

DANISH
FOREIGN POLICY
YEARBOOK
2008

EDITED BY NANNA HVIDT AND HANS MOURITZEN

DIIS · DANISH INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

DANISH
FOREIGN POLICY
YEARBOOK
2008

EDITED BY NANNA HVIDT AND HANS MOURITZEN



DIIS

DANISH INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES · 2008

© Copenhagen 2008

Danish Institute for International Studies, DIIS
Strandgade 56, DK-1401 Copenhagen, Denmark

Ph: +45 32 69 87 87

Fax: +45 32 69 87 00

E-mail: diis@diis.dk

Web: www.diis.dk

Editors: Nanna Hvidt and Hans Mouritzen

Layout: Mark Gry Christiansen

Print: Gullanders Bogtryk a-s, Denmark

ISBN 978-87-7605-273-7

DIIS publications can be obtained from
the booksellers or ordered at
ekspedition@nordisk-bog-center.dk

Wholesale for booksellers:

Nordisk Bog Center A/S

Bækvej 10-12, DK-4690 Haslev, Denmark

Ph: +45 56 36 40 40

Fax: +45 56 36 40 39

Contents

PREFACE · 7

CHAPTER 1: ARTICLES · 9

Abstracts in English and Danish · 9

The International Situation and Danish Foreign Policy 2007 · 13

Ulrik Federspiel

Danish and US Foreign Aid Compared: A View from Washington · 31

Carol Lancaster

The Impeccable Ally? Denmark, NATO, and the Uncertain Future
of Top Tier Membership · 55

Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning

Danish Euroscepticism: Unique or Part of Broader Patterns? · 85

Catharina Sørensen

CHAPTER 2: SELECTED DOCUMENTS · 115

CHAPTER 3: DANISH FOREIGN POLICY IN FIGURES · 167

CHAPTER 4: OPINION POLLS · 173

CHAPTER 5: SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY · 183

Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook

Editors

Nanna Hvidt

Hans Mouritzen

Editorial e-mail: hmo@diis.dk

Editorial Assistant

Pauline Thisted Sachs

Linguistic Consultant

Robert Parkin

Editorial Advisory Board

Clive Archer, *Manchester Metropolitan University*

Hans Branner, *Nørre Gymnasium*

Eric Einhorn, *University of Massachusetts*

Poul Engberg-Pedersen, *The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*

Daniel Hamilton, *The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies*

Frederik Harhoff, *University of Southern Denmark*

Bernd Henningsen, *Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*

Christine Ingebritsen, *University of Washington*

Tonny Brems Knudsen, *University of Aarhus*

Henrik Larsen, *University of Copenhagen*

Sverre Lodgaard, *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs*

Birgitte Olsen, *Danish Institute for Human Rights*

Ove Kai Pedersen, *Copenhagen Business School*

Sten Rynning, *University of Southern Denmark*

Helle Rytönen, *Stanford University*

Bengt Sundelius, *Uppsala University*

Ben Tonra, *University College Dublin*

Preface

Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2008 is the twelfth volume of the yearbook in its present form. As previously, it focuses on Danish foreign policy and Denmark's position within an international and a transnational context – at the regional as well as the global level. In line with the yearbook's tradition, we present the official outline of Denmark's 2007 foreign policy by the Permanent Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Ulrik Federspiel. In addition, we have included scholarly articles by Carol Lancaster, Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning, and Catharina Sørensen, who represent only themselves and their academic expertise. As always, we see it as crucial to get a foreign perspective on Denmark and Danish foreign policy. This can be found in the article by Carol Lancaster (Georgetown University, USA), comparing the Danish and the US foreign aid programs and seeking for explanations regarding the vast differences at stake. Secondly, Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning (both from University of Southern Denmark) analyse, whether Danish security and defence policy can retain its 'strategic' role in NATO in the coming years. Finally, Catharina Sørensen (DIIS) compares Danish euroscepticism in a European and Nordic perspective; the causes and implication of the phenomenon are discussed, and good advice to EU 'communicators' are offered.

The articles are abstracted, both in English and Danish, at the outset of chapter one. After the articles follows a small selection of official documents, which we consider to be pioneering or characteristic of Danish foreign policy during 2007. This is supplemented by essential statistics on Danish foreign policy, as well as some of the most relevant polls on the attitude of the Danish population on key foreign policy questions. A bibliography then offers a lim-

ited selection of scholarly books, articles, and chapters published in 2007 in English within the yearbook's topic.

The editors of *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook* are Director Nanna Hvidt and Hans Mouritzen, Head of DIIS foreign policy research. Members of the editorial Advisory Board have served as reviewers, and they have also provided crucial inputs in the thematic selection process for the scholarly articles. Pauline Sachs has served as the assistant editor, while Robert Parkin has been our linguistic consultant.

The editors

DIIS, Copenhagen

May 2008

Chapter I

Articles

ABSTRACTS IN ENGLISH AND DANISH

The International Situation and Danish Foreign Policy 2007

Ulrik Federspiel

This is an outline of Danish foreign policy 2007 provided by the Permanent Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Throughout 2007, a number of events made it clear that unconventional actors and issues continue to influence both domestic policies and foreign policy. The challenge from failed or fragile states, new demands to multilateral cooperation and climate/energy as a new theme in foreign affairs are among the challenges examined in the present article. Efforts to understand and adjust to the new framework conditions are analysed. It is concluded that a holistic approach, combined with further coordination between relevant actors and a strengthening of multilateral organisations are needed. These measures will improve crisis management and help to pre-empt conflict.

I artiklen analyserer Udenrigsministeriets direktør Ulrik Federspiel dansk udenrigspolitik i 2007. Gennem året viste en række begivenheder, hvordan utraditionelle aktører og emner på den internationale scene fortsat har indflydelse på såvel indenrigs- som udenrigspolitiske forhold. Håndteringen af svage eller skrøbelige stater, udfordringen for det multilaterale samarbejde samt klima/energi som nyt tema i udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitikken analyseres. Der redegøres for, hvordan der inden for rammerne af dansk udenrigspolitik arbejdes på at forstå og håndtere

de nye rammevilkår. Det konkluderes, at der er behov for en holistisk tilgang såvel som en øget koordination mellem relevante aktører og en styrkelse af de multilaterale organisationer. Disse forholdsregler vil forbedre håndteringen af internationale kriser og bidrage til at komme konflikter i forkøbet.

Danish and US Foreign Aid Compared: A View from Washington

Carol Lancaster

For those in Washington – and, alas, there are not many – who study the aid programs of countries other than the US, the Danish aid program probably offers the most dramatic contrasts to US aid, as well as some suggestive ideas for the emerging debate in the US over how to organize its foreign aid in the future. This article will examine these two different aid programs and ask why they appear so distinct. It will argue that the differences are embedded in the different geo-strategic positions of the two countries, as well as differences in ideas on the appropriate role of the state in society and their different political institutions. It will conclude by suggesting that, unfortunately, there is relatively little in the fairly coherent and effective Danish aid system that can be easily transferred to the US.

For de ganske få i Washington, der studerer bistandsprogrammer i andre lande end USA, udgør dansk bistandspolitik sandsynligvis den klareste kontrast til amerikansk bistandspolitik. Desuden kan den danske måde at gøre tingene på være en kilde til inspiration for den begyndende debat i USA om, hvordan fremtidens bistandshjælp skal tilrettelægges. I artiklen undersøges det danske og det amerikanske bistandsprogram, og der spørges, hvorfor de fremstår så forskellige. Der argumenteres for, at forskellene udspringer af de to landes forskellige geo-strategiske positioner såvel som forskelle i ideer om statens rolle i samfundet og deres forskellige politiske institutioner. Der konkluderes, at der desværre er relativt lidt i det temmelig integrerede og effektive danske bistandsprogram, som umiddelbart kan overføres til en amerikansk sammenhæng.

The Impeccable Ally? Denmark, NATO, and the Uncertain Future of Top Tier Membership

Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning

Denmark, for many years a reluctant Atlantic ally, changed its profile in the post-Cold War world and undertook to support various NATO missions outside NATO territory. Danish foreign policy became militarized and, following the September 2001 terrorist attacks, Denmark became a strategic actor applying military force to defeat its enemies. A defence agreement in 2004 brought wide-ranging military reforms, and Denmark thus appeared to have completed its transformation from a reluctant to an impeccable NATO ally both politically and militarily. This transformation is analysed in the present article. It first examines the nature of the changes. In the subsequent two sections, their durability is questioned: section two examines the international context within which Denmark must operate, whereas section three focuses on the choices that have been made and are likely to be made, as the government experiences the push and pull of conflicting international and domestic pressures. It is concluded that it is unclear whether decision-makers will be willing and able to reach the type of political agreement that will maintain Denmark's newly acquired status as an impeccable ally.

Danmark var i en længere årrække NATO-allieret med fodnoter, men forandrede sin politik efter den kolde krig og støttede diverse NATO-operationer uden for alliansens traditionelle område. Dansk udenrigspolitik blev militariseret, og efter angrebene d. 11. september 2001 blev Danmark en strategisk aktør, som bruger militære midler til at nedkæmpe sine fjender. Forsvarsforliget i 2004 resulterede i væsentlige reformer, og Danmark så ud til politisk såvel som militært at have fuldført forandringen fra reserveret allieret til mønsterallieret. Denne forandring analyseres i artiklen. I det første afsnit gennemgås forandringens karakter. I de to efterfølgende afsnit stilles spørgsmålstegn ved dens holdbarhed: andet afsnit gennemgår den internationale scene, som Danmark må tilpasse sig, mens tredje afsnit kigger på de valg, som er foretaget og sandsynligvis vil blive foretaget i det indenrigspolitisk-internationale krydsfelt. Konklusionen er, at det er uklart, om beslutningstagerne kan og vil træffe de beslutninger, som vil fastholde Danmarks status som mønsterallieret.

Danish Euroscepticism: Unique or Part of Broader Patterns?

Catharina Sørensen

To what extent is Danish euroscepticism similar to euroscepticism in other EU member states? Based on a novel conceptualization of euroscepticism that recognizes its multifaceted nature, this article investigates existing hypotheses that cross-national patterns of euroscepticism can be explained by a country's geographical location, political system, dominant religious affiliation, level of affluence, population size, or the timing of its entry into the EU. This search for patterns involves drawing up the eurosceptic map of the EU and, more specifically, a comparison of the types, strengths and dynamics of euroscepticism across the member states. The study demonstrates that clear cross-country patterns are difficult to establish, and this is illustrated through a case-study of Nordic euroscepticisms. In conclusion, the consequences of diverse euroscepticisms are discussed. The article should further our understanding of the ebb and flow of public opinion and contribute to on-going debates on how best to communicate the EU to its citizens. Knowledge about euroscepticism may assist campaigners of both pro- and anti-EU orientations in focusing their arguments better.

I hvor høj grad er der lighed mellem dansk euroskepsis og euroskepsis i andre EU-medlemslande? Baseret på en ny begrebsliggørelse af euroskepsis, der anerkender dens mange facetter, undersøger artiklen en række eksisterende forklaringer på euroskepsismønstre, nemlig et lands geografiske placering, politiske system, dominerende religion, velstandsniveau, befolkningsstørrelse og det tidspunkt, hvor et land blev medlem af EU. Gennem denne søgen efter mønstre tegnes EU's euroskeptiske landkort, og medlemslandenes forskellige euroskepsisprofiler sammenlignes. Artiklen demonstrerer, at det er vanskeligt at fastslå tydelige mønstre, hvilket illustreres gennem en case-studie af euroskepsis i EU's nordiske medlemslande. I konklusionen diskuteres konsekvenserne af forskelligartet euroskepsis. Denne artikel søger at fremme forståelsen af den offentlige meningsflod og ebbe og at bidrage til debatter om, hvordan man bedst kommunikerer EU til dets borgere. Viden om euroskepsis kan bistå både pro- og anti-EU-kampagner med at målrette deres argumenter bedre.

The International Situation and Danish Foreign Policy 2007

Ulrik Federspiel¹

In my contribution to the Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook last year, I commented on how globalisation and the development of complex international networks create new requirements and challenges for the conduct of foreign policy. In today's foreign policy, focus changes constantly and the need to take a large number of foreign tools into consideration has become more evident than ever. New actors and new issues are having an impact both on relations within countries, between countries and on the international system as such. This is the challenge that we had to handle in 2007 – and in the years to come – in order to enhance stability and strengthen a rule-based international system, including human rights.

In the following, I will examine a number of key issues and how we coped with them during 2007. I have chosen to focus on: (1) the challenge from failed or fragile states, (2) new demands to multilateral cooperation and (3) climate as a new foreign policy issue.

DENMARK'S ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILE AND FAILED STATES

Failed states are among the challenges that have moved to the top of the international agenda. One reason is that state fragility often leads to conflict and human rights violations, which spread easily to neighbouring states, thereby

¹ Ambassador Ulrik Federspiel is the Danish Permanent Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

threatening international peace and security. Furthermore, failed states may present opportunities for radicalised groups and international terrorism seeking a safe haven. And finally, state fragility weakens the ability of states to promote much needed development. Thus, most fragile states are characterized by severe poverty.

The Danish Government works for a strengthened and more coherent development effort in fragile states both bilaterally and multilaterally. We have to be better to deal with failed states and avoid that they become fertile grounds for terrorists, fanatics and international criminal networks. In this effort, development assistance is closely connected to security policy efforts, because, as recent experience shows, the use of force alone cannot achieve sustainable stability in countries with security problems.

The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the means to apply a holistic approach that also includes close relations with the Ministry of Defence and humanitarian NGOs. But foreign policy tools must be adjusted to ensure focus and impact. As recent experience from insurgency campaigns shows, only a multi-faceted approach works. We can win the war – but even more importantly, we need to win the peace. We must, therefore, improve civil-military coordination and ensure that civil action in areas like police operations, the rule of law, security sector reform, good governance and economic development programmes are seen as essential and indispensable in conflict and crisis management.

Denmark can obviously not be present in all fragile states. Efforts are concentrated in those fragile states that have high political priority or where Denmark has special qualifications, for instance through previous or existing presence. Country knowledge is a key prerequisite in both diplomacy and development, but it takes time to acquire. Therefore, multilateral agencies sometimes have an advantage in fragile states. Accordingly, Denmark also supports engagement in fragile states through the UN system, the World Bank, EU, NATO and other organisations and NGO's.

A central objective for the international community in fragile states should be state-building. There is little doubt that effective and democratic states are better equipped to cope with the challenges of globalisation and to seize the opportunities it presents. And they are better able to participate as responsible members in international cooperation.

During 2007, Denmark obtained hands-on practice in dealing with failed or fragile states; in particular in Iraq, Afghanistan and Sudan, where bilateral and multilateral efforts were closely coordinated.

From Basra to Bagdad

The high level of sectarian discontent and violence that characterized Iraq in 2006 continued into the first half of 2007. The second half of 2007, however, saw a significant reduction in violence; a development which has given rise to cautious optimism. But Iraq is still struggling with the legacies of the former regime and skepticism towards the multilateral forces. Deep-seated mistrust between sectarian groups and unsettled questions regarding the distribution of authority and natural resources are challenges that must be overcome in the process towards a stable and secure Iraq. Major hurdles have been overcome since 2003, but vital issues lie ahead, like strengthening the newly founded institutions of the Iraqi state.

The Danish engagement in Iraq continued in 2007 in response to the request of the Iraqi Government and the UN, and reflects the multi-stranded approach described in the above. The aim of the Danish efforts is twofold; to support the Iraqi people in taking over the security responsibility and to support the democratically elected government in rebuilding Iraq. In this regard, three trends characterized 2007: Firstly, a clear Iraqi ambition to take over the security responsibility and a growing capacity within the Iraqi security sector to achieve this goal; secondly, a lack of progress towards political reconciliation; and thirdly, a growing need to increase the support to capacity building of central Iraqi institutions and wider reconstruction efforts.

In 2007, Denmark made significant adjustments to its engagement in Iraq in order to meet the changing situation and to accommodate the current needs of the new Iraqi state. Concurrent with the gradual transfer of power to Iraqi authorities (Basra being handed over to Iraqi control in December 2007) and with the improvements in the security situation, the Danish engagement and reconstruction efforts were gradually shifted from Basra to Baghdad and from military support to civilian capacity building and reconstruction.

In August 2007, the Danish battalion in the Basra province was replaced by a helicopter detachment working under the British division in southern Iraq. The helicopter detachment and its approximately 55 military personnel were

withdrawn in December 2007, ending the Danish military presence in the Basra province. In addition, the Danish police training program has in 2007 moved its focus from the Basra province to Baghdad, where Danish policeofficers are now engaged in capacity building of the Iraqi Police. Denmark continues to be a member of the coalition, having among others 6 military trainers in the Coalition training program, 3 military advisors assigned to UNAMI (United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq) and 14 personnel at NATO's training mission for the Iraqi army.

In spring 2007, a Technical Advisory Office was established in Baghdad as part of the Danish Embassy there. And during consultations with the Iraqi Government in August 2007 it was agreed to support capacity building activities in Iraqi ministries in Baghdad within the areas of agriculture, water, transport, migration, rule of law, human rights and good governance. By the end of the year, four civilian advisers were attached to the office. It is expected that up to ten advisers will be attached to the office in 2008. In November 2007, the Danish Government earmarked an additional USD 20 million for reconstruction in Iraq and extended Denmark's commitment in Iraq with another two years. This brings the Danish reconstruction efforts for 2003-2010 to a total of USD 137 million. Furthermore, Denmark continues to provide support to internally displaced people in Iraq and Iraqi refugees, mainly in Syria and Jordan. Denmark is the third largest supplier of this kind of aid (USD 28 million in 2007).

There is broad political agreement on the Iraq policy described above, as a very broad majority of parties within the Danish Parliament support the Government's policy as it was laid out in the resolution adopted in May 2007.

From Kabul to Kandahar

In 2007, Denmark strengthened its contribution to Afghanistan both in terms of development assistance and military contribution. In relative terms, Denmark is now among the largest military contributors and the second largest financial donor (USD 53 million in 2007) to Afghanistan. These numbers reflect the perception in Denmark of how serious it would be if the international community does not succeed in bringing lasting stability to Afghanistan.

