of what they were fighting for. Patriotic images of a laughing Norwegian king, surrounded by happy Norwegian children in Scotland could give any exile a boost of morale and motivation, strengthening the bonds both to the homeland as well as to the Norwegian king and government in exile.

The British press also took advantage of the Norwegian boarding school. Joyous descriptions of Drumtochty Castle's opening party were found in many big, British newspapers. All of them filled with admiration and sometimes pride. Both the Norwegian press in exile and the British press were patriotic during the war, and neither was afraid to use propaganda to reach their goals. The Norwegian goal was often to motivate the exile communities. One of the agendas of the Allies regarding the press, and therefore also the Norwegian and British agenda, were to

show and strengthen the relationship between the Allies and to display to the world that the Allies were unified and cooperated closely.

7.7 School as a function for demonstrating ideas and influencing others

In addition to using the exile schools as a function for motivating the Norwegian people, the exile school was also used as a good example of Norway and Norwegian values. The same is probably true for the rest of the exile communities. With the British and American attention drawn toward the grand opening of Drumtochty Castle, the Norwegian government could show the western world how Norwegian ideals were practised. The Norwegian school system had already received positive attention after the strong resistance the Norwegian teachers back home had shown toward the Nazi ideology. Displaying the values and norms of the Norwegian school in exile could cement a good impression of the Norwegian society and serve as a good commercial for Norway. Further, it could help improve the Norwegian's standing in the alliance.

The exile schools could simultaneously contribute to a strengthening of the bonds between the exile governments and their homelands. Some of the exile governments were worried about their return to the homeland after the war. The concerns often involved how they would be greeted by the general public and whether they would be perceived as legitimate. Displaying to the population at home and abroad that they took good care of their vulnerable children while being in exile would perhaps strengthen the reputation of the government in exile.

It is uncertain whether the people at home in Norway or other occupied states knew about the exile schools, at least whether they had any knowledge about it while the Second World War was still ongoing. Undoubtedly, if the exile governments had not taken any actions to protect the refugee children the best they could, there would most likely have been consequences. The Nazis regimes in the occupied countries would probably have used it as a powerful tool in their own propaganda against the governments in exile in London. The results would perhaps have contributed to distrust toward the British and the Allies, as well as toward the exile governments.

7.8 School as a function for international cooperation

The unique situation of several governments in exile in Great Britain at the same time enabled them to lay the foundations of a new form of cooperation. Allied ministers of education and their governments worked together, helped each other out with problems that occurred while being in exile, and made decisions on how to organise their schools in exile. Establishing

boarding schools in exile was a joint decision made by the Allied governments in exile. The establishments of various nations' exile schools in Great Britain were also used as an argument when the Norwegian exile government invited Norwegian parents in exile communities to send their children to Drumtochty Castle.

The exile governments did not work isolated from the host nation. The British government was involved in several ways from the very start of their exile existence. Various institutions of the British government, like the Board of Education and the British Council, aided the exile governments, and later the exile schools the best they could and on several fields. For instance, the British government helped the exile governments to find suitable locations for the schools and with the evacuation of the refugee children. Further, they aided in questions regarding the staffing, renovations and equipping of the schools. Lastly, the British government also had an advisory role in the legal aspects of establishing the schools and if needed, also provided financial support.

The cooperation between the British government and the exile governments in Great Britain was fundamental for what was to come. Ever since World War I, cooperation regarding education had been attempted through the League of Nations and the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC). This organisation was perceived by many nations to be inadequate. The cooperation that emerged between the exile ministers of education in Great Britain during the Second World War soon took the form of a conference, called the Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education (CAME). This conference was not solely established because of the exile schools. Rather, the exile schools had given the ministers incentives and mutually valuable experience in cooperation with each other before the conference was formed.

The cooperation that took place at CAME was a continuation and improvement of the international cooperation that had been established by the IIIC in the League of Nations. The cooperation was nothing new. It was an evolution and not a revolution that culminated with the establishment of UNESCO. The new organisation was characterized by the idea of internationalism, where they created something different from what had been in the past, based upon their sovereign states. The cooperation between the states would contribute to securing a long-lasting peace, which was the ultimate goal for CAME and UNESCO. Their philosophy was that wars begin in the minds of men. The only way to secure peace was through cooperation, equal education, knowledge, trust, and tolerance.

7.9 The significance of schools in exile

The significance of schools in exile has been proven to be wide-ranging and comprehensive between the different nations as well as the people involved. Obviously, the schools were significant on several levels. What the different exile governments perceived the function of school to be varied. Imsen's three functions of school could be present in all the exile schools but prioritised differently. Schools in exile were significant as an identity builder, imprinting the people involved with experiences as well as displaying the nation's identity to the rest of the world. Simultaneously, it served a pragmatic role, of keeping the children safe and secure, while laying the groundworks for international relations. The function of school in exile was in other words similar to school in peacetime, but with another dimension. It was temporary.