The Danish engagement in Afghanistan illustrates the holistic political, civilian and military approach. We help the Afghans to fight the hard core insur-

gency and at the same time we support the Afghan government by reconstruction efforts, thus helping to provide hope for a better future to the many that are right now waiting to see what democracy is good for.

The emphasis on creating the best possible coherence between security and development has now also become a guiding principle in the joint international efforts in Afghanistan. Denmark has been the driving force in a substantially raised focus on coordination between NATO and other actors in Afghanistan. And Denmark has shown a good example on the ground by implementing new concepts for the interplay between military and civilian reconstruction.

This approach has already proven successful. In the Northern province Badakshan, hundreds of projects have been implemented in a joint effort by Danish military teams and the civilian development advisor from Danida. The security situation is now so good that the team in 2007 moved on to the more insecure Southern province Helmand, while Government authorities and NGOs will continue to work on the long-term development challenges in Badakshan.

By the end of 2007, a broad range of political parties agreed with the Government on a plan for the Danish engagement in Helmand for 2008. With the Helmand plan, very specific benchmarks have been set for what Denmark, in close cooperation with the Afghan Government and international partners, aims to achieve in 2008. Among the goals for the Danish engagement is: firstly, that we shall contribute to make the Afghan Government capable of exercising its authority in an increasing part of Helmand to the extent that security is adequate to secure reconstruction; secondly, that at least 70.000 children will attend school, and thirdly, that young people will get access to vocational training in order to provide them with an alternative to being enrolled in the narcotics economy. Helmand is – and will remain for some time – a very difficult operational environment, and it will be a challenge to meet these goals. However, the direction has been set during 2007.

Still waiting for Sudan

Judging from developments during 2007, it is clear that there are no easy solutions in Sudan. The deployment of UNAMID faces severe challenges and several rebel groups declined to participate in the Darfur peace negotiations. In other words, the situation on the ground in Darfur continues to be extremely

serious. The current situation reminds us that there are no 'quick-fixes' in conflict struck states such as Sudan. The deliberate obstruction by the Government of Sudan does not make things easier. Our efforts are, however, not in vain. Albeit not a breakthrough, the developments represent small steps towards peace. A UN peace keeping force has been agreed to and also more or less its composition. The UN has tactically accepted President Bashir's demand that the force does not include NATO or other Western forces. This means that the Danish support squadron will not be sent to Sudan.

Denmark has continuously contributed to the international efforts of bringing peace to Darfur. We contribute substantially to the humanitarian efforts, the Darfur peace negotiations and we have also offered to contribute to UNAMID. However, the Sudanese Government continues to put up road blocks for the development of the international framework. In a conflict struck state such as Sudan, we must continue to apply a flexible approach and stand ready to make use of any windows of opportunity that may appear. Preparations for early recovery and reconstruction efforts have thus begun. We have to be ready to ensure a substantial peace dividend when the security situation improves. The Foreign Ministry has therefore a Technical Advisory Office in Khartoum.

On a more positive note, the end of 2007 brought an end to the crisis in the National Unity Government of Sudan, so the crucial implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), which ended more than 20 years of civil war between Northern and Southern Sudan, can continue. Despite remaining tension and outstanding issues, the risk of a return to armed conflict seems to be decreasing. At the same time, humanitarian and reconstruction efforts, which Denmark supports, are underpinning the positive development.

In April 2007, the Danish diplomat, Ambassador Torben Brylle was appointed as EU Special Representative for Sudan being responsible for furthering EU's policy objectives for Sudan and representing the EU at relevant high-level meetings with governments, non-state actors and international institutions.

Crunch time for Kosovo

Kosovo was another issue high on the international agenda during 2007. The international community continued the efforts to find a solution to the future status of Kosovo. The UN's Special Envoy, Martti Ahtasaari, in the first half of

2007 continued his talks with the authorities in Pristina and Belgrade without being able to reach common ground with the two parties. Serbia was only prepared to accept an extensive autonomy for Kosovo, while the authorities in Pristina would not settle for less than independence.

Ahtisaari's proposal for the future status for Kosovo was presented during 2007. But efforts to agree on a resolution in the UN Security Council, as a framework for the implementation of Ahtisaari's status proposal, failed during summer as Russia was not prepared to accept a status solution for Kosovo that was not agreed to by Belgrade (and Pristina). This led to a new round of negotiations with the two parties, this time facilitated by an international trojka consisting of the EU, Russia and the US. Negotiations lasted from August to December 2007 where a report was presented to the UN Secretary-General. Despite having explored all options, it had not been possible for the two parties to reach a mutually acceptable solution. Against this background, the European Council in December expressed its agreement with the UN Secretary-General that status quo in Kosovo was not sustainable and stressed the need for a settlement for Kosovo. The European Council made it clear that the EU was prepared to play a leading role in implementing a settlement defining Kosovo's future status.

EU has in 2007 continued the preparations for the civilian ESDP-mission – the biggest ever – in Kosovo through a planning team in Pristina (EUPT Kosovo, headed by a Dane). The mission is expected to assist the Kosovo authorities in developing and strengthening an independent multi-ethnic justice system and a multi-ethnic police and customs service, adhering to internationally recognised standards. The mission will be monitoring, advising and mentoring, while retaining certain executive responsibilities. It is, however, also important to ensure a continued robust KFOR presence in Kosovo.

Denmark has provided substantial assistance to Kosovo since the cessation of hostilities in 1999, initially supporting the reconstruction efforts and later with more long-term development assistance in the form of a micro credit programme aimed at promoting business development and employment. It is against this background that Denmark is now considering enhancing its efforts to support the development process in Kosovo once the future status of Kosovo has been settled. A key priority will be to promote economic growth in order to improve domestic resource mobilisation capacity and reduce the high

unemployment. Another key priority will be to enhance the capacity of the new government in Kosovo to undertake its future obligations to the benefit of all Kosovo people across ethnic divides.

The question of sustainable economic growth and the continued democratisation and stability of Kosovo and the Western Balkans will be very important challenges for Denmark and the EU also in the years to come.

Strengthening the efforts in Africa

The inability of many African states to handle the challenges of globalisation such as terrorism, epidemics and environmental degradation, and the exclusion of many African countries from economic globalisation, has to be handled at the international level in the years ahead.

The international community has already committed itself to increasing assistance to Africa, and many African governments are showing the will to strengthen the reform effort. The UN's Millennium Declaration set 2015 as the year by which eight key goals (the so-called Millennium Development Goals – MDGs) in world development should be achieved. We are now half-way through this 15-year period, and Africa is lagging considerably behind the rest of the world. Despite progress in Africa at present, the MDGs will probably not be fulfilled in the continent. Projections indicate that Africa will remain the poorest continent on the globe for many decades to come. If Nigeria and South Africa are excluded, the combined gross national product of Sub-Saharan Africa is only the size of Denmark's.

This is the backdrop for the new Danish Africa Strategy from August 2007. The strategy sets the inclusion of Africa in globalisation and its development into an equal global partner as the main priority for Danish policy towards Africa. Denmark will, furthermore, work for increased regional integration as a driving force for enhanced security and provide more and better assistance to Africa with focus on employment, young people and gender equality.

An extraordinary effort is required if Africa is to be a part of global development. Denmark has a humanitarian obligation to help Africa's many poor and particularly vulnerable groups and to contribute actively to ensure the African countries a greater share in the world's prosperity. Therefore, Africa will be the main priority for Denmark's development cooperation in the years to come. Besides increased development assistance, there should also be an increased

political engagement in Africa, in which foreign policy, trade, environmental and security policies will play key roles.

MULTILATERAL COOPERATION: REFORMING THE 'MULTILATERAL HOUSE'

The framework for multilateral cooperation as we know it today is to a large degree a product of the past. Its structures reflect the balance of power and the international agenda as developed in the years following World War II. In the post-war period, the UN institutions and the Bretton Woods system were established. Adding a number of other well-known international organisations – the EU, NATO, WTO and OSCE and others – it largely captures the picture of today's multilateral international cooperation and the framework in which it takes place.

But the institutional setup for multilateral action seems to be out of date. Reflection is, hence, needed on how to tune this framework to better cope with the world of today. Clearly, a lot has happened since the above mentioned organisations were born. There is no longer one single global conflict dictating international politics as a whole and disciplining the players to act accordingly. New threats and players have joined the game. And the challenges, dynamics and conflicts are more complex and interrelated than ever, creating a much more unforeseeable global environment and a need to take cooperative action in a different way.

The benefit and value of international organisations must be clear and possible to identify. Otherwise, they become redundant. In other words, there is a direct connection – and not only a trade-off – between the long-term legitimacy and the day-to-day efficiency of international organizations.

The US and the Transatlantic partnership with Europe continue to be a core element in these common endeavors to promote international peace, freedom and wealth. But in addition to transatlantic efforts to strengthen international cooperation, we need to draw our attention to some of the specific organizations that, in combination, are essential in the conduct of Danish foreign policy.

Developments in the EU

In many respects 2007 was a turning point for the EU. This was the year where the EU celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Rome Treaty. The celebration marked the start of what proved to be a very busy year in the European calendar. After some years dominated by the so-called 'Reflection period', Europe managed to overcome the inertia and take some decisive steps towards resolving the question of the future of the EU. Under the guidance of German and Portuguese presidencies, member states went through an intensive process that culminated on December 13 with the signing of the new Lisbon Treaty. Now the 27 member states will have to ratify the Treaty. In Denmark, the Treaty is expected to be ratified by the Parliament in 2008.

The Lisbon Treaty marks the end of a long process of institutional changes that stretches over the past 20 years. In the same period, the EU has grown from 9 to 27 members. It is an ambitious Treaty that will enable the enlarged EU to function effectively in the future. Denmark has particularly welcomed the new Treaty's emphasis on openness, stronger democracy, more effective decision making and instruments allowing the EU to play a more prominent role as a global player.

The Lisbon Treaty provides the enlarged EU with a stable and lasting institutional framework for the foreseeable future. This will allow the EU to fully concentrate on addressing the concrete challenges ahead. In order to help the EU better anticipate and more effectively meet the challenges in the longer term, Heads of States and Governments decided at the European Council in December 2007 to establish an independent reflection group. The group will identify the issues and developments that will require an EU response in the future and offer a first analysis of how these may be addressed.

But many challenges require immediate response. Facing the climate challenge is one of those issues that featured most prominently on the European agenda in 2007. This was not least the case at the European Council in March 2007 (see also below).

Another important challenge is how to tackle globalisation. Following turmoil on international financial markets, this was a debate that dominated the European agenda during the second half of the year. Globalisation offers opportunities, but it also creates threats. How to exploit the former without being unnecessarily exposed to the latter is a question that has divided European

member states. But after a long and at times difficult debate, member states – with strong support from Denmark – agreed on a globalisation declaration at the European Council in December 2007 that clearly commits the EU to the continued promotion of free and open trade and recognises that national reforms are a precondition for success in a globalised world.

In sum, during 2007 the EU regained momentum in the shaping of open and effective democratic institutions whereby the EU will be able to cope with the world of today. This was needed in response to the enlargement of the EU, but also in a broader perspective to developments in the world surrounding Denmark and the EU.

Developments in the UN

On 1 January 2007 former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan handed over the responsibilities to Secretary General Ban Ki-moon (a professional diplomat and former South Korean Minister for Foreign Affairs in 2004-2006). Such transitions pose challenges and this one is no exception. The new UN Secretary General maintains focus on a charged multilateral agenda of crisis management, peace building, development and the MDGs as well as UN reform. In the Secretary General's own words: Multilateralism is back!

Fundamental changes and reforms are, however, required to adjust the UN to the global challenges of the 21st century. Reform must remain high on the agenda for the new Secretary General. Although politically controversial, Security Council reform is essential to ensure that the Council reflects the world of today. But progress has been slow and difficult – even though an initiative in December 2007 by the chairman of the General Assembly, Srgjan Kerim, has raised hopes that progress will be possible in this vital area. Denmark and the Nordic countries are engaged in the process.

Reforms in other areas are on-going, with the recommendations in the High Level Panel Report 'Delivering as One' about reforms on UN presence at country level attracting particular attention. Denmark fully supports the reform agenda. Despite reservations from many developing countries, first valuable experiences are now being made on a voluntary basis in 8 pilot countries around the world.

Women also play a central role in the Danish Government's efforts to reach the UN MDGs by 2015. Denmark launched an initiative to put MDG3 on

gender equality, and women's economic empowerment in particular, at the very top of the international agenda and is planning a conference in early 2008. Furthermore, the role of women in post-conflict situations is central to the revision of the National Action Plan regarding UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security. The revision was initiated in 2007 in close collaboration with the Ministry of Defence, the National Police and civil society.

The UN still faces difficult challenges of reform that must be overcome in order to keep its historic role as the global forum for international peace and security. In terms of institutional change, the UN is not yet experiencing progress comparable to that of the EU. But Denmark will continue its active effort in this regard.

The peace keeping challenges are daunting for the UN with over 100.000 persons deployed in UN peace keeping missions. An important task, for example, is carried out by the UN operation to Liberia, to which the former Danish Ambassador to the UN, Ellen Margrethe Løj, was appointed the new Special Representative of the General Secretary in October 2007.

Developments in NATO

Almost 60 years since its inception, NATO remains the most important military alliance and continues to promote stability and democracy in Europe and beyond in the face of a rapidly changing international security environment. Thus, by the end of 2007, approximately 1000 out of the 1100 Danish troops engaged in international operations were under NATO command. Of these, some 660 served in Afghanistan and around 310 in Kosovo, where NATO forces based on UN mandates are making indispensable contributions to regional stability and development.

Denmark supports such an agenda, where NATO is involved in broad and far-reaching operations. But a further shaping of the Alliance – and its political and military agenda – is necessary to maintain or even further strengthen NATO as a significant security policy instrument. Important steps have already been undertaken to ensure a framework that is more comprehensive – both in terms of geography and subjects.

With the full support of Denmark, NATO has set in motion a transformation process in order to maintain the capability of the Alliance to address

today's and tomorrow's challenges head-on. In 2007, NATO has taken a more proactive approach to civil-military cooperation, not least in Afghanistan. This flows from the decision taken at the NATO summit in November 2006 to improve the ability of the Alliance to cooperate closely with key civilian actors – such as the UN and the EU – in ongoing and future operations. Being one of the key proponents of a more comprehensive approach to NATO-led operations, this development is very satisfying from a Danish perspective. But the principle of burden sharing and solidarity within NATO needs to be upheld.

2007 has also witnessed a NATO becoming increasingly aware of today's media environment, and how the Alliance must be able to tackle the challenges of the information age in an open and credible way. Both topics, related to NATO's public diplomacy efforts, require dialogue and cooperation with a range of external actors, as well as a look at NATO's set-ups and tools. By doing so, NATO is continuing to ensure its relevance as a military alliance and the most important forum for transatlantic political dialogue on security matters.

Furthermore, NATO's extensive partnership cooperation serves as a platform to engage key partners – including Russia and Ukraine – in virtually all aspects of NATO's activities. In 2007, this cooperation has served as an important political forum to handle difficult issues such as the CFE-treaty, missile defence and questions pertaining to Kosovo.

In 2007, the debate about possible NATO enlargement also started. A decision has to be taken at the NATO summit in Bucharest in April 2008.

Developments in WTO

After Director General Pascal Lamy suspended negotiations in the Doha Round in July 2006, focus shifted to the G4 (EU, US, India and Brazil). However, in spite of serious efforts, the G4 did not succeed in bringing a result closer and in June 2007 negotiations therefore returned to the WTO. The following months were characterized by intense negotiations in Geneva – bringing progress at the technical level, but still no breakthrough. On this background, Lamy has warned that the present window of opportunity will probably close during 2008 due to upcoming US presidential elections.

In June 2007, the Danish Foreign Minister and the Minister for Economic and Business Affairs officially launched 'An Assertive Trade Policy Strategy'. The strategy sets WTO as the top priority in Danish trade policy, but also

points to bilateral and regional trade and investment agreements as necessary complements to the multilateral track. Denmark therefore supported the launch in 2007 of trade negotiations between the EU and Korea, India and ASEAN respectively. In particular negotiations with Korea moved encouragingly forward – thus paving the way for a possible conclusion in 2008 of the EU's first bilateral trade agreement with an Asian country.

In the larger picture of international trade negotiations, Denmark will continue a proactive trade policy and work for progress in the WTO Doha Development Round to avoid a return to protectionism among the world's significant trading nations and to pave the way for a better integration of developing countries into the global economy.

CLIMATE AND ENERGY

During 2007, it was once again made clear that the traditional division between domestic and foreign policies continued to narrow, that increased attention is required in foreign policy to new aspects of domestic politics and that international negotiations are becoming increasingly interrelated. This applies not least to the field of climate and energy.

Climate change and future access to energy are among the most important challenges facing the global community in the 21st century. Consequently, climate change and energy was in 2007 – again – among the issues on top of the national and international political agenda. Indeed, events in 2007 cemented the position of climate change as one of the key global issues of our time.

Providing stability and security as a foundation for human well-being, global freedom and prosperity is a major foreign policy goal. Scientific evidence increasingly demonstrates that climate change poses a threat to achieving this goal. In contrast to traditional foreign policy and security threats, climate change is not caused by 'hostile' enemies. Climate change may rarely be the sole cause of violent conflicts, but climate induced environmental stress can increase the severity, duration and collateral impacts of a conflict and lead to increased pressure on the borders of developed countries by millions of 'climate refugees'. All this calls for new thinking, also in the area of foreign policy.

A number of events during 2007 have demonstrated that the momentum

for a global climate change agreement is getting ever stronger. In April 2007, climate change was for the first time ever on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council. This clearly demonstrated that climate change, foreign policy and security issues are interlinked and must attract greater political attention.