Most of the refugees perceived their stay in Great Britain to be temporary. The temporariness of their situation could have been challenged without the exile schools. With the schools in exile as a tool, the governments in exile had a chance to make sure that the new generation was prepared to go back home after the war and do their duties for their nation. This separates the exile schools from schools in peacetime. School has a preparatory function for the children's adult life, in peace as in war. In exile, this function got an extra dimension cementing the temporariness of the children's exile situation.

This thesis has shown what significance the schools in exile had. Simultaneously, the thesis has shown that several related topics are waiting to be researched. One of those topics is the comprehensive history of the Norwegian exile communities in Great Britain. This has previously been touched upon by for instance the Norwegian historians Olav Riste and Guri Hjeltnes. Secondly, my thesis has not been able to give a comprehensive view of the relationship between the Norwegian exile government and communities on the one side, and the Scottish authorities and local population on the other side. Lastly, the Norwegian government's relationship with the British Council and other British institutions is a topic worth exploring.

Bibliography

Archival sources

Private archives:

J. Rørvik: Jakob Rørvik's private archive.

The National Archives, Kew, London, UK (NA):

BW 74/1. Conference of Allied Ministers of Education: minutes.

ED 42/1. British Council: Proposed meeting with Ministers of Education of Allied Governments in this country.

ED 42/15. Inspection of Foreign Schools in Great Britain.

ED 42/19. Relations with the International Labour Office.

ED 121/270. Suggestions for development of C.A.M.E. into U.N.E.S.C.O.

ED 121/389. Conference of Allied Ministers for Education.

ED 121/390. Allied Ministers' San Francisco conference on the U.N. Charter.

The National Archives, Oslo/Norway, Riksarkivet (RA):

S-2066/D/Db/L0002. Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet i London, Arkivet 1940-1945. D: SAKARKIV. Db: Den norske internatskolen i Skottland.

S-2066/D/Db/L0007, Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet i London, Arkivet 1940-1945, Db: Den norske internatskolen i Skottland.

S-2066/D/Da/L0024, Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet i London, Arkivet 1940-1945, L0024: 6. Folkeskoler.

S-2066/D/Da/L0025, Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet i London, Arkivet 1940-1945, 6. Folkeskoler.

S-2066/D/Da/L0026, Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet i London, Arkivet 1940-1945, 6. Folkeskoler.

Literature

Almlid, G. K. (2020). *Britain and Norway in Europe Since 1945. Outsiders*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berg, B. & Lauritsen, K. (2009). *Eksil og livsløp*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Conway, M. & Gotovitch, J. (Red.). (2001). *Europe in Exile. European Exile Communities in Britain 1940-45*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Corse, E. (2013). *A Battle for Neutral Europe. British cultural propaganda during the Second World War*. London, New York: Bloomsbury.

Døving, C. A. (2009). *Integrering: Teori og empiri*. Oslo: Pax.

Eastment, D. J. (1982). *The policies and position of the British Council from the outbreak of war to 1950* University of Leeds. Downloaded from https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/640/

Feidel-Mertz, H. & Hammel, A. (2004). Integration and Formation of Identity: Exile Schools in Great Britain. *Shofar, 23*(1), 71-84. https://doi.org/10.1353/sho.2005.0010

Grimnes, O. K. (1969). *Et flyktningesamfunn vokser fram. Nordmenn i Sverige 1940-45*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

Hay, I. (1946). *Peaceful Invasion*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hjelmtveit, N. (1969). *Vekstår og vargtid*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Hjeltnes, G. (1995). *Handelsflåten i krig 1939-1945: Sjømann: lang vakt* (bd. 3). Oslo: Grøndahl/Dreyer.

Imsen, G. (1997). *Lærerens verden. Innføring i generell didaktikk.* Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.

Jakubec, P. (2020). Together and Alone in Allied London: Czechoslovak, Norwegian and Polish Governments-in-Exile, 1940-1945. *International history review, 42*(3), 465-484. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2019.1600156

Lloyd, J. M. (1979). *The Scottish School System and the Second World War: A study in central policy and administration.* (Doctor of Philosophy, University of Stirling). Downloaded from https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/12293/1/lloyd-thesis.pdf

Lord Butler. (1971). *The art of the possible. The memoirs of Lord Butler*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Melve, L. & Ryymin, T. (2018). *Historikerens arbeidsmåter*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Nielsen, R. B. (2021). Unpublished Research Assignment: Exiles or immigrants? A comparative study of Norwegian groups in Sweden and Great Britain during WW2. Universitetet i Agder.

Nøkleby, B. & Hjeltnes, G. (2000). *Barn under krigen* (2. utg.). Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

Patel, K. K. & Kaiser, W. (2018). Continuity and Change in European Cooperation during the Twentieth Century. *Contemporary European History, 27*(2), 165-182. https://doi.org/10.1017/S096077731800005X

Riste, O. (1973). *"London-regjeringa": Norge i krigsalliansen 1940-1945: 1: 1940-1942: Prøvetid* (bd. 1). Oslo: Det Norske samlaget.

Riste, O. (1987). *Utefront* (bd. 7). Oslo: Aschehoug.