Furthermore, the UN' Secretary General hosted the first ever UN meeting at heads of state level to focus on climate change in New York on 24 September. The meeting proved important in building up momentum for the 13th Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change held in Bali in December. The Bali Conference was the most important climate change event of the year. The parties agreed on an Action Plan for the way forward for an agreement in Copenhagen in 2009 when Denmark will host the 15th Conference of the Parties to the Climate Convention (COP15). While Denmark and the EU would have preferred that the agreement had been reached on a specific global objective for a future international climate agreement, it was still an important result that 2009 is now the unquestionable deadline for arriving at a new global climate change deal and that all actors are involved in the negotiations. But difficult negotiations now lie ahead. The process is complex, involves many different actors and different interests, and must take place within a very short timeframe. The new agreement should be ambitious and global in scope and provide the framework for the active engagement of businesses, civil society and financial institutions in the transformation to a sustainable global energy and climate future.

At the EU Spring Summit, the EU Member States made a historical decision on climate and energy. It was decided to reduce green house gas emissions by 20% in 2020 – or by as much as 30% as part of an international agreement. In 2020, the share of renewable energy is to rise to 20% of the energy production – a target which is binding for the Member States. The EU Member States also agreed on a binding minimum target for bio-fuels of 10% of vehicle fuel by 2020. The agreement on the energy and climate package was a landmark event. However, as progressive and far sighted as the decision was, it is still the easy half of the equation. Looking beyond 2007, the EU must agree on the implementation. It will be a challenge for the Member States to mend and bend their positions on issues that will have consequences for both the climate and the national economies. We must reach a compromise giving a fair and balanced burden-sharing between the countries. 2007 stands as the year where the EU

took a big step forward. The EU position as a reliable partner should also be used to increase our dialogue and partnership with countries outside the EU. Speaking with one voice, the EU can make a real difference. The EU should continue to play a leading intellectual, technological, and financial role in the international response to climate change.

Climate change is affecting people's lives globally but it constitutes a particular challenge to developing countries where most people are directly dependent on the natural environment for their livelihoods. It represents a major threat to developing countries' aspirations for the future and could undermine the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

Climate change will have an effect across sectors and on numerous aspects of development. Therefore, there is a crucial need to integrate climate considerations into all development policies and programmes – multilateral as well as bilateral – whilst building on national priorities. This will also constitute an indirect way of leveraging further finance for climate change adaptation. The Government in 2007 presented its priorities for Danish development assistance during the period 2008 to 2012. Climate change, energy and environment is one of three priorities and the Danish Climate and Development Action Programme of 2005 will now be rolled out to all Danish partner countries.

THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

Several other developments and trends from 2007 are central and could be singled out, for example signs of new momentum within the Middle East Peace Process, developments in North Korea and Iran, serious incidents in Pakistan and Kenya by the end of the year as well as the challenges derived from trade and financial turmoil, demographic growth, immigration, poverty, epidemics and the environment – just to mention a few examples that will also set the agenda for the years to come.

But the key question remains how to handle the new issues on today's foreign policy agenda and the new actors that have joined the game. No doubt, the winners of the game will be those who understand and adjust to the new framework swiftly and effectively and who understand the growing need for horizontal coordination in international relations. In the years to come, we

need to be prepared for such change. And we need new working methods and solutions that are pro-active and result oriented in essence.

To sum up.

First of all, we need to further develop an integrated and coherent approach in fragile or failed states in order to avoid conflicts and improve crisis management operations. The need for effective coordination between all actors involved in fragile states should be addressed, including procedures to further coordinate the use of military, humanitarian, economic and diplomatic tools.

Secondly, we need to strengthen existing multilateral organisations that unfortunately – some of them – risk losing influence. From a Danish point of view, formal multilateral cooperation continues to be a high priority, as the freedom of action of nation states is dependent on a stable and rule-based international environment based on international cooperation and agreements. We therefore need to develop and strengthen a multilateral governance system that is ready for the future. As the world becomes smaller, the need to cooperate becomes bigger. But reforms are needed so as to enable international organizations to operate effectively. This is in the interest of Denmark and this will be a major challenge ahead.

Thirdly, we need better coordination. The new issues high on the foreign policy agenda should be dealt with in horizontal structures and in the interface between domestic and international affairs in order to guide and steer between the inner and outer and link otherwise separate policy sectors such as energy and climate.

Danish and US Foreign Aid Compared: A View from Washington

Carol Lancaster¹

Among aid-giving countries, there are few that are more different than Denmark and the US. The most obvious difference is, of course, size. With a population of 5 and a half million, Denmark is only almost 2% of the US population of 304 million. The US is one of the world's largest countries in land mass; Denmark is one of the smallest. The US has a presidential political system with federal, state and local governments all playing a role in politics. Denmark has a parliamentary system that governs the country. Denmark is ethnically homogenous compared to the US – a nation mostly of immigrants from many different places on earth. Both countries are among the richest countries in the world and are part of the Western alliance that is centered on NATO. And both provide foreign aid for bettering the human condition abroad.

With the differences in these countries, one would expect considerable differences in their foreign aid programs and one would be right. The contrasts and commonalities in Danish and US aid fall into four broad categories: the volume of aid and its division into bilateral and multilateral categories; the purposes and policies governing aid-giving; the management and delivery of aid; and the organization of government to manage aid programs. In each of these categories, the contrasts appear to outweigh the commonalities.

1 Carol Lancaster is an associate professor in the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. The editors are grateful to Lars Engberg-Pedersen (DIIS) for reviewing an earlier version of this article.

CONTRASTS AND COMMONALITIES

The Volume of Aid

Both Denmark and the US are committed to being generous aid-giving governments. Denmark provided USD 2.6 billion in official development assistance (ODA) in 2007. The US provided USD 21.8 billion. In absolute terms, Denmark ranks as a middle-sized donor among the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), coming between Austria and Norway.² The US is the largest aid donor in absolute terms.

But of course, absolute size tells us little about a country's aid effort relative to the size of its economy. Here the contrast between Denmark and the US is dramatic. The US, with its enormous economy, provides the least amount of aid as a proportion of its gross national income (GNI) at 0.16% of any rich country. Denmark ranks fourth in the list of relative aid generosity, with official development assistance (ODA) representing 0.81% of GNI. (For many years, Denmark ranked first but lost this rank in the early years of this decade with the retrenchment in aid. Norway is now ranked as the most generous for providing 0.95% of GNI in ODA.)

Denmark has long striven to remain among the 'front-runners' in the relative size of its aid, for decades maintaining its aid above the 0.7% of GNI target much discussed in the UN, and the government is committed to keeping its aid at 0.8% of GNI at the minimum. In contrast, the US has shown little interest in what its ranking is among aid-giving governments. In fact, no sane government official in Washington would evoke UN targets as a rationale for increasing US aid. And the evident poor performance of the US in aid-giving as a percentage of GNI is only occasionally mentioned and produces few lamentations. Clearly, there are very different attitudes in these two countries regarding the appropriate size and role of ODA in their foreign policies.

Another contrast between US and Denmark is the proportion of aid allocated to multilateral organizations. The US provides far less of its aid to UN agencies, the World Bank and other regional development banks – 13% in 2007 – than does Denmark (38% in the same year). This trend has been

2 See OECD, 2008, for a report on the volume of official development assistance in 2007.

evident in the history of these countries' aid-giving but in the case of the US, multilateral aid is at a particularly low proportion of total US aid. There are several reasons for this difference: the US is currently providing a large amount of funding for reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan which is unavoidably bilateral. Denmark is providing high levels of aid to the EU to fulfill its commitments as a member state. More fundamentally, Denmark, like many small countries, looks to international organizations to constrain powerful member states and supports their activities through its assistance. It has also been the case that small countries have found it useful to channel their assistance through multilateral institutions to avoid the costs of administering an aid program that may be relatively small in absolute terms but which inevitably has high overhead expenses.

In the US, there has always been a much greater tendency towards unilateralism than in most other countries, reflecting the less hospitable views in the US government and among much of the public towards international organizations (in which the US has often been a lone opponent of many proposals, above all in the UN General Assembly) and any possible encroachments on US sovereignty emanating from such organizations as well as a desire to brand its aid with its name to wield maximum influence in support of its global leadership role. These skeptical views of international organizations and the remnants of isolationist tendencies in the US (which is practically a continent unto itself and typically very self-absorbed) also affect the receptivity of the US government and informed public to advice from the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD on foreign aid. DAC peer reviews of US aid and recommendations are usually ignored in Washington and get very little attention even from development-oriented think tanks, much less senior public officials or the media. In Denmark and other European countries, in contrast, the views of the DAC can receive considerable attention and even exert policy influence.

Purposes and Policies

Both Denmark and the US deploy their aid for multiple purposes. Among the most prominent in both countries are promoting development in poor countries and furthering the diplomatic interests of the donors. But one thing is striking about the literature on aid policies in the two governments: US offi-

cials tend to put their national interest motives first, while Danish officials tend to put their development motives first in justifications for aid.³

These different approaches to the goals and rationales of foreign aid reflect a real difference in priorities in the two countries' aid programs. Historically, US aid began with two programs – aid for Greece and Turkey in 1947 and the Marshall Plan in 1948 – that were driven primarily by security concerns, namely countering the expansion of Soviet and communist influence in Western Europe. Without the national security rationale, it is very doubtful that in the late 1940s the US Congress would have supported more than the minimum amount of aid necessary to prevent a humanitarian crisis in early post-war Europe. It was only later in the 1970s and 1980s that the development goal of US aid became more prominent, reflecting the growing influence of non-governmental organizations within the US in supporting aid for development abroad.⁴

Danish aid really began in the early 1960s, when the government initiated a campaign to mobilize support for an aid program among Danish non-governmental organizations. Support proved enthusiastic and ensured that Danish aid had a strong development orientation, reflecting the views of church-based NGOs and support organizations throughout the country. These groups have remained a key and essential component of the domestic 'resource base' for Danish aid and have influenced the goals and priorities of that aid over the years.

The national interest in Danish aid has been far less linked to stemming the spread of communism or promoting peace in the Middle East and elsewhere – goals which have so informed US aid in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa. Copenhagen has been more driven by ensuring a Danish presence in regions of the world where it has few economic or political ties, to permit Denmark to enjoy more than a limited regional profile in Western Europe that its

3 While the development community in Washington laments the intrusion of international politics and US diplomatic goals into US aid-giving (potentially competing with development purposes) and envy the prominent emphasis on development in Danish aid, it seems that some in Denmark and elsewhere regret the lack of diplomatic concerns in Danish aid since it makes that aid less easily protected from attacks or neglect by parliamentarians or the public. We all share a common struggle for the right mix of motives in our aid-giving.

4 For more details on the evolving domestic politics of US aid, see Lancaster, 2006. There is also a chapter on the origins and evolution of Danish aid in the book.

size and history might otherwise dictate. In an important sense, Danish development goals abroad have led its diplomacy. The reverse has most often been true in the US.

Both countries have used their aid for purposes other than diplomacy or development. Danish aid has had (and continues to have) an important commercial component involving the promotion of Danish exports. Commercial goals have been less salient in US aid apart from the practice – still continued – of tying a large proportion of US bilateral aid to US goods and services. The difference here is that in the past Denmark has used its aid actively to promote exports by aiding some ‘non-program’ countries according to their commercial interest. US aid has been more passive in furthering US exports -- its allocation by country or use has not been determined by commercial motives. But the purchase of US goods and services as part of aid-funded projects has been tied to the US market. This practice began in the early 1960s as a means of bolstering the US balance of payments. Once in place, it has proved hard to change and remains in place, at least for USAID programs.

Both governments have begun to allocate growing amounts of their aid to ‘global issues’ such as reducing or adapting to climate change (on the part of Denmark) or fighting HIV/AIDS (on the part of the US). These are issues that are easily grasped and supported by the publics of the two countries (while promoting ‘development’ can be a bit abstract and distant), and they promise to affect the lives of many in the two donor countries, as well as the lives of those in aid-receiving countries. It seems likely in the future that the US will follow Denmark in allocating aid for activities involving climate change.

This trend towards using aid to address global problems raises an issue that is just beginning to become visible in the US. What should the balance be between aid for these types of issues and aid for development and poverty reduction in the world? As long as aid levels for global issues remained a small proportion of total aid, there was no issue. But in the US at least, aid for HIV/AIDS has ballooned in an unprecedented fashion – for some recipients of US bilateral aid, it is set to become 85% or more of their total bilateral aid allocation from the US in 2008. And as a portion of total US aid, assistance to fight HIV/AIDS is set to become at least a third of US bilateral aid worldwide in 2009. There actually seems to be a bidding war in Washington to raise this level: the Congress has consistently supported more aid for fighting HIV/AIDS

than the administration has requested (and is now passing legislation to raise the total annual level of this funding to USD 10 billion per year – fully half of current total US ODA). Is this the future of foreign aid – more to fight global problems and less to help reduce poverty in poor countries?⁵ The answer in the US may well be ‘yes’. It is not clear what Denmark’s answer will be.

Another common policy concern in Denmark and the US is what to do about failing or failed states, and more specifically, how to use aid to address the problems of these countries. The source of this concern is the same in both countries: failing and failed states can become sources and sanctuaries for terrorists. A secondary concern is the humanitarian cost of state failure. Both countries also face the same problems with this new goal: how shall we define ‘fragile’, ‘failing’ and ‘failed’ states? There is no settled definition at present.⁶ The problem is that most states – especially in poor countries -- have some serious weaknesses often in areas such as the delivery of essential services to their citizens, providing security within their borders, creating an environment for investment and growth and ensuring political and civil rights for their people. But which ones are most important and at what point do weaknesses in some or all of these functions lead to civil violence and state collapse? And why do these problems worsen, improve or stay the same?

We still lack definitions and a theory of state failure. As a result, our abilities to intervene to reverse state fragility and failure (sometimes called ‘nation-building’ policies) remain limited. Nevertheless, the US military is beginning to provide economic assistance to ‘stabilize’ fragile states (e.g., in the Sahel and Horn of Africa), raising concerns in the development community in the US of a potential ‘militarization’ of US aid. US aid is far from being militarized but the issue of how much involvement the military in the US or Denmark should have in aid-giving is a real one.

5 Some see HIV/AIDS as more a humanitarian problem where it exists rather than a ‘global problem’. But others see it as part of a broader set of problems involving the outbreak and spread of infectious diseases – what breaks out in one country can spread rapidly to many others, like TB, SARS and others. Yet others see it as a global problem for the potential threat it can pose to the security of afflicted countries (as the disease spreads and, since it is often most intense in the military, can weaken security structures and encourage local and region conflicts). It is all of these and more, including a grave threat to development. But most importantly, addressing it involves focusing more on a single problem rather than the integrated set of challenges that most typically constitutes the development problem in poor countries.

6 For a recent effort to define and classify ‘weak states’, see Rice & Patrick, 2008.

There is one emerging goal of aid in Denmark that has relatively little prominence in the US – its use to support immigration and refugee policies. The issue of immigration is a major one in US politics, but it takes a rather different form than in Denmark. In the US, the debate is mainly about what to do about illegal immigrants (of which there are an estimated 12 million and growing) – should they be sent home or provided a ‘path to citizenship’? Foreign aid plays almost no role in these debates (except occasionally in regard to funding economic activities in Mexico).

In Denmark the immigration issue appears to be less about illegal immigrants and more about the integration of peoples from very different cultures into what has been one of the world’s most homogenous societies. One approach is to discourage immigration by furthering development in countries of origin and encouraging a return to such countries on the part of immigrants. There does not seem to be much Danish aid allocated specifically to strengthening countries of origin, but there is quite a lot of rhetoric about refugees and immigration in what the government and government officials say about these issues with regard to Danish aid, especially since the center-right coalition government took power in 2001. An outside observer might be tempted to identify a significant use of Danish aid for this purpose, given the prominence of the issue, including in Danish aid discussions.

Approaches to the Management and Delivery of Aid

There is another contrast between the US and Denmark – in the delivery of foreign aid. Denmark, along with a number of other European governments, began in the 1990s to provide a portion of its aid in the form of budget support for functional ministries in developing countries. This form of aid is often called Sector Wide Investment Programs or SWAPs. Often pooled with aid from other donor governments to finance part of the budget of a health or education ministry’s budget, SWAPs are intended to reduce the administrative burdens on recipients of multiple aid donors with their own priorities and administrative requirements, to support the programmatic priorities of those recipient and to avoid the tendency among aid donors to create new organizational arrangements (at times outside of recipient governments) to implement the aid, thus reducing the capacity building impact of the aid and the sustainability of the activities it has funded.

The US provides very little program aid its funding being mainly for projects agreed with recipient governments or implemented with non-governmental organizations and contractors. And there is little inclination in Washington to shift to SWAPs. These types of aid transfers are regarded as risky and vulnerable to corruption. But the real reasons are based on domestic politics in the US: the US Congress wants to be able to identify concrete results from US aid expenditures, which is not possible with pooled aid funds for budget support. It is probably not too cynical to suppose that some of those NGOs supporting US foreign aid appropriations, which are also often the implementers of aid projects, are unenthusiastic about SWAPs because such aid is likely to be managed and implemented mainly by the local ministries receiving it with little NGO involvement.

There is another important contrast between the management of Danish and US aid. The newest US bilateral aid agency the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC, established in 2003) – which is set eventually to handle USD 5 billion in aid per year provides its aid based on the performance of potential recipient governments according to a list of objective indicators, given below with their sources:⁷

Indicator	Category	Source
Civil liberties	Ruling justly	Freedom House
Political rights	Ruling justly	Freedom House
Voice and accountability	Ruling justly	World Bank Institute
Government effectiveness	Ruling justly	World Bank Institute
Rule of law	Ruling justly	World Bank Institute
Control of corruption	Ruling justly	World Bank Institute
Immunization rate	Investing in people	World Health Organization
Public expenditure on health	Investing in people	World Health Organization
Girls' primary education completion rate	Investing in people	UNESCO *
Public expenditure on primary education	Investing in people	UNESCO and national sources

7 See MCC, 2008.

Indicator	Category	Source
Cost of starting a business	Economic freedom	International Finance Corporation
Inflation rate	Economic freedom	IMF WEO **
Days to start a business	Economic freedom	International Finance Corporation
Trade policy	Economic freedom	Heritage Foundation
Regulatory quality	Economic freedom	World Bank Institute
Fiscal policy	Economic freedom	National sources, cross-checked with IMF WEO
Natural resource management index	Supplemental information	CIESIN/Yale ***
Land rights and access index	Supplemental information	IFAD/International Finance Corporation

* UNESCO = United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

** IMF WEO = International Monetary Fund's World Economic Outlook database.

*** CIESIN = Social and Economic Data Application Center at Columbia University.

This 'performance-based' aid is in effect a form of *ex ante* conditionality. While most donors have some form of conditionality associated with their aid, this approach is particularly formal and evident. It is intended to enhance the effectiveness of the aid (on the assumption that countries with better policies will make more effective use of aid) and to protect it from being diverted to diplomatic uses as US aid often is. The amount of aid per recipient, provided in five-year compacts, is also supposed to be large enough in volume (e.g., several hundred million dollars) to create compelling incentives for such governments to conform to the performance indicators and for those governments not yet eligible to introduce needed reforms to gain eligibility.

The other element in the MCC is that recipient governments are supposed to come up with a plan for using the aid. They must consult with their people, set up a local organization to manage the aid and come up with an acceptable plan for its use. These requirements are intended to ensure that the aid has local ownership and involvement. It appears that many of the sixteen governments with MCC compacts have requested funding for infrastructure projects to which the MCC has agreed. Infrastructure has not been a focus of US aid

funding for many decades, so this represents a change in the way the US is doing business in its aid-giving.

The combination of management approaches in the MCC represents a new and potentially promising model for delivering foreign aid. However, it has yet to prove itself. The Corporation has been slow to start work, and disbursements remain quite low – several hundred million dollars out of almost USD 5 billion appropriated by Congress. Part of the problem has been on the US side in getting a start up government organization operating and partly as been on the recipient side in fulfilling the requirements for eligibility and operation in a context of weak institutions and capacity. There is no government aid-giving agency quite like the MCC in any other donor country, including that of Denmark.

The Organization of Aid

Perhaps the area of greatest contrast between Danish and US aid is in the way the two governments have organized themselves to manage their aid. The US aid system is highly fragmented, with most of it outside the control of the Department of State. Denmark's aid is wholly integrated into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. While the way Denmark organizes its aid does not seem to be a matter of controversy in Copenhagen at present, the way the US organizes its aid is now hotly debated in Washington, with the prospect of organizational changes likely in the future.

*Denmark's Aid Organization*⁸

There are three major players in Danish aid: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (with its embassies abroad) the Danida Board and Parliament. Unlike most aid donors, there is no separate aid agency responsible for policy and/or implementation of Danish development cooperation.

Responsibility for managing Danish aid is fully integrated into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including budget, programming systems and personnel. There are two ministers – one for foreign affairs and one for development – responsible for the ministry as a whole. Danish embassies in the field house Denmark's aid experts in the field and have considerable discretion in the plan-

8 For a detailed description of Danish aid, its organization and policies, see OECD, 2007a.

ning and implementation of aid-funded programs.

A second major element in Denmark's aid organization is the Danida Board, made up of nine prominent individuals from various segments of Danish society, who serve in their personal capacity to advise the Minister of Development on development aid programs and projects, NGO projects and research activities funded with Danish aid, and sometimes endorsing those programs; to monitor country programs; and to advise on bilateral and multilateral aid policies. The Board has long had an influence beyond its formal advisory role for the Minister. Parliament often relies on the Board's opinions on Danish aid programs in its own considerations, giving the Board considerable influence with both government and parliament.

The Danish Parliament's role in Danish aid involves reviewing and approving each year the government's policy priorities and examining the aid portfolio. There are frequently major debates in Parliament on Denmark's aid, helping to inform parliamentarians (who sometimes travel abroad to observe projects and programs) and to build knowledge and consensus on Danish assistance.

Thus, the Danish government has a relatively simple and by all accounts, efficient system for managing its foreign assistance -- in considerable contrast to the US.

The US Aid Organization

The US aid system is highly fragmented and becoming more so by the year. At present, there are two major bilateral subcabinet-level aid agencies -- the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the MCC, mentioned above -- in addition to major aid bilateral programs run by the Department of State (including the very large amounts of funding to fight HIV/AIDS) and increasingly, aid programs operated by the Department of Defense. Responsibility for US involvement in international financial institutions (like the World Bank) is lodged in the Department of the Treasury. There are two small aid agencies (the African Development Foundation and the InterAmerican Foundation); and modest aid programs located in all other federal departments. For example, the Department of Labor provides aid abroad in support of labor standards and fighting child labor; the Department of Health and Human Services (through its Center for Disease Control) works on international health issues; the Department of Energy provides technical advice to govern-

ments of developing countries on energy issues, and so on. The chart below lists the government agencies providing economic assistance:⁹

The following is a comprehensive list of all US Government organizations that have funded foreign assistance projects in the Fiscal Year 2006:

- African Development Foundation
- Department of Agriculture
 - Agricultural Research Service (ARS)
 - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
 - Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service (CSREES)
 - Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS)
 - Forest Service (FS)
- Department of Commerce
 - US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - Commercial Law Development Program (CLDP)
 - International Trade Administration (ITA)
 - National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)
 - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
- Department of Defense
 - Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA)
 - Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)
 - US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Department of Energy
- Department of Health and Human Services
 - Center for Disease Control
 - Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
- Department of Interior
 - Compact of Free Association
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Department of Justice
- Department of Labor
- Department of State

9 See USAID, Greenbook.

- Department of Treasury
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Export-Import Bank
- Federal Trade Commission
- Inter-American Foundation
- Millennium Challenge Corporation
- National Endowment for Democracy
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation
- Peace Corps
- US Trade and Development Agency
- US Agency for International Development (USAID)

Further, in a number of these cases, decisions on policy and country allocations of aid are separate from implementation – another form of fragmentation. This is the case with a number of the aid programs located in the Department of State which USAID implements.

Finally, in a recent effort at reforming the organizational structure of US aid, USAID was partially integrated into the Department of State, including its budget planning functions, but not its personnel system. The Administrator of USAID is now also Director of Foreign Assistance, reporting to the Secretary of State. This reform, which has stalled since the former Director of Foreign Assistance resigned in 2007, was interrupted before it was fully implemented.

The US Congress also plays a major role in influencing US foreign aid. It must pass legislation each year appropriating aid funding. It holds public hearings on the major issues involving aid, and draws up and passes legislation which lists not only the total amount of aid the administration can spend, but to a considerable extent also for some US aid programs, how it can and cannot spend it. For example, it told the administration to spend USD 546 million in Colombia in 2008; USD 13 million for democracy activities in Burma; USD 75 million for Afghan women and girls and many other specific program and country allocations.¹⁰ None of these legislative earmarks and directives is necessarily bad, but there are very many of them, and they tend to sharply constrain the administration in managing much of its bilateral aid.

10 Council on Foreign Relations, 2007: 1025ff.

The problem with the highly fragmented US aid system is that there may be duplication of efforts or one program can undercut another. For example, the Department of Defense funding for the digging of wells or building of schools in West African countries has apparently had little connection with existing US aid programs in those countries or with development strategies associated with them. Synergies are lost and applying the aid in support of a broad set of goals and strategies becomes impossible. It is sometimes the case that even US ambassadors in the field do not know the entire range of US aid-funded programs in their countries.

The fragmentation and incoherence in US aid-giving and the partial reforms that sought to integrate USAID into the Department of State have provoked a vigorous debate in Washington over how US aid should be organized in the next administration. The debate has been conducted in think-tank meetings, Congressional hearings and a series of reports on the future of US aid and US foreign policy generally. The reports and books are listed below:

- *On the Brink: Commission on Weak States and US National Security*, Center for Global Development, 2004
- *Security by Other Means*, Lael Brainard, ed., the Brookings Institution, 2006
- *Commission on Smart Power*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2007
- *Beyond Assistance*, The HELP Commission Report on Foreign Assistance Reform, 2007
- *Embassies Grapple to Guide Foreign Aid*, A report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, 2007
- *Integrating 21st Century Development and Security Assistance*, Final Report of the Task Force on Non-Traditional Security Assistance, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2007.

The major concerns and recommendations are:

- Need to elevate development as key element in US foreign policy to support US interests, values and leadership in the world
- Need for overall vision of the role of foreign aid

- Need for greater focus on limited number of goals for the use of aid
- Concern about the impact of the Department of Defense in the aid and development business
- Need for reform to overcome problems of organizational fragmentation and disarray in aid system
- Need better to explain to the American people the objectives and importance of foreign aid/development

The specific aid organizational issue emerging from these reports and debates is whether major US aid programs should be located in a new Department of Development (modeled on the Department for International Development in the UK), or whether the Department of State should have more control over US aid, with USAID under the control of (and probably merged into) the Department of State. At stake here is the issue of which interests control a major portion of US aid – in a separate department which would have as its mission promoting development abroad, or in the State Department, which would ensure that US aid was closely aligned with US foreign-policy priorities? The development community, which supports the first option, wants to strengthen development in US foreign policy and believes that a unified, independent, cabinet-level agency given this mission would ensure the latter's autonomy and integrity. The foreign-policy community, which generally supports the second option, wants to ensure that aid and development support US foreign-policy goals generally. The development community fears that – given the frequent conflicts between development and diplomatic priorities – the development mission will be lost if USAID or other aid agencies come under greater control by the Department of State.

The next president of the US will have these and other options before him or her for reorganizing US aid. Should that president be a Democrat, the likelihood of an aid reorganization giving heightened status and autonomy to development in US foreign policy would be greater, though creating a cabinet-level development agency would be politically costly with Congress since members of Congress usually try to vote as infrequently as possible for foreign aid legislation or add amendments to that legislation that may benefit their constituents without any relationship to the purpose of the legislation and often opposed

by the administration.¹¹ Should the next president be a Republican, the likelihood is that he will maintain the current system or bring aid agencies closer to the Department of State. It is also possible that, with the pressing and difficult challenges the new president will face in both domestic and foreign policy, he or she will do nothing with US aid organization until later in the administration's term – if ever.

WHY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US AND DANISH AID?

The contrasts between the Danish and American aid programs and the obvious need for organizational reform in the American program naturally raise the question – why the differences? And why does the US not adopt the clearly more streamlined and efficient Danish model of aid organization in which all aid functions are located in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

The answers to these questions take us into the fundamental domestic political and international factors shaping US aid, which are very different from those shaping Danish aid and point to the fact, sometimes overlooked, that even international policies of governments are strongly influenced by domestic politics.

The Volume of Aid

Denmark is near the top of the list of the most generous aid donors relative to the size of the donor's economy; the US is at the bottom. Why? Some in the US would argue that if you take into account the total burden of international engagement, which would include defense expenditures as well as aid, the US

11 In theory, the Congress should renew authorizing legislation every two years. But because it is legally possible to avoid passing that legislation biannually, no foreign assistance authorization bills have been passed since 1985. Legislation appropriating aid funds must be passed each year or programs must come to a halt and this has been done. Sometimes changes in aid programs can also be passed as amendments to other legislation, thus avoiding a full blown reauthorization of foreign assistance. But for a major reorganization of US aid, new authorizing legislation would have to be considered and passed by Congress and the President would have to work hard to get the needed votes and to keep the legislation 'clean' of amendments not relevant or acceptable. This process is costly, judging from past experience. For a brief history of the problems of aid reform in the US, see Lancaster, 2008.

would likely rank much higher and Denmark lower.¹² But the overall burden-sharing of international commitments is not the most satisfactory explanation for the wide difference in aid effort – indeed, burden-sharing is seldom mentioned in discussions of relative aid efforts.

What explains this difference is something much more fundamental to each country: it involves the different foundational ideas, widely shared in each society, about the appropriate role of the state in society. The US, of all the world's developed countries, is the most oriented towards 'classical liberalism' or libertarianism – meaning that the values of limited government, individual liberty and free markets are widely shared by many Americans, even to a considerable extent by those on the left of the US political spectrum. The American republic was established at the end of the eighteenth century, when the classical liberalism of John Locke, Adam Smith and others was in vogue. The ideas of these philosophers inspired the founding documents of the new republic – the Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution. Debates on the use of public resources – for example, to relieve suffering in Ireland during the potato famine of 1847 and later – were partly couched in libertarian terms, with the argument that it was an inappropriate use of the US taxpayers' monies to help individuals beyond the borders of the US – an extension of the classical liberal view that the government that governs least governs best, and that taxes (i.e. seizure of private property by government) should be imposed only for the most compelling purposes of benefit to the taxpayers themselves.¹³

These views still play a role in the attitudes of many in the US towards the role of government in society. Some in the US still regard foreign aid to better the lives of foreigners as an inappropriate use of US taxes. The prolonged debate in the US over health care is another manifestation of the basic disagreement about a greater or lesser role of government in society. The debate over

12 It is worth noting here that the Center for Global Development in Washington DC. has produced a Commitment to Development Index which includes aid but also trade, investment and migration policies related to development plus policies with regard to the environment, security and technology. (This Index does not include expenditures on defense; 'security' expenditures involve specific activities like peace-keeping which have a direct effect on development in poor countries.) In this Index, Denmark ranked second in 2007; the US ranked 14 out of 21. See Center for Global Development in the references.

13 For more detail regarding the classical liberal tendencies in US thinking, see Lancaster, 2006: Chapter 3.

reducing federal taxes is yet another manifestation of this tension – those in favor of tax reductions are frequently motivated by the goal of forcing a reduction in the role of government in society.

Another manifestation of the resistance to aid-giving among a considerable portion of the US public is the long-held skepticism that aid was or could be effective in bringing about beneficial change in other societies. Decades before there were empirical studies of aid effectiveness (which are now numerous but still far from satisfactory), American conservatives, echoing the arguments of the late Professor Peter Bauer of the London School of Economics, argued that concessional transfers from one state to another were unnecessary to spur development and were doomed to be ineffective or worse because they strengthened the very states that were most often the obstacles to successful growth.¹⁴

This is not to deny that there is also widespread support for using public resources to support development abroad – polls frequently show over half of the US population supporting such use of government funding. But polling also shows the support for foreign aid by the US public to be among the lowest of any major aid-giving country. Foreign assistance for development itself has been a highly contested and often very unpopular policy since its beginning in the early years after World War II. Presidents have in recent decades avoided mentioning foreign aid in their major speeches, and members of Congress have avoided voting for aid if they possibly could. The aversion to foreign aid may have abated somewhat since 9/11, when the American population woke up to the dangers of ignoring problems beyond the borders of the US, but there is no guarantee that their increased support for aid is permanent.

As a result of the divided public on foreign aid, US aid-giving has long rested on two basic approaches – it has been used for diplomatic and national security purposes not only because they were important to US national interests, but because only those purposes could garner the grudging acquiescence of the political right in the US for foreign economic assistance. Aid has also been used for development to maintain the support of the political left. Pursuing one of these fundamental goals without the other can torpedo US aid politically.

14 See for example Bauer, 1981. Bauer's thinking has long permeated the work of the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank in Washington DC., and the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank also in Washington DC. Both of these institutions have produced numerous papers on aid and aid effectiveness.

Arguably, that is in part what happened to US aid levels in the 1990s, when the diplomatic uses of that aid greatly diminished with the end of the Cold War and overall levels of US aid fell sharply. The War on Terror has re-established a driving diplomatic purpose for US aid, which has risen accordingly.

The unpopularity of aid among a significant portion of the US public contrasts with its popularity among Danes. Public opinion polls have shown consistently high levels of support for generous volumes of aid in Denmark and among Nordic countries generally. This difference from the US, reflecting a different view of the legitimate role of the state in society, can also be observed in government tax revenues as a percentage of GNP: the percentages in Sweden, Denmark, France and Norway are the highest in the OECD (between 44% and 50%); the equivalent percentage in the US is 28%.¹⁵ Behind these dramatic differences is not just a history of classical liberal views in the US, but a greater embrace of social democratic ideas in the Nordic countries and a greater comfort on the part of the population with a much more prominent role for the state in society. This has translated into greater support among the Danish public for a more generous program of aid to support development and poverty reduction abroad.

The Goals of Aid

The differences in the goals of aid between the US and Denmark is related primarily to the geostrategic positions of the two countries. The US regards itself as a global leader with worldwide national interests; it has a universal presence and a frequent involvement in trying to shape global issues and crises. It seeks for example, to eliminate terrorist activity; to mediate political crises in Kenya; to dampen tensions between India and Pakistan; to take the lead on resisting the spread of weapons of mass destruction; to try to bring about peace between Palestinians and Israelis; to influence the production and export of drugs in Latin America. In many of these efforts, US policies are less than successful; sometimes they are poorly informed or managed; but at other times US involvement is essential for a resolution of problems. Whether well-informed or successful or not, the perspective from Washington is that a worldwide US presence and engagement is required in most major international issues.

15 OECD, 2007b. The data is for 2006.

Foreign aid has proved very useful in supporting US global leadership. It can reward friends; it can provide incentives to foreign governments to support US policies. It can be used to symbolize ties between the US and other governments or show US support for particular international initiatives. It can on occasion buy votes in the UN or bases for the use of the US military. These and other diplomatic uses of economic assistance can coincide with the pursuit of long-term development goals. But they can and often do conflict with those goals, especially when it comes to the types of government the US chooses to support with its aid for diplomatic purposes. It is likely that the US would provide the government of Pakistan with little or no aid, given that government's record of corruption and economic ineptitude, if the 'War on Terror' did not exist. Much of the aid to Middle Eastern governments falls into the same category.

Thus, the role of the US as a global leader seeking to advance its own worldwide interests and manage a host of international crises inevitably influences the aims of US aid, one major one being what we have termed 'diplomacy' – peace-making, containing rogue governments, fighting terrorist networks and, in the days of the Cold War, containing the expansion of Soviet influence.

As a small country, Denmark enjoys a different geostrategic position one which does not have a global scope or active engagement worldwide. That does not mean that Danish aid has no geostrategic components, but these tend to be far less demanding than those felt by public officials in Washington. The Danish government, on the other hand, decided to deploy a proportion of its aid actively to promote its commercial interests abroad – in part as a means of bolstering the 'domestic resource base' supporting its aid. It is difficult for an outsider to judge how important this goal remains, but it does not seem to have disappeared as yet. Perhaps Denmark has had the luxury of using its aid in this way because it did not have major diplomatic imperatives shaping its aid-giving. One wonders whether US aid would have had a more prominent commercial orientation if that aid had not been used so much for supporting US diplomatic goals abroad.