Riste, O. (2004). *Norway's foreign relations : a history* (2. utg.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Rosendahl, B. T. (2015). Patriotism, money and control. *Scandinavian Journal of History, 40*(2), 159-194. https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2015.1011686

Rosendahl, B. T. (2017). *Seafarers or war sailors? The ambiguities of ensuring seafarers' services in times of war in the case of the Norwegian merchant fleet during the Second World War* University of Agder, Kristiansand.

Sirevåg, T. (1980). *Men skolen skal aldri forgå. Om skole og samfunn i aust og vest.* NKS-forlaget.

Stachurska-Kounta, M. (2017). *Norway and the League of Nations 1919-1939. A Small State's Quest for International Peace.* University of Oslo.

Varvin, S. (2015). *Flukt og eksil* (2. utg.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time maps: collective memory and the social shape of the past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newspapers

Aberdeen Evening Express. (1942, 04.11.). Bon Accord Gossip by the Rambler. *Aberdeen Evening Express*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000445/19421104/024/0002

Aberdeen Press and Journal. (1942, 03.11.). King Haakon of Norway at Drumtochty. Cheers and Smiles of Proud Young Patriots. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000578/19421103/049/0004
Dundee Courier. (1942a, 21.12.). Drumtochty Castle Party. *Dundee Courier*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000564/19421221/048/0004
Dundee Courier. (1942b, 03.11). King Haakon Opens School in Castle. Mearns Outpost Of Norway. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000564/19421103/030/0002
Dundee Evening Telegraph. (1943, 02.07.). Crown Prince At Scotland's "Little Norway". *Dundee Evening Telegraph*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000563/19430702/084/0008
Fine, B. (1945, 22.04.). Education in review. Seek Support at San Francisco Conference For International Office for Education. *New York Times*.
Helgelands Blad. (1943, 24.09.). Gamle tradisjoner - unge menn. *Helgelands Blad*, s. 1. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/8c6f394e9108f1540bfc2288be5dc396?page=0&searchText=%22isle%20of%20man%22
Hem, M. (2021, 09.04.). Nordmenn kan ha blitt internert ulovlig under krigen. *Forsvarets forum*. Accessed at https://forsvaretsforum.no/andre-verdenskrig-historie-storbritannia/nordmenn-kan-ha-blitt-internert-ulovlig-under-krigen/192899
Hulme, C. (1945, 22.11.). Declaring War on Atom Bomb: U.N.E.S.C.O.'s Plan for World Peace. *The Press and Journal*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000578/19451122/027/0002
Norsk Tidend. (1940, 30.08.). Norsk Tidend. *Norsk Tidend*. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/0d4618af74f475b2d6aa4cf788e7b5c1?page=0
Norsk Tidend. (1942a, 07.11.). Den norske skolen i Skottland innviet. *Norsk Tidend*. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/2fa69ba5aba59d114769ed3a1f2b118b?page=0
Norsk Tidend. (1942b, 14.11.). En skoletime på slottet. *Norsk Tidend*. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/4e76f53a1be615691198d30532452b61?page=0
Norsk Tidend. (1942c, 07.11.). I skolen på slottet. *Norsk Tidend*. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/2fa69ba5aba59d114769ed3a1f2b118b?page=0
Norsk Tidend. (1942d, 07.11.). News of Norway. *Norsk Tidend*. Accessed at https://www.nb.no/items/2fa69ba5aba59d114769ed3a1f2b118b?page=0
Spence, J. C. (1942, 03.11.). School for children who risked death for liberty. *Daily News (London)*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0003214/19421103/039/0003
The Scotsman. (1942a, 03.11.). King Haakon's day with Norwegian children. School in Scottish Castle Opened. *The Scotsman*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000540/19421103/101/0004
The Scotsman. (1942b, 03.11.). Men and affairs. A Scotsman's Log. *The Scotsman*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000540/19421103/100/0004
The Scotsman. (1943, 05.05.). The British Council. Educational Work in Scotland. *The Scotsman*. Accessed at https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000540/19430505/110/0003

Webpages

British Schools Museum. Being punished. Accessed 11.10.2021 at https://britishschoolsmuseum.org.uk/discover/collections/being-punished/

Diaspora. (2021). I *Lexico*. Accessed 25.10.2021 at https://www.lexico.com/definition/Diaspora

Imperial War Museum. What happened to people displaced by the Second World War? Accessed 20.10.2022 at https://www.iwm.org.uk/history/what-happened-to-people-displaced-by-the-second-world-war

International Labour Organization. History of the ILO. Accessed 12.01.2022 at https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/history/lang--en/index.htm

Lycée Français Charles de Gaulle de Londres. History. Accessed 06.11.2021 at https://www.lyceefrancais.org.uk/a-propos/histoire/

The National Archives. Board of Education and Ministry of Education: Conference of Allied Ministers of Education: Correspondence and Papers. Accessed 06.12.2021 at https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C6841

The National Archives. Propaganda. Accessed 13.11.2022 at https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/help-with-your-research/research-guides/propaganda/

United Nations archives. League of Nations: Intellectual Cooperation. International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. Accessed 09.12.2021 at https://libraryresources.unog.ch/lonintellectualcooperation/IIIC