One further difference in aims to be noted: as mentioned above, in recent years US aid has become much more tied to fighting HIV/AIDS abroad. While HIV/AIDS is a terrible plague worldwide and especially in Africa, the recent US emphasis on providing very large amounts of aid to fight this disease

is pure domestic politics. This use of aid is one that the political right in Congress and elsewhere can support (especially the Christian right) as a manifestation of the US being a 'Good Samaritan' and one the political left in Congress and beyond can also support in terms of relieving human suffering abroad. It is one in particular that important elements of the evangelical movement in the US have come to embrace – and this movement is an increasingly influential force in the domestic politics of US aid. It is an issue the President can support because he undoubtedly believes in it, and it also provides him with a legacy of addressing a devastating global scourge. This coalition of domestic support for a particular use of aid is almost unprecedented in the politics of US aid and explains the extraordinary amount of funding dedicated to this goal.

Approaches to the Management of Aid

The MCC represents a new approach to aid-giving for the US. Behind this effort is not only an experiment with applying the concepts of performance-based aid and giving the recipient government maximum responsibility and 'ownership' of the aid, but another experiment as well. President Bush promised the Congress in effect that if they would support the creation of the MCC with substantial amounts of new funding, he would ensure that the aid would be used more effectively than in the past, based on the criteria for choosing recipients and delivering the assistance. (Neither of these experiments can yet be said to be successful.) Thus, the emphasis on greater aid effectiveness was in part a response to the skepticism long present in the US, for reasons explained above, about the appropriateness and efficacy of aid – especially where the monies were transferred from one state to another. The aid skeptics in Congress have been quiescent lately, so the President's implicit bargain has worked – for a time. But eventually, the question of whether performance-based, recipient-driven aid is more effective will have to be answered. And that debate, which cannot be many years in the future, will likely help reawaken the skepticism many Americans feel about aid and, more fundamentally, the role of government in promoting economic progress.

A second difference between the US and Denmark in the delivery of aid – i.e. the aversion to SWAPs in Washington – is also in considerable part based on domestic politics in the US. Because the Congress plays such an influential role in shaping US foreign-aid programs (and most other US government

spending programs) and because it expects to see concrete results for its aid appropriations, it is politically difficult for any US administration to allocate a significant proportion of its aid to budget support in recipient countries. There is no US 'flag' on the outcomes of those expenditures since they are pooled with aid from other governments and the recipient ministry to finance expenditures. One may argue that, since most aid is fungible, having an American or Danish plaque on a bridge or health clinic is illusory. But illusions play a large role in politics and are sometimes necessary to maintain support for unpopular programs.

A second reason why the US government is unlikely to turn much of its aid into program support is because the NGOs and contractors who make up much of the constituency for aid within the US also play a major role in delivering that aid. As mentioned above, if USAID funds were shifted from projects to budget support, these groups might lose the grants and contracts for implementing aid activities. They are understandably resistant to program aid and successive administrations have recognized the need to maintain their support for the overall aid program. One of the political problems confronting the MCC is that, because it transfers its aid to governments to manage – which means that US NGOs have a negligible role in implementing the aid – the domestic constituency for USAID within the US political system does not exist for the MCC, making it vulnerable to cuts or even elimination in the future.

CONCLUSION

What this entire discussion demonstrates is that the policies, goals, organization and delivery of foreign aid is deeply embedded in the domestic political systems and geopolitical postures of donor governments. Major differences in the foreign-aid programs of Denmark and the US must be understood in terms of the fundamental attitudes and norms of their populations towards the role of government in society and their country's role in the world, as well as the structure and function of the different political systems of the two countries. These factors in turn derive from the very different geographies and histories of the two countries, as well as their role internationally.

We in the development community in Washington look with envy on the

generosity of the Danish government in its aid-giving and in the relatively coherent policy and organizational structure of its aid. But we must not covet what we cannot have. If our aid system were organized in the way Denmark's is – with responsibilities for aid located primarily in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – we would be in danger of losing the development mission of that aid, as it would most likely be drawn off for use in managing short-term crises in distant lands. And then, the political left in Congress and elsewhere would find great fault with the use of that aid for mainly diplomatic purposes and likely cut it severely.

Not everyone in Washington agrees with this view. Those in the foreign policy community will take particular exception, believing that the Department of State should have maximum control over all the tools of foreign policy to ensure that they are consistent with the major aims of US foreign policy. They will also argue that the Department of State is able to manage aid programs and preserve their development mission as well. History thus far suggests otherwise. Thus, the issue of the organization of US aid is likely to be hotly debated in the coming years, especially since the new administration will have to face the present organizational chaos.

REFERENCES

- Bauer, Peter (1981), *Equality, the Third World and the Economic Delusion*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Center for Global Development, Commitment to Development Index 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.cgdev.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- Council on Foreign Relations (2007), Consolidated Appropriations act 2008, 17 December 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.cfr.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- Lancaster, Carol (2006), *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lancaster, Carol (2008), *George Bush's Foreign Aid: Transformation or Chaos?* Washington DC.: Center for Global Development.
- MCC (2008), Selection indicators for MCC assistance programs. Online, HTTP: [www.mcc.gov] (accessed 20-05-2008).

- OECD (2007a), Peer Review of Denmark, The Development Assistance Committee (DAC), Paris, 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.oecd.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- OECD (2007b), OECD countries' tax burdens back up to 2000 historic highs, Total tax revenue as percentage of GDP 2006, 17 September 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.oecd.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- OECD (2008), Debt Relief is down: Other ODA rises slightly, Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD-DAC), 4 April 2008. Online, HTTP: [www.oecd.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- Rice, Susan E. & Stewart Patrick (2008), Index of State Weakness in the Developing World, Report, Brookings Institution, Washington DC, 2008. Online HTTP: [www.brookings.edu] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- USAID, Greenbook, Overseas Loans and Grants, List of US. Government Organizations Involved in Overseas Assistance. Online, HTTP: [www.usaid.gov] (accessed 20-05-2008).

The Impeccable Ally? Denmark, NATO, and the Uncertain Future of Top Tier Membership

Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning¹

Denmark, a founding member of the Atlantic Alliance, was for many years a reluctant Atlantic ally. Given its geographical location and possession of Greenland, both of which ensured American interest in its national survival, Denmark maintained low defence expenditures and dissented on key issues within the Alliance.² This is no longer the case, since Denmark changed in the post-Cold War world, becoming engaged in various crisis operations far from its territory and simultaneously undertaking to build the type of reaction forces that NATO calls for. Observers thus concluded that Danish foreign policy had become militarized.³ The terrorist attacks of September 2001 brought further change. Where Denmark had recently become accustomed to using military force as a means of crisis management and settlement, it now saw itself as part of a strategic equation: Denmark had direct enemies and needed to deploy and use military force to defeat them.⁴ Denmark the strategic actor subsequently crafted a defence agreement in 2004 that involved a wholesale reform of its defence. Gone was the idea of drafting a mobile force on to a main territorial defence force. Today, the partially professionalized defence force is an expeditionary force, while various other homeland defence units are in charge of territorial defence. Denmark, though running a low defence budget, thus began producing the kind of output that NATO kept calling for: deploy-

1 Jens Ringsmose is a post-doc and Sten Rynning is professor at the Department of Political Science at the University of Southern Denmark.

2 Villaume, 1995.

3 Heurlin, 1993.

4 Rynning, 2003.

able expeditionary forces that were sustainable in terms of national logistics and reinforcement and that could be put in harm's way in the combat zones where NATO now needed to be engaged. As Denmark scored high on most accounts, it appeared to have completed its transformation from a reluctant to an impeccable NATO ally.

We take stock of this transformation in this article. There is no doubt that Denmark has changed and gained leverage within the Alliance. Witness the access gained by Prime Minister Fogh Rasmussen to US President W. Bush: early in the Bush presidency, in 2002, Fogh Rasmussen was accorded an Oval Office meeting, which at the time was hailed in the press as an exceptional reception; by 2008 he had been riding cross-country bikes with President W. Bush at Camp David and had become one of just a handful close allied leaders to visit the President in his home in Crawford, Texas. In the first section of this article we therefore lay out the nature of the Danish changes and the country's ability to claim more influence in the diplomacy of the Alliance.

We also question the durability of this phenomenon, however, as sections two and three make clear. Section two examines the international context within which Denmark must operate. Section three considers the choices Denmark has made and is likely to make as it experiences the push and pull of conflicting international and domestic pressures. Internationally, the long-standing ambition to develop deployable and sustainable forces – an ambition Denmark has largely met – has encountered the complex reality of irregular or asymmetric warfare. To fight wars is to possess a very large range of skills while being strategically able to coordinate all instruments in the national and international panoply of means. This challenge stymies Western and indeed global diplomacy and it has pushed the NATO transformation agenda, defined in 2002-2003, off track. The national repercussions, treated in the third and final section, are notable. The Danish defence agreement of 2004 did not really address the challenge of comprehensive planning, which emerged subsequently, and was more a product of NATO's transformation agenda of 2001-2003. The intervening years have conspired to present Denmark with a new challenge if it is to safeguard its standing as an impeccable ally. Comprehensive planning, along with the 2007 pull-out of Iraq, has provided political relief in so far as Danish policy-makers have been able to discuss not war but reconstruction, thus taking the sting out of the challenge of being a strategic actor (who will

you fight; how will you defeat them).⁵ The strategic challenge has not gone away, however: will Denmark will take on the enemies of the American world order and fight them? The challenge comes in a new guise, though: will Denmark overcome its political bias against the EU in defence affairs and engage fully in the political-strategic dimension of comprehensive planning; and will it spend the money required to produce new capabilities, including military ones, and including the means to attract new recruits and maintain experienced soldiers? Perhaps most fundamentally, can Danish policy-makers agree to a purpose behind a broad EU-NATO engagement? Will Denmark labour for 'Europe's global model' of pluralism and the transformation of enemies into friends or rather 'America's global model' of unipolarity and the active defence of liberalism?⁶ Danish policy-makers shunt these questions because they know that they disagree. This disagreement does not bode well for the type of robust political agreement that is needed to maintain Denmark's strategic engagement and newly acquired status as a small but impeccable ally.

DENMARK'S TOP-DOG STATUS IN NATO

Political commentators and pundits have long argued that NATO is evolving into a two-tier alliance. While some member states step up to the plate and shoulder the majority of the collective burdens and risks, others – being reluctant to invest adequately in expeditionary capabilities, and declining to put their armed forces in harm's way – drag their feet and free-ride. As a result, so the argument runs, NATO is increasingly divided into an A-team consisting of disproportionately contributing allies, and a 'burden and risk-shedding' but also less influential B-team. Put differently: observers argue that NATO consists of net security providers and net security consumers. This reading of NATO's internal dynamics is usually followed by the warning that a further increase in the tensions pertaining to the ostensibly incessant burden-sharing debate is likely to result in the Alliance's demise. Bereft of a unifying external threat, and

5 Rynning, 2003.

6 Calleo, 2007.

beset by an acrimonious burden-sharing debate, NATO will inevitably disintegrate.⁷

We do not see signs that NATO is about to come apart: after all, NATO has been through crises before and strong interests are attached to it. However, we recognize the current crisis and its potential, and we agree with these observers that the Alliance is showing signs of a divide between A- and B-members. It is in this new setting that Denmark is dear member of the A-team. In the words of Minister of Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller, Denmark had by 2006 made it into 'NATO's first division'.⁸ Gone are the days when the notion of 'Denmarkization' was invoked to describe blatant free-riding strategies in military alliances⁹ and the external view of Denmark within the Alliance is more positive than in decades.¹⁰ The two immediate drivers behind the improved Danish standing in transatlantic security and defence relations are a radically transformed military instrument and an extensive political readiness to deploy forces in international engagements in the Balkans and, most importantly, Afghanistan.

The fundamental transformation of the Danish armed forces, culminating in the milestone June 2004 Defence Agreement, began slowly in the mid 1990s with the establishment of the Danish International Brigade (DIB). Although the Danish armed forces had frequently participated in various traditional UN peacekeeping missions since 1948, the making of the 4,500-strong expeditionary brigade marked a significant qualitative shift in Denmark's security outlook, reflecting the dramatically altered European security environment, as well as NATO's increasing emphasis on out-of-area engagements. In line with the Alliance's growing concern with diffuse challenges to stability emanating from outside the treaty area, the ambitious Danish objective was to sustain continuously 1,500 troops deployed internationally. While the basic force structure

7 See, for instance, Fred Attewill & Hélène Mulholland, 'Gates demands more troops willing to 'fight and die' in Afghanistan', *The Guardian*, 7 February 2008; Andrew J. Bachevich, 'NATO at twilight', *Los Angeles Times*, 11 February 2008; Helle Dale, 'Necessary Alliance: Afghanistan a true test for NATO', *The Washington Times*, 21 February 2007; Menon, 2007; Tjalve Schou, 'Kommentar: Sikkerhed og solidaritet' *Information*, 11 December 2007; 'What alliance?' *Wall Street Journal*, 28 June 2004.

8 Folketingets Forhandling, 2 May 2006.

9 Heurlin, 2003:247.

10 Ringsmose, 2007.

remained conscripted and could be mobilized only in response to territorial threats, the DIB represented a first transformative step towards a more mobile and expeditionary military instrument.¹¹

Throughout the decade from the launching of the Danish International Brigade to the making of the 2004 Defence Agreement, transformation made only slow progress. The 1995 and 1999 Defence Agreements gave some priority to the armed forces' international assignments: an increased slice of the budget was allotted to international operations, and new investments were made in deployable hardware. However, the costly Cold War force structure – long-term conscription and static mobilisation defence – survived both agreements.¹² Danish policy-makers were more focused on reaping the so-called 'peace dividend' than driving military transformation. Sizeable budget cuts were made in the course of the 1990s and reductions in military spending continued well into the new millennium.¹³ As a consequence, NATO's agenda for transformation was pursued only half-heartedly and to some extent 'on the cheap'. In spite of mounting pressure from NATO and especially the US to develop internationally deployable and high readiness capabilities – most notably embodied in NATO's 1999 Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) and 2002 Prague Capability Commitment (PCC) – the Danish armed forces began the preparations for the 2004 Defence Agreement with the conviction that territorial defence defined the centre of gravity. At this point Denmark had clearly not conformed to NATO's demand for power projection capabilities.

The broad and highly ambitious reforms of the 2004 Defence Agreement elevated Danish defence to NATO's top tier.¹⁴ Taken as a whole, the sweeping reorganization and structural changes brought about by the defence agreement were in almost complete accord with the overall recommendations and demands made by the Alliance's force planning authorities and NATO's transformation command, Allied Command Transformation (ACT). At the beginning of 2008, the force structure generated by the 2004 agreement is still being

11 Petersen, 2004: 479f. Bertel Heurlin argues that the DIB in addition began a process of 'denationalization'. See Heurlin, 2007a and 2007b.

12 Forsvarskommandoen, 2000: chapter 6; Hækkerup, 2002.

13 Petersen, 2004: 478ff.

14 Forsvarsministeriet, 2004.

praised as a 'role model within NATO'.¹⁵ If completed as planned in 2009, the transformation will provide mobile forces capable of undertaking tasks at the highest end of the spectrum of conflict. In many ways, the structure agreed to in 2004 resembles the ideal force structure that NATO planners have endorsed at least since the end of the 1990s. Notwithstanding the still relatively modest financial investments in the Danish defence sector,¹⁶ the fully implemented agreement will generate a deployable and highly relevant force for the 21st century. Hence, the reform was not about spending more, but spending the same small amount of money more wisely and efficiently.

With its emphasis on deployability, sustainability and increased professionalization, the 2004 Defence Agreement dovetailed almost entirely with a new set of parameters that increasingly came to shape the Alliance's burden-sharing debate from the late 1990s. While the defence sector's input side – and in particular 'defence spending as a percentage of GDP' – had dominated Cold War discussions of burden sharing, output factors such as numbers of deployable troops and strategic lift capacity rose to the top of the agenda in the 1990s. Thus, concurrently with NATO's transformation from an 'Alliance in being' to an 'Alliance in doing', the centre of gravity of the burden-sharing debate moved from the *resources invested* in defence to the *actual capabilities* resulting from these investments. Central among the new 'usability' parameters is the so-called 40-8 usability target, agreed to by NATO defence ministers at the 2004 Istanbul Summit. The objective is "that 40 per cent of each nation's overall land force strength should be structured, prepared and equipped for deployed operations under NATO or other auspices, and that 8 per cent of the overall land force strength would either be engaged in or earmarked for sustained operations at any one time."¹⁷ With the full implementation of the 2004 Agreement, Denmark will be able to deploy approximately 60% of the force, as opposed to 40% prior to 2005, and sustain a deployment of about 10% of the overall land force strength – i.e. well above the Alliance's usability targets.¹⁸ Not surpris-

15 US ambassador to NATO, Victoria Nuland, at "NATO Towards Bucharest and Beyond", DIIS Seminar 3 March, 2008.

16 See Ringsmose, 2007: 24. As during the Cold War, Denmark's military expenditure, measured as a percentage of GDP, is well below the NATO average.

17 Sturm, 2005.

18 Ringsmose, op. cit.: 32. See also Gade, 2005.

ingly, the 2004 Agreement was warmly welcomed by the NATO authorities and the outgoing General Secretary, Lord Robertson.¹⁹

Another important driver behind Denmark's ascendancy to the status of NATO *musterknabe* has been the extensive political willingness to provide a comparatively substantial number of troops in out-of-area interventions and high-risk operations. Commencing with the rather modest – but symbolically highly important – contribution to the U.S.-led military coalition against Iraq in 1991, Danish policy-makers persistently opted for an active and hitherto unseen militarized foreign policy during the 1990s. Relatively strong support was offered for first UN and later NATO missions in Croatia and Bosnia, and when NATO – led by the US – decided to attack Yugoslavia without an explicit UN mandate in 1999, Denmark retreated from its otherwise firm pro-UN policy and went along with the move. The reluctant ally gave way to an ambitious ally.²⁰ Whether for the sake of human rights and the solidity of a liberal, rule-based international society or of a more comfortable position of influence in unipolar/American world order, or both, policy-makers in Copenhagen repeatedly chose to assign sizeable force contingents to international peace-support operations all through the 1990s.

In the aftermath of 11 September 2001, Danish decision-makers continued to commit a relatively high level of forces to international operations. In addition, Denmark moved beyond traditional peace-support operations to counter-insurgency and regular warfare and thus provided significant force contributions to the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq. While, as we shall see below, the commitment to NATO's ISAF mission in Afghanistan has moved Denmark into the ranks of NATO's A-team members, the effects of the military support for the American-led coalition in Iraq from the spring of 2003 to August 2007 have been more ambiguous. On the one hand, the Danish contribution has evidently generated much political capital and goodwill in Washington. Given the US' unrivalled position in the Alliance, this has clearly worked to reinforce Denmark's standing in transatlantic security affairs. On the other hand, European opposition to what was perceived as American arrogance and unilateralism in Iraq led first and foremost to German and French

19 Heurlin, 2007b: 81.

20 Rynning, 2003.

frustration with Denmark's dedicated support for the U.S.-led 'coalition of the willing'.²¹ Although the battered relationship between Copenhagen and Berlin was soon restored – partly as a consequence of the Danish decision to deploy approximately forty troops to the German Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in northern Afghanistan in the summer of 2004²² – Denmark's reputation suffered a set-back in continental Europe.

The Danish military contribution to the operations in Afghanistan commenced in December 2001 and January 2002, when a significant majority in the *Folketing* (Danish parliament) approved government proposals to commit a rather robust contingent to the American-led Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and a mine-clearing team to the British-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF).²³ In December 2004 and again in February 2006, the *Folketing* mandated a reinforcement of the Danish contribution to ISAF, which by August 2003 had been taken over by NATO. Danish troops arrived for the first time in the insurgent-infested province of Helmand in late spring of 2006 as a part of ISAF's expansion to the south of Afghanistan. Significantly, and quite unusually in the ISAF context, Denmark has imposed none of the so-called national caveats on the deployed troops. In parallel to the withdrawal of Danish forces from Iraq in the summer of 2007 – and after repeated NATO calls for more troops – the *Folketing* decided to bolster the deployment in Helmand to the size of a battalion.²⁴ At the time of writing, about 690 Danish soldiers are doing service in Afghanistan, the great majority of them in Helmand.

The extensive Danish willingness to deploy a significant number of forces in high-risk areas in Afghanistan has been met with much appreciation and applause inside NATO.²⁵ Moreover, Alliance commanders at the top level have expressed their high esteem for the Danish personnel and their skills and ex-

21 Michael Seidelin, 'Europa: USA's venner har det svært', *Politiken*, 3 August 2003.

22 Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen made the announcement that the government was prepared to contribute to the German PRT northern Afghanistan during an official visit to Berlin in June 2004. There is little doubt that the prime minister used this proclamation as a symbolic gesture for the purpose of re-establishing diplomatic ties between Copenhagen and Berlin.

23 Petersen, 2004; Rynning, 2003.

24 Denmark continues to commit Danish trainers to NATO's Training Mission Iraq.

25 See, for instance, 'Fogh: ikke flere danske soldater til Afghanistan', *Ritzau*, 8 October 2007.

pertise in counter-insurgency operations.²⁶ Denmark is no longer on the defensive as prior to 1990, but is taking a more pro-active and offensive approach in NATO affairs. The government's high profile in repeated heated disputes regarding burden-sharing and alliance solidarity in southern Afghanistan reflects a fundamental sense of confidence in Copenhagen: Denmark would not stick its neck out if it was not a top-tier member with strong backing from the US. In sum, a transformed military capacity and political will made Denmark close to an impeccable ally.

THE INTERNATIONAL DOMAIN: FROM MILITARY DEPLOYABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY TO COMPREHENSIVE ENGAGEMENT

As a small country, Denmark must follow in the footsteps of its larger allies, in terms of both the narrow art of crafting skilled military forces and the broader political challenge of addressing major threats. Politically, Denmark has chosen to strengthen ties to the US although other options – such as following France and Germany in the desire to strengthen the European pillar – are on the table. The choice in military affairs is less obvious. All allies are pushed to deliver forces that are both deployable and sustainable. Moreover, all allies must react and adapt to military transformation as it takes place in the US, as this is the agenda giving substance to NATO's force planning.

Military transformation is not a set agenda, though, because its focus and terms of reference change along with world events. For instance, in 2001-2003 it was as if highly skilled forces were a force unto themselves and merely a prelude to the messy business of stabilization that could be left to robust police forces and development agencies. This is no longer the case. Spurred by asymmetrical war in Afghanistan and Iraq, the 'three block war' argument developed back in 1999 by General Charles Krulak is now at the heart of strategic debate and planning. Western forces will encounter hostile, neutral and friendly forces

26 Background briefing by senior official from NATO's Military Committee, NATO headquarters, Brussels, January 2008.

in just one neighbourhood (the three blocks), and they must settle in for a sustained engagement in which they are just a minor, though vital part.

The end of the Cold War and the new security tasks on the periphery of Europe, notably in the Balkans, soon left their marks on NATO planning. Deployability and sustainability did not make it into NATO's Strategic Concept of 1991, which was written when the Soviet Union was still around, but by 1993 the impact of Balkan operations was visible and the onset of thorough reform came in January 1994. The Brussels NATO Council meeting at this point instructed the NATO organization to develop and adapt its 'structures' to conduct the full range of missions, including external operations.²⁷ The pressure to adapt and reform has not abated since then. The Comprehensive Political Guidance issued at the 2006 Riga summit (an update to the 1999 Strategic Concept) thus notes that:²⁸

- the Alliance will require the agility and flexibility to respond to complex and unpredictable challenges;
- must have the capability to launch and sustain concurrent major joint operations and smaller operations for collective defence and crisis response on and beyond Alliance territory, on its periphery, and at strategic distance;
- requires forces that are structured, equipped, manned and trained for expeditionary operations in order to respond rapidly to emerging crises;
- On this basis, the Alliance requires sufficient fully deployable and sustainable land forces, and appropriate air and maritime components.

From Brussels to Riga and beyond, deployability and also sustainability are the primary preoccupations of NATO force planners. Still, within this trend of continuity we must take note of important changes that intervened in the

27 NATO, 1994: paragraph 9.

28 NATO, 2006a: See the first paragraphs of section 3.

wake of the terrorist attacks in September 2001 and the resulting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. These events have increased the pressure for allied force restructuring, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Iraq was never a NATO operation, but it involved many NATO nations; Afghanistan directly follows from NATO's Article 5 declaration of September 2001 and is thus part of the Alliance's *raison d'être*.

The Prague summit of November 2002 underscored the Alliance's readiness to confront threats wherever they may arise – that is, on a global scale – and noted the implications for NATO forces. “In order to carry out the full range of its missions, NATO must be able to field *forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed*, upon decision by the North Atlantic Council, to *sustain operations over distance and time*, including in an environment where they might be faced with nuclear, biological and chemical threats, and to achieve their objectives”.²⁹ This was deployability and sustainability, but in a new and more urgent wrapping. Two years later, at the next NATO summit in Istanbul, NATO defined a set of usability goals to guide national force planners which also would serve to monitor and compare national defence reforms. These usability goals are the 40-8 target mentioned above.

The NATO Response Force (NRF) initiated at Prague was meant to be one of the principal transformation mechanisms in so far as the NRF was not merely a high readiness standby force, but also a funnel that would teach rotating units new types of warfare. With a steadily increasing number of units moving through the six-month NRF rotations, national forces would gradually be staffed with NRF-trained and -certified units and thus be lifted to another level of military capability. In time, they would be transformed. The NRF was presented as an outline, a blueprint, at the Prague summit in 2002, and four years later, in Riga, the Alliance declared the NRF at ‘full operational capability’ (FOC). This was a stretch of imagination that papered over two underlying problems.

One problem was the growing inability of European allies to field forces in ongoing operations. Particularly the demands of the Afghan operations strained allied capacities and revealed the existence of significant legacy forces even in the new millennium. The Cold War was still alive as far as force struc-

29 Paragraph 4, emphasis added.

tures were concerned, and few allies were ready to field forces greater than minor coalition contributions in a durable high-intensity operation. The problem is not really to put troops on the ground in Afghanistan, but to provide them with everything they need in terms of combat support and logistics, and then to rotate units in and out on a six-month schedule. Struggling to do this, the allies simply lost the ability to commit forces to the NRF – forces that would not contribute to ongoing operations because they are on standby and moreover require money for their transformation.

By the fall of 2007, one year subsequent to the FOC declaration, NATO was therefore compelled to revise its policy. In Noordwijk in October, at an informal meeting (meaning no statements or declarations are released), NATO defence ministers adopted what a spokesperson labelled a ‘graduated approach’ to the NRF.³⁰ The NRF was effectively slimmed down: NRF headquarters will remain staffed, but fewer combat units will be assigned to the force. Naturally, the allies intend to assign units to Afghanistan rather than the NRF. While NATO maintained that the underlying NRF concept remained intact, the turn of events indicated a change in the transformation agenda, which brings us to the other underlying problem.

The NRF was the child of the transformation thinking that permeated the Pentagon when Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was at its helm. The NRF was in some respects the NATO equivalent of the ‘shock and awe’ that characterized the 2003 Iraq war plan, although it must be emphasised that the NRF was always the tip of an iceberg – the full force structure – that consisted of less rapid but equally skilled and much more numerous reaction forces. The NRF is intended as a force that moves in first and enables later entry by the bulk of the intervention forces. Still, and this was the transformation point of the NRF, rotating units in and out of the NRF were supposed to upgrade – transform – the iceberg, the reaction forces beneath the NRF.

Transformation thus conceived is in a crisis and has in fact been so for the past five to six years. In Prague in 2002, NATO not only launched the NRF but also revised its command structure: the European strategic command in Mons, Belgium, would henceforth focus on operations (becoming Allied Command Operations, or ACO) and the former Atlantic strategic command in Norfolk,

30 Appathurai, 2007.

in the US, became the strategic command for transformation (Allied Command Transformation, or ACT). ACO has since then been busy running Afghanistan and generating forces for the operation; ACT has struggled to find a role in the NATO force-planning machine. It is not that the Alliance leader has lost interest in transformation: the US continues to value the NRF, but sees it mainly as a means to help Europeans transform their forces. US forces were not part of the original NRF design, but they did subsequently enter the force to shore it up; in 2007, when Europeans failed to commit adequate forces to it, the US threatened to pull its forces out and let the NRF wither. The trouble is that both ACT and NRF are political victims: European decision-makers are squeezed by operational demands and small budgets and have neither the time nor money to invest in transformation.

ACT continues to be important in so far as the Alliance is in need of a mechanism for the development and testing of the concepts that will frame long-term force planning, and also because the Alliance will benefit from an institutional link to the ACT's American equivalent, the much larger US Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM), also located in Norfolk. ACT is an allied asset in the collective endeavour to solve problems arising from new wars. These problems relate notably to questions of multinationality – coordination among allies is an inherent challenge to any alliance, especially for alliances undertaking real operations – within contexts of three block wars and civil-military co-operation. NATO is preparing its fifth multinational experimentation (MNE), which will begin in 2008 but host its major capstone event in 2009. These MNEs began in 2001 in USJFCOM, but they are now headed by a so-called Multinational Interoperability Council and have become a major mechanism for planning and testing force concepts in complex operational environments.

These MNEs reveal the predicament of the ACT: indispensable, but poorly defined. The 2009 MNE major capstone event will take place in sub-Saharan Africa and will focus on the type of comprehensive engagement that has become a planning and operational mantra in recent years. This is not the high-intensity transformative agenda of 2002, when the NRF was launched as a transformative spearhead. Today the spearhead is a package of all-round soldiers, along with development agencies of all sorts. The choice of sub-Saharan Africa is not coincidental but dovetails with the American 2007 decision to set up a distinct regional military command for Africa (AFRICOM) on par with

the well-known commands for Europe (EUCOM), Central Asia and the Middle East (CENTCOM), and so on. AFRICOM will not involve 'large troop bases' in Africa and is altogether a 'different command', according to AFRICOM: "Designers of U.S. Africa Command clearly understand the relationships between security, development, diplomacy and prosperity in Africa. As a result, U.S. Africa Command, or AFRICOM, reflects a much more integrated staff structure, one that includes significant management and staff representation by Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and other U.S. government agencies involved in Africa. The command will also seek to incorporate partner nations and humanitarian organizations, from Africa and elsewhere, to work alongside the U.S. staff on common approaches to shared interests."³¹ Transformation has lost its previous clarity. Transformation used to imply 'network-centric warfare' and 'effects-based operations', but it has now become a diffuse call for deploying to Afghanistan and undertaking a comprehensive engagement once there. NATO recognized as much at the 2006 Riga summit when the heads of state and government declared that operations in Afghanistan and Kosovo had taught them that "today's challenges require a comprehensive approach by the international community involving a wide spectrum of civil and military instruments,"³² which amounted to NATO's official embrace of the comprehensive approach. At the 2008 Bucharest summit, NATO repeated its commitment to comprehensive planning, which also became a cornerstone in the ISAF Strategic Vision for Afghanistan that also came out of this summit.³³

Deployability and sustainability can be planned for in strictly military terms: nations must acquire a number of air- and sea-lift capabilities, command and control systems, means of intelligence-gathering, weapons systems, and so on. But the broader requirements of sustainability cannot be defined as long as the 'comprehensive approach' is in flux. A force deployed to Afghanistan, Iraq or another difficult area such as the Darfur region or Somalia cannot hope to sustain itself unless the whole range of civilian instruments make their appearance and contribute to the building of new regimes. It goes almost without

31 United States Africa Command, 2008.

32 NATO, 2006b: paragraph 10.

33 NATO, 2008a: paragraph 10; NATO, 2008b.

saying that such nation-building is immensely complex, and one would be hard pressed to identify a single case of a successful, externally generated nation-building process, which for years has been a problem besetting the world of development aid.

Background interviews with officials from various countries convey the impression that NATO may not be the organization that has been hardest hit by the avalanche of comprehensive planning: after all, NATO remains primarily a military organization.³⁴ The problem lies in parallel to NATO and beneath it, that is, within broader international organizations such as the EU and the UN, as well as within member states. The inability of the US government to coordinate its many civilian agencies properly in response to Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 stands out as a reminder that nations are not unified actors but pluralistic composites. Similarly for the EU and the UN, it is a truism that if these organizations did not exist one would need to invent them, but nonetheless the political, bureaucratic and financial complexity of their operations is striking.

Allies who look to perform well within allied contexts and thus gain influence will today find it difficult to identify with certainty the precise instruments with which such influence can be sought. In the day and age of Secretary Rumsfeld, the solution appeared to rest with military transformation and instruments of high-intensity engagement and, crudely speaking, shock and awe. This was the context within which Danish policy-makers conceived of the fairly radical defence reforms of 2004. The preparation of this set of reforms naturally began prior to 2004, and Danish planning by and large dovetailed with NATO's embrace of Rumsfeld's agenda, from the 2002 Prague summit and beyond.

Rumsfeld ceased his term as Secretary of Defense in November 2006 and has since become the object of intense criticism, with recent books describing his 'arrogance' and 'catastrophic' legacy or promising a 'prosecution by book'.³⁵ Rumsfeld's shock and awe legacy is considered, rightly or wrongly, to have resulted in the long and bloody battle to stabilize Iraq, and proponents of a com-

34 Conducted by authors on various occasions.

35 Cockburn, 2007; Herspring, 2008; Ratner, 2008.

prehensive approach are using Rumsfeld in negative campaigns to discourage a focus on high-intensity military instruments and degrade the usefulness of military transformation more broadly.

Allies searching for influence and who felt inspired by the transformation agenda are thus pushed to reconsider their reform efforts. Was too much emphasis placed on high-intensity forces? What can be done to promote diplomatic coordination at the international level between organizations such as the EU and NATO, or to integrate the use of all instruments in the national toolbox? The Danish challenge at the level of national integration probably resembles that of other countries, that is, that it is a substantial challenge. As the subsequent section will argue, this may account for the Danish reluctance to run a Danish Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in Afghanistan.

The Danish challenge at the international level is equally great. Denmark has opted out of the EU's defence dimension and more broadly harbours political anxieties regarding the Union's political potential. These anxieties are not shared by most members of parliament. However, the political extremes on both right and left share them, as do a considerable number of voters, which is, of course, why the defence opt-out along with the other three opt-outs came about in the first place. The formal opt-outs can be removed following a referendum to that effect; the anxieties are informal and are likely to remain. Such EU anxiety is a political challenge now that the two principal contestants in the Atlantic arena, the US and France, are coming together on EU-NATO issues. The outcome of this rapprochement will likely be decided in the course of the French EU presidency in the fall of 2008 and in the warm-up to NATO's 60th anniversary summit in the spring of 2009, but it is already now clear that things are changing. France is no longer fearful of a 'Berlin Plus in reverse' – which is to say that NATO-run operations would engulf the EU and give NATO the opportunity to exert strategic control – and is negotiating its re-entry into the allied command structure. The US is similarly less hostile to the EU's foreign-policy role because soft skills in nation-building are precisely what are needed in Afghanistan and elsewhere. "We need a stronger EU, we need a stronger NATO and if Afghanistan has taught us anything, we need a stronger, more seamless relationship between them", declared U.S. ambassador Victoria Nuland in Paris in February 2008, and she went on to note, with an implicit, yet clear criticism of the views of former Secretary Rumsfeld, "Coalitions of the

Willing have their limitations”.³⁶

New ways of doing military business must be defined, tested and put into practice, and all this will require money – very significant amounts of it. NATO is currently asking allies to spend 2.0% of GDP on defence: in 2007 Denmark spent 1.3%. Denmark has escaped criticism because it has handled its money well and delivered a significant allied output, its meagre budgetary input notwithstanding. For some time it seemed that NATO was and would continue to be all output-focused: those who could deliver capable expeditionary forces would be in the alliance top-tier. Denmark could thus claim top-tier status. Troubled times have returned, however. The alliance does not field enough capable forces, and its transformation showcase – the NRF – is stalemated. Input is thus making a comeback in the burden-sharing diplomacy of the alliance: allies are increasingly measured not only on what they deliver, but also on what they invest in defence.³⁷ A defence effort at 1.3% is unlikely to impress, nor is the argument that Denmark puts close to 1% of GDP into development assistance writ large.

In conclusion, three points stand out:

- Military transformation was the guiding idea during the term of Secretary Rumsfeld and it marked the Atlantic alliance, just as it marked the US approach to the Iraq war. The Danish defence agreement of 2004 took shape during these years and was equally marked by transformation. However, subsequent low-intensity war in Afghanistan and Iraq has changed the meaning of transformation. Transformation stakeholders today debate whether technology is part of the solution to or the problem of low-intensity warfare, and the debate remains unresolved.
- Comprehensive planning and action, and thus the integration of the full range of military and non-military instruments, have come to dominate the very top of the Alliance’s agenda. Comprehensiveness is a challenge to any ally, including Denmark, because it unsettles cemented divisions of labour in the national administration. It is, moreover,

36 Nuland, 2008.

37 Ringsmose, 2007.

a challenge to countries such as Denmark that harbour political reservations vis-à-vis international institutions – in Denmark's case, the EU. Comprehensiveness will lead to closer cooperation between all these institutions, rendering formal opt-outs obstacles to the making of coherent foreign policies.

- Burden-sharing debates will increasingly focus on both input and output, given the operational strain of notably Afghanistan and Iraq. Allies must not only be good at what they are doing; they must also do more.

International conditions thus set an agenda for change in the Danish case: Denmark must revisit the underlying logic of its 2004 defence agreement, streamline the domestic coordination of national agencies and prepare politically for fluid diplomacy across NATO-EU and other organizational boundaries. A failure to meet these challenges will rob Denmark of its ability to define itself as an impeccable ally.

THE NATIONAL DOMAIN: ADJUSTING TO A CHANGING INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT?

While Denmark is still a member of NATO's first division, the ongoing developments in and around the Alliance discussed above are liable to challenge the current Danish position in transatlantic security affairs in the years to come. The push and pull of a changing international environment could seriously harm the Danish position as an impeccable ally. Since its 2001-2002 emergence as a strategic actor, Denmark has fought alongside the US in the defence of liberal values and the Western world. This 'strategic choice' brought Denmark to both Afghanistan and Iraq.³⁸ Subsequently, as this article has demonstrated, Denmark has honed its military tools and deepened notably the engagement in Afghanistan, becoming the impeccable ally. It was never clear that a political

38 Rynning, 2003.

consensus could carry this choice, however. Today, Danish policy-makers face difficult decisions and one may doubt the extent to which political agreement can be reached. We begin with the challenge of burden-sharing, then move on to an integrated civil-military approach to international operations before ending with more general reflections on the EU-NATO relationship.

As described above, the input side of NATO's burden-sharing debate is slowly regaining ground. Although the output side – the so-called utility targets and the political willingness to provide forces to high-risk missions – still play the dominant role in the discussions about who should do what, the pendulum is gradually swinging back towards the relative size of national defence budgets and the financial investments made in military hardware. For Denmark, the current burden-sharing issues pose two main challenges. Firstly, Denmark's reputation as an impeccable ally may suffer from the failure to bring the defence agreement to fruition: as of spring 2008, it is highly doubtful whether the armed forces will be able to fulfil the ambitious objectives regarding deployability and sustainability outlined in the 2004 Defence Agreement. In the autumn of 2007 the Chief of Defence, Jesper Helsø, publicly downgraded the ambition concerning the number of deployed troops for 2008 to 1,350 from the originally stated ambition of 1,900 soldiers. Although on the same occasion the Chief of Defence made it clear that the armed forces still aim to provide an international capability of 2,000 troops in 2009, the ultimate target of the Defence Agreement, observers question the feasibility of this.³⁹ As the Social Democrats' spokesman on defence issues, John Dyrby, put it in the early spring of 2008: "It is – to put it mildly – very optimistic to believe [that the armed forces can attain the goal of 2,000 deployed troops in 2009, JRI and SRY]".⁴⁰

The main reason behind the Danish Defence's likely inability to fulfil the high aspirations of the 2004 agreement is an unanticipated and significant number of resignations, a phenomenon directly related to the high frequencies of international deployments.⁴¹ The aim is to have at least 2½ years separate any

39 Henrik Dørge, 'Krig er for farligt', *Weekendavisen*, 7 March 2008; Christian Brøndum, 'Soldaternes udmarch trækker tæppet væk under forsvaret', *Berlingske Tidende*, 18 October 2007; Hans Mortensen, 'Lige nu gør det ondt', *Weekendavisen*, 9 February 2007.

40 Henrik Dørge, 'Krig er for farligt', *Weekendavisen*, 7 March 2008 – authors' translation.

41 Forsvarets Personeltjeneste, 2007.

given soldier's international deployments: however, strained personnel groups within the armed forces are reported to have less than nine months between deployments.⁴² The result has been a high number of vacant positions – about 2,200 at the time of writing⁴³ – and naturally an increasing deployment pressure on the remaining personnel. A vicious cycle of higher frequencies of deployment must be broken if the armed forces are to meet the ambitious goals laid down in the existing defence agreement.

In addition, the missions to Iraq and Afghanistan have proved to be more expensive than anticipated. One cause of the unexpected costs has been the exceptionally demanding conditions faced by Danish troops in both southern Iraq and Afghanistan. Another has been the dispersed geographical employment of troops. The bold objective pertaining to the number of Danish troops participating in international operations was originally based on the politically recognized precondition that the armed forces would be primarily deployed in two major mission areas. In reality, simultaneous operations in Kosovo, Iraq and Afghanistan have strained the armed forces, in particular the land forces,⁴⁴ as has the dispersed engagement within the Afghan theatre of operation. There is a political reason for this dispersal: small Danish contingents allocated to the Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Mazar-e Sharif, Feyzabad and Chaghcharan have bought Denmark political capital in Stockholm, Berlin and Vilnius.⁴⁵ However, the gain of political capital has brought military and budgetary trouble. Until now the budgets of the Danish armed forces have been salvaged by additional economic resources made available by the many vacant positions. However, the current employment of the Danish defence force appears to be beset by an inherent imbalance between economic resources and political objectives. As Mikkel Vedby Rasmussen notes, “Many of the difficulties that the defence faces regarding officers leaving the military or helicopters that do not fly, are stemming from the fact that the politicians have ambitions on behalf of

42 Forsvarskommando, 2007.

43 Michael Lund, 'Ingen piloter til forswarets Hercules-fly', *Nybedsavisen*, 5 April 2008.

44 Poul Kiærskou, 'Hærens nye virkelighed', *Politiken*, 3 January 2007.

45 The three Provincial Reconstruction Teams are led respectively by Sweden, Germany and Lithuania. In the summer of 2007 the Folketing decided to terminate the military contribution to the Swedish PRT, and at the NATO summit in Bucharest in April 2008 the Danish government announced that the contribution to the German-led PRT in Feyzabad will be brought to an end in the near future.

the defence that they are unwilling to finance".⁴⁶

The second challenge arising from NATO's contemporary burden-sharing debate is the increased emphasis given to the financial means allocated to the respective allies' defence sector – i.e. the burden-sharing equation's so-called input indicators. Provided that the primarily American and British pressure for national military expenditures that meets the Alliance's formal goal of spending at least 2.0% of GDP on defence is sustained or intensified,⁴⁷ Denmark could lose its top-tier standing. Neither policy-makers nor the public appear willing to sustain the burdens of a defence budget that comes close to meeting the targets defined by NATO members themselves. With the exception of the Danish People's Party (*Dansk Folkeparti*),⁴⁸ no political party has publicly spoken out in favour of an increased defence budget,⁴⁹ and the majority of the Danish public seems disinclined to exchange 'butter for guns'. In the beginning of 2007, 63% of the respondents in a national survey answered that Denmark should spend "less" or "much less" on defence in 2008; only 5% had a preference for increased military expenditure.⁵⁰ However, notwithstanding the growing importance of input parameters in the Alliance's burden-sharing diplomacy and speaking to Denmark's favour, risk-sharing and output indicators are likely to play a significant role in the transatlantic disputes about solidarity as long as NATO is actively engaged in high-risk operations in Afghanistan.

Just as NATO's evolving burden-sharing debate is liable to present Danish policy-makers with tough choices in the years to come, so too is the Alliance's increasing concern with a tighter and better organized coordination between civil and military instruments of power. Bringing together military and non-military efforts has become a major occupation for NATO. The experiences of particularly Iraq and Afghanistan, but also those of the western Balkans, have highlighted the fact that overwhelming armed force might be sufficient to ensure military victory but not strategic success.⁵¹ Or, as often expressed by

46 Rasmussen, 2008.

47 Ringsmose, 2007: 34f.

48 'DF ønsker flere milliarder til forsvaret', *Ritzau*, 22 March 2008.

49 Christian Brøndum, 'Hækkerup formand for forsvarskommission', *Berlingske Tidende*, 17 January 2008.

50 Peter G. H. Madsen, 'Danskerne vil sætte forsvaret på skrump' *Ugebladet A4*, 26 February 2007.

51 Mandel, 2006.

national policy-makers: “militarily tools might win the war, but not the peace”; to that end, a host of civilian means are indispensable. The hard-learned lessons from ongoing operations Iraq and Afghanistan have thus – as described above – worked to modify NATO’s transformation agenda. Joint planning and implementation of civilian and military efforts are now inherent aspects of NATO’s transformation.⁵²

For Denmark, the impeccable ally, the need for thorough coordination between civilian and military actors in crisis areas is old news. Denmark has long and energetically advocated a more systematic approach to civil-military cooperation inside NATO – first of all through the promotion of the so-called Concerted Planning and Action-initiative (CPA) – and Danish decision-makers and diplomats have generally taken a proactive role in developing a conceptual framework for a more holistic approach to crisis-management and post-conflict reconstruction.⁵³ Denmark has also sought to spearhead this initiative in practice, beginning with the 2004 Defence Agreement, which focused not only on high-intensity operations, deployability and interoperable war fighting capabilities but also on a Danish version of a ‘comprehensive approach’: “The military effort must be planned in coordination with other Danish endeavours to obtain maximum effect of the overall effort and fortify Denmark’s ability to assume responsibility. The relevant players should be brought together as early as possible to prepare the deployment of Danish military contingents so that it becomes possible from the beginning to define any relevant civilian stabilisation efforts in the field of military operations. A focused effort and mutual exploitation of military and civilian experience in this context would make it possible to obtain better results and thus – other things being equal – also reduce the need for a military presence.”⁵⁴

Since the launching of the distinct Danish interpretation of a comprehensive approach in 2004, the civilian side of the coin has mainly been conceived in terms of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). From the outset, therefore, civil-military cooperation was to be for soldiers and humanitarian

52 Juul, 2006: 71.

53 Fischer & Christensen, 2005.

54 Forsvarsministeriet, 2004.

workers.⁵⁵ However, and revealingly, the plan did not survive the first encounter with the enemy. In both Afghanistan and Iraq, the NGOs decided that the security situation in the areas where Danish troops were deployed was too perilous for humanitarian workers to operate in, and the armed forces were consequently compelled to engage in efforts that would otherwise have been directed by the NGOs; for the most part, therefore, the civilian side of the equation was simply missing. The lack of civilian counterparts – as well as limited military resources – also account for the reluctance of the armed forces in early 2007 to take on the responsibility of a PRT in Afghanistan. This idea of establishing a Danish PRT never really got off the ground and thus did not enter the public arena, though it did circulate within government. Background interviews indicate that a major obstacle to the idea was the fact that the armed forces would be obliged to engage in a long-term venture for which they have inadequate capabilities. Even if deployments in other areas of Afghanistan were brought to an end, a Danish PRT in the province of Day Kundi or Nimroz – where the need for reconstruction teams was and is most acute – would stretch the Danish armed forces to their limits, partly given the lack of civilian counterparts.

The missions to both Afghanistan and Iraq have displayed the need for a redefined and specifically Danish comprehensive approach that moves beyond the first-cut solution initially laid out in the high intensity-oriented Defence Agreement of 2004. The civilian component of a multifaceted approach to counter-insurgency and post-conflict reconstruction clearly needs to be strengthened. Most importantly, more civilian experts in the areas of policing, public administration, macroeconomics, legal and judicial systems, and infrastructure should be engaged in the counter-insurgency and reconstruction efforts if real comprehensiveness is to be achieved. Combined civil-military engagements thus need to become a focus for soldiers and civil servants, or alternatively, soldiers and private contractors with the skills of civil servants. Although Danish policy-makers and civil servants have done a great deal to put the issue high on the Alliance's agenda, Denmark's NATO reputation as an initiator and a pioneering ally in this crucial area is likely to weaken if deci-

55 As outlined in a memorandum produced by the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2004: "As a point of departure, private Danish and international humanitarian organizations should handle the implementation of stabilization efforts financed by Denmark" (authors' translation). See Udenrigsministeriet & Forsvarsministeriet, 2004.

sion-makers fail to improve inter-agency cooperation and in particular develop a skilled and civilian deployable capacity.⁵⁶

Leading Danish decision-makers have by now acknowledged that the current model is wanting, which is clear from the Danish government's 2007 platform. Involvement in conflict-ridden and dangerous areas has rendered the existing concept inadequate: "The Government will ensure that the experience gained from Danish operations so far, primarily in Iraq and Afghanistan, is translated into forward-looking initiatives that can strengthen the coordination of civilian and military action in connection with Danish military engagement. There is a need for enhancing cooperation between civilian and military actors..."⁵⁷ The fact remains that Denmark has been good at describing the problem, but very slow at solving it: Denmark has about 700 soldiers deployed in Afghanistan but the number of diplomats can be counted in single digits. This tardiness can be justified with reference to the complexity of the problem: the UN has tried for decades to undertake comprehensive engagements but repeatedly fails; the US could not do it in 2004 within its own borders, and so on. Still, Denmark has gained its status as an impeccable ally not by being big – that is not in the nature of things, given the country's size – but by being smart, producing the kind of instruments the Alliance needs. These instruments are now changing, and Denmark must likewise change. Looking back, the 2004 decision to organize expeditionary forces and do away with traditional territorial defence – while perceived as radical at the time – might soon appear as a blessed opportunity of easy reform, if only because it concerned only the military. There is no doubt that the wholesale reform of the military is a daunting and complex challenge, and the subsequent reform process bears this out, but it is, after all, an in-house challenge. If Denmark wants to be smart in tomorrow's security environment, it must change the full bureaucratic and organizational infrastructure ranging from foreign via military to economic affairs. Ideally, then, the Defence Commission that at the time of writing is preparing the ground for a new Defence Agreement of 2009 should be wrapped up in a larger reform of the public sector. This is not the case, and the new agreement is

56 Peter Viggo Jakobsen, 'Hvordan vinder vi freden?' *Jyllands-posten*, 14 January 2008; Daniel Korski, 'Uset. Forsvaret har brug for civil reserve', *Politiken*, 4 March 2008; Nikolas Veicherts, 'Send flere bureaukrater', *Weekendavisen*, 9 November 2007.

57 Statsministeriet, 2007.

more likely to be dominated by the concern to implement fully the 2004 agreement and prevent the resignation of the experienced personnel who are needed for international operations.

One might hope that Denmark's troubles will go away because comprehensive planning proves too difficult at the international level too: if it cannot be done, the allies and their partners will fall back on previous planning cycles and the production of the capabilities that Denmark excels at providing. Such wishful thinking is precisely that – wishful. The abandonment of comprehensive planning will lead to withdrawal from the Afghan engagement, and since this is of vital interest to the Alliance, judging by any of NATO's political statements, that will imperil NATO as a whole. The realization that wishful thinking is no solution also informs the Franco-American rapprochement and the coming new deal between NATO and the EU. Clearly, such a rapprochement is difficult – if only because the Turkish-Greek dispute seems unending – but it now appears likely. After all, President Sarkozy has declared it as his ambition to construct a new partnership with the US as well as an *entente amicale* with Great Britain, and President W. Bush has endorsed the goal of EU autonomy in strategic affairs too.

As transatlantic relations move from the acrimonious 'either NATO or the EU' debate to the more constructive 'how should we combine the two?', Denmark encounters problems. First of all, Denmark has a formal opt-out that hampers our full participation in these deliberations. Secondly, Denmark must invest in a new toolbox, but has so far failed to produce comprehensive tools and has no visible desire to allocate more money to defence affairs. Thirdly, Denmark's political position becomes less clear and the domestic debate consequently more difficult. This last point is worth some final thoughts.

That part of the Danish political spectrum running from the centre to the far left has warmed to the idea of an EU security and defence policy. In 1991-1992, significant forces on the left opposed the 'Union' partly on the grounds that it would federalize defence policy and conduct traditional defence – or strategic – policy like any other great power. The Union was seen as the antidote to mediating policies such as peacekeeping, development and reconstruction. Today the situation is different, and these same political forces favour the EU because it is seen as more mediating than, not least, the US. The hope is that the EU can balance or contain the US. In contrast, the right-wing government

and its parliamentary majority views the US distinctively more favourably and believes that military force is part and parcel of international affairs. Put differently, the 'Mars-versus-Venus' debate that flared internationally a couple of years ago is still alive in Denmark: the left wing tends to favour Venus in the shape of a more peaceful EU; the right wing tends to favour Mars in the shape of a more realistic NATO.⁵⁸

Naturally, a new deal between NATO and the EU will muddle the picture, and this is precisely where the Danish political debate will become more difficult. Political contestants can no longer refer to one or the other organization: they must operate in the same institutional arena, promote clashing Mars- or Venus-like arguments, while navigating the Danish defence opt-out. Consider a Danish opportunity to support a particular NATO-EU rapprochement: is this indicative of more Mars and less Venus, or vice versa? Is European security yet again being run by gung-ho Americans, or are inefficient but high-minded Europeans about to undermine the trusted transatlantic relationship? One might hope that Denmark will simply focus on its 'national interest' and avoid this debilitating debate, but this is impossible: the national interest is partly a product of this debate and cannot be defined without it. Moreover, a likely referendum in 2009 on the defence opt-out – along with the other opt-outs – will, if history is a reliable guide, be an occasion for intense debate. In short, Denmark is caught in a political situation that is hardly conducive to major public-sector reform and path-breaking defence agreements. In a couple of years, this may change as a consequence of decisive outcomes in the referenda. Still, one wonders because referendums are subject to political interpretation. Moreover, and much more significantly, it is within the next two years that NATO will hammer out a new Strategic Concept that 'operationalizes' the founding treaty; that NATO and the EU will work out a new relationship; and that Denmark must reconsider its 2004 Defence Agreement.

58 Kagan, 2003.

CONCLUSION

Denmark's position as an impeccable ally is the outcome of hard work and successful reforms. It is also, one should note, the outcome of a willingness to commit troops to battle zones and thus to have soldiers who are willing to pay the highest price in serving their country. To date, fifteen Danish soldiers have paid the highest price while serving in Afghanistan. This top-tier position has brought Denmark political benefits in the shape of influence in NATO and access to the American president and his team of security advisors. Although one might disagree with this political direction, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that a significant defence investment has brought remarkable results.

We have traced the making of this policy in this essay, moving through the early engagement in Bosnia through the September 2001 attacks and the engagements in Afghanistan and Iraq. We have outlined the way in which international developments challenge the currencies of Danish influence, that is, the making of expeditionary forces and the willingness to put them in harm's way, notably because transformation is increasingly concerned with comprehensive engagement, thus partly bringing about a rapprochement between NATO and the EU, and partly because burden-sharing is again becoming an issue of input. We then assessed the difficulties with which Denmark is faced, as it must now upgrade those of its investments that make a top-tier status possible: personnel are leaving the armed forces and forces are stretched thin; defence budgets are small and not about to rise; no real gains have been made in terms of comprehensive engagement tools; and the NATO-EU rapprochement is likely to stir an intense debate on political aims that will expose underlying disagreement regarding Denmark's strategic status: must Denmark fight alongside the US to win; must Denmark to the contrary reconstruct and develop alongside the EU; is a third way possible? In the absence of a clarified 'national interest', fundamental reform is stalled.

The period from 2001 to about the present time may in retrospect be regarded with nostalgia, as already mentioned. US leadership, however controversial, combined with major combat and military operations, made it fairly simple to claim top-tier status along a military track. Today, several political, military and economic tracks must be made to converge for this claim to be made credible. The challenge is for Denmark to define its national interest and

then make this convergence happen at home and at the NATO-EU level. One might hope that the stakes and difficulties involved will inspire a sober political debate on the big, strategic issues.

REFERENCES

- Appathurai, James (2007), Press Conference by NATO Spokesman, Noordwijk, the Netherlands, 25 October 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 20-05-2007).
- Calleo, David P. (2007), 'The Atlantic Alliance in a Global System,' *Asia-Pacific Review*, vol. 14, no. 1: 72-89.
- Cockburn, Andrew (2007), *Rumsfeld: His Rise, Fall, and Catastrophic Legacy*, New York: Scribner.
- Fischer, Kristian & Jan Topp Christensen (2005), 'Improving Civil-Military Cooperation the Danish Way,' *NATO-review*, summer 2005. Online HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 20-05-2007).
- Forster, Anthony (2006), *Armed Forces and Society in Europe*, London: Palgrave.
- Forsvarets Personeltjeneste (FPT) (2007), FPT – afganginterviews 2007: Afrapportering fra ophobede interviews, Report, 21 December 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.fpt.dk] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- Forsvarskommandoen (2000), *Ved forenede kræfter*, Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck.
- Forsvarskommandoen (2007), *Årsrapport 2006*, Copenhagen: Forsvarskommandoen.
- Forsvarsministeriet (2004), Agreement Regarding Danish Defence 2005-2009, Copenhagen, 10 June 2004. Online, HTTP: [www.fmn.dk] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- Gade, Søren (2005), 'The Danish Response to the Transformation Challenge,' speech at NATO's Secretary General Annual Conference 2005, Brussels, 14 April 2005. Online, HTTP: [www.fmn.dk] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- Herspring, Dale R. (2008), *Rumsfeld's Wars: The Arrogance of Power*, Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

- Heurlin, Bertel (1993), 'Nye prioriteringer i dansk udenrigspolitik', in Nikolaj Petersen & Christian Thune (eds), *Dansk udenrigspolitisk årbog 1993*, Copenhagen: Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut / Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag: 30-50.
- Heurlin, Bertel (2003), *Riget, magten og militæret. Dansk forsvars- og sikkerhedspolitik under forsvarskommissionerne af 1988 og 1997*, Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Heurlin, Bertel (2007a), 'Denationalisation of Danish Armed Forces and Militarising of Danish Foreign Policy' in Janne Haaland Matlary & Øyvind Østerud (eds), *Denationalisation of Defence*, London: Ashgate: 113-135.
- Heurlin, Bertel (ed) (2007b), *Nationen eller Verden? De nordiske landes forsvar i dag*, Copenhagen: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.
- Hækkerup, Hans (2002), *På skansen. Dansk forsvarspolitik fra Murens fald til Kosovo*, Copenhagen: Lindhardt og Ringhof.
- Juul, Birgitte (2006), 'Concerted Action and Planning by Civil and Military Organizations', in Jean Dufourcq & David S. Yost (eds), *NATO-EU Cooperation in Post-Conflict Reconstruction*, Rome: NATO Defence College.
- Kagan, Robert (2003), *Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, London: Atlantic Books.
- Mandel, Robert (2006), *The Meaning of Military Victory*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Menon, Rajan (2007), *The End of Alliances*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NATO (1994), Press Communiqué M-1(94)3, Meeting of the North Atlantic Council NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 11 January 1994. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- NATO (2006a), Comprehensive Political Guidance, Endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government, Riga, 29 November 2006. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- NATO (2006b), Riga Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Riga, 29 November 2006. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- NATO (2008a), Bucharest Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Coun-

- cil, Bucharest, 3 April 2008. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- NATO (2008b), ISAF's Strategic Vision, Declaration by the Heads of State and Government of the Nations contributing to the UN-mandated NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, Bucharest, 3 April 2008. Online, HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- Nuland, Victoria (2008), Speech by US. Ambassador to NATO Victoria Nuland, Ambassador discusses strengthening global security for Europe, Paris, 22 February 2008. Online, HTTP: [www.america.gov] (accessed 27-05-2008).
- Petersen, Nikolaj (2004), *Europæisk og globalt engagement 1973-2003*, Dansk udenrigspolitisk historie, bd. 6, Copenhagen: Gyldendal leksikon.
- Rasmussen, Mikkel Vedby (2008), DF sætter dagsordenen, Danish Institute for Military Studies (DIMS), Blog, 21 March 2008. Online, HTTP: [www.difms.dk] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- Ratner, Michael (2008), *The Trial of Donald Rumsfeld: A Prosecution by Book*, The Center for Constitutional Rights (not yet released).
- Ringsmose, Jens (2007), *Danmarks NATO-omdømme. Fra Prügelknabe til duks*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for Military Studies (DIMS).
- Rynning, Sten (2003), 'Denmark as a Strategic Actor? Danish Security Policy after 11 September', in Per Carlsen & Hans Mouritzen (eds), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2003*, Copenhagen: (DIIS).
- Statsministeriet (2007), Society of opportunities – Government Platform 2007. Online, HTTP: [www.stm.dk] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- Sturm, Steve (2005), 'Military matters: Matching capabilities to commitments', *NATO-Review*, spring 2005. Online HTTP: [www.nato.int] (accessed 20-05-2007).
- Udenrigsministeriet & Forsvarsministeriet (2004), Samtænkning af civil og militær indsats i internationale operationer. Online, HTTP: [www.fmn.dk] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- United States Africa Command (2008), A Different Kind of Command. Online, HTTP: [www.africom.mil] (accessed 28-05-2008).
- Villaume, Poul (1995), *Allieret med forbehold – Danmark, NATO og den kolde krig. En studie i dansk sikkerhedspolitik 1949-1961*, Copenhagen: Eirene.

Danish Euroscepticism: Unique or Part of Broader Patterns?

Catharina Sørensen¹

The common assertion that Denmark is a particularly eurosceptic country is often sustained on the grounds that Denmark is the only EU member state to have voted ‘no’ twice in a referendum on integration. Up until the present decade, Denmark was in fact the only member state to have ever voted ‘no’.

With four non-Danish ‘no’ votes in the present decade, however, it is timely to ask to what extent Denmark is unique with regard to its euroscepticism. Is Danish euroscepticism the idiosyncratic product of a particular historical, cultural and political background? Or do recent manifestations of euroscepticism in other member states suggest that cross-national patterns can be readily identified? These questions form the backbone of the present article. By answering them, the aim is to suggest a way for students of European integration to grasp the how’s and why’s of public euroscepticism.

A TYPOLOGY OF EUROSCEPTICISM

While public euroscepticism, or durable and strong sentiments of disapproval directed towards the EU, is one of the most topical issues in contemporary European integration, there has, paradoxically, been little clarity about the nature of euroscepticism. Despite its many implications, the contours and borderlines of scepticism have remained elusive. Elsewhere, I have argued that the explana-

¹ Catharina Sørensen, Ph.D., is a project researcher at DIIS. The editors are grateful to Christine Ingebritsen (University of Washington, Seattle) for reviewing an earlier version of this article.

tion for the elusiveness of euroscepticism is a product of the insufficient and inadequate attention that is given to its diverse and dynamic nature.² The implications of this 'dependent variable problem' are significant and imply that many existing studies have inadvertently surveyed different phenomena altogether.

In response, I have offered a conceptualisation of contemporary euroscepticism that integrates existing theoretical insights into public opinion and legitimacy with targeted empirical indicators.³ The result, the typology of euroscepticism provided in Table 1 below, demonstrates that I find statistical evidence for the existence of four independent and coherent types of euroscepticism, namely economic, sovereignty-based, democratic and social euroscepticism. The coherence and independence of the four different types of euroscepticism was statistically confirmed through gamma tests and Cronbach's Alpha tests. The types were deduced from a review of the existing literature on EU public opinion and EU legitimacy.⁴ Each type can assume a hard or a soft level of intensity, where only hard euroscepticism amounts to a questioning of membership itself. Regarding this conceptualisation of euroscepticism, it is thus possible to be eurosceptic towards the formulation of integration taking place in the Union at the present day, without wanting to leave the EU altogether.

With multiple direct opinion poll indicators for each cell, the typology is a practical tool for analysing public reactions to EU developments at various levels of analyses.⁵

2 Sorensen, 2007a.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 See Annex 1.

Table 1: *Typology of euroscepticism.*

Euroscepticism	Economic	Sovereignty-based	Democratic	Social *
Soft	Dissatisfied with output from the EU	Sceptical of developments thought to further a closer union	Critical of the current set-up of the EU	Critical of the EU's ideological orientation – here limited to a critique that there is too little social Europe
Hard	Wants to leave the EU on the grounds that it is not useful, predominantly on economic grounds	Wants to leave the EU on the grounds that it is a threat to national integrity	Wants to leave the EU on the grounds that it is undemocratic and remote	Wants to leave the EU on the grounds that it is dominated by an unacceptable ideological stance – here that there is too little social Europe

* Social euroscepticism is one manifestation of a broader 'political euroscepticism' that is characterised by largely the same cleavages and alignments known from national political debates. I illustrate this with reference to the critique that the EU is too liberal, which has recently become an increasing focus of literature on EU public opinion (see Sørensen 2007a). In depth delineation of the four types can be found in Sørensen 2007a.

The confirmation of statistical independence across the four types invites students of euroscepticism to abandon the rooted assumption of euroscepticism as a uniform phenomenon that can be readily compared across countries or socio-demographic categories. Instead, EU citizens' euroscepticism is characterised by a variety of combinations of the types. For example, euroscepticism in Finland is likely to be different from euroscepticism in the Netherlands, the euroscepticism of entrepreneurs different from that of blue collar workers, and so forth.

There are, however, several reasons why we may expect *some* countries, or *some* socio-demographic categories, to share a particular profile of euroscepticism. This article pursues this expectation with regard to the fifteen oldest member states of the EU. It will thus investigate the extent to which a country's euroscepticism profile can be explained by a number of broader criteria.

While the question of what explains euroscepticism is contentious,⁶ few scholars expect it to be the product of a blank slate evaluation of EU actions and visions, where a new EU proposal is evaluated without the influence of exogenous structural factors. Manifestations of euroscepticism have proven too diverse for this to be the case, and clear and stable cross-national differences have crystallised.⁷ Consequently, it has been sought to explain euroscepticism through the combination of an impact-study of EU actions with an awareness of idiosyncratic country-specific characteristics.⁸ One extreme position would be to expect that euroscepticisms in member states are so unique that the search for common explanations is meaningless. The other extreme would expect patterns of euroscepticism among member states to be readily found and explained by a number of broad factors. Departing from a case study of euroscepticism in Denmark, still the record holder of no votes in EU referendums, the aim of this article is to examine the extent to which Danish euroscepticism is comparable across member states.

The rest of this article proceeds as follows. After an introduction to Danish euroscepticism, I present the theoretical argument for cross-national patterns of euroscepticism and list the dominant hypotheses in the existing literature as to what patterns to look out for. Next, I present the euroscepticism situation of the EU's fifteen oldest member states and group the countries according to the pattern hypotheses I have identified. This process allows me to prove or disprove the hypotheses, as well as to examine to what extent and why one or more countries share a euroscepticism profile similar to that of Denmark.

6 See, for instance, Gabel 1998; McLaren, 2007; Ray, 2007.

7 Reif & Inglehart, 1991; Ingebritsen, 1998; Sørensen, 2007a.

8 Historical and cultural legacy, political system, etc.; see, for instance, Eichenberg & Dalton, 1993; Anderson & Kaltenthaler, 1996; Hooghe & Marks, 2004. The focus in the literature has been on examining euroscepticism country by country, as opposed to cross-nationally. It would, of course, also be possible to examine the cross-national socio-demographic characteristics of euroscepticism (gender, age, etc.). This, however, is not the focus of this article.

DANISH EUROSCEPTICISM

Denmark's reputation for being a sceptical member of the EU is older than its 1973 membership. A crude, yet dominant, interpretation has been that Danes share a binary approach: closer cooperation amongst European countries is seen as attractive on economic grounds but undesirable on political grounds.⁹ Tangible manifestations of Denmark's hesitant stance notably include its four EU opt-outs that were secured following the Danish 'no' to the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. With the Danes' rejection of the Euro in 2000, the assumption of a strong euroscepticism in Denmark has rarely been questioned.

Recent evidence nevertheless calls for precisely this questioning. As I demonstrate in this article, Denmark's eurosceptic reputation is largely uncorroborated by empirical data from recent years. In a number of areas, Eurobarometer polls show that Danes are no more sceptical than the European average, and their level of scepticism is generally decreasing. Perhaps more surprisingly, and contrary to what has been the dominant interpretation, polls show that, even throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, Danes have rarely been more sceptical than the EU average when it comes to established indicators of euroscepticism, such as support for membership and the feeling of benefit from membership. Has it been the very act of holding EU referendums, rather than particularly critical public EU attitudes, that has given Denmark its eurosceptic reputation? Is Danish euroscepticism in fact similar to that of the founding member states' populations?

Table 2 applies the typology of euroscepticism introduced above to Denmark.

Table 2. *Contemporary Danish euroscepticism in relation to the EU average.*

Economic euroscepticism	Sovereignty-based euroscepticism
Status: No	Status: Yes
Development: Decreasing	Development: Stable
Democratic euroscepticism	Social euroscepticism
Status: Partial	Status: No
Development: Decreasing	Development: Stable

9 For a synthesis of this argument, see Sørensen 2007b.

Figure 1. *Development of Danish euroscepticism.*




Figure 1 details the development over time of each of the four types, based on its longest polled indicator (indicator one, as listed above).

Table 2 shows that Denmark is strongly sceptical in the sovereignty type of euroscepticism. Here, all four indicators show relative scepticism and, as Figure 1 shows, sovereignty-based scepticism is generally stable over time.¹⁰ Relative to the EU average, Denmark is to some extent characterised by democratic euroscepticism; however, we see from Figure 1 that, in absolute terms, this type of scepticism has slightly decreased over time. We can, moreover, also note a rather stable call for a more social EU, as well as decreasing criticism of the lack of the economic utility of co-operation.

Where measurable, Danes' sceptical opinions towards the EU as such (hard euroscepticism) have decreased over the years. Since 2001, perceptions of EU

10 With regard to the indicator of sovereignty-based euroscepticism gauging the preferred level of decision-making, it is interesting to note that this stability is a product of shifts in the opposite direction within the respective policy areas being surveyed. While the percentage of the Danish population wanting cooperation within educational policy to be decided purely at national level rose from 73% to 79% between 2002 and 2007, the percentage wanting cooperation on protecting the environment to be decided purely at national level decreased from 48% in 2002 to 27% in 2007. Such nuances confirm the dynamic nature of sovereignty-based euroscepticism, which is often not limited to a principled rejection of supranational cooperation, but a case-to-case evaluation that can change over time.

membership as a 'bad thing' have not been higher than 16%. Prior to 2000, they often surpassed 25% (curiously, an all-time 'low' during this period, 14%, came in 1992, the year of the Danish rejection of the Maastricht Treaty). However, in EU referendums there still tend to be more Danes than the EU average who vote 'no' because of a rejection of the very idea of European integration. Simple correlation calculations demonstrate that it is particularly within the economic and sovereignty-based types of euroscepticism that strong Danish desires to withdraw from EU co-operation are found.¹¹ This desire is weakest (albeit still significant) within the type of democratic euroscepticism, which means that criticism of the Union's democratic credentials is least likely to constitute hard euroscepticism in Denmark.

It is noteworthy that, contrary to levels of hard euroscepticism, economic scepticism in Denmark has in fact rarely been higher than the EU average throughout the more than twenty years surveyed by Eurobarometer. It has, in other words, never been appropriate to speak of relative Danish euroscepticism in this regard. Notwithstanding this relatively low point of departure, scepticism concerning all three long-term indicators measuring economically oriented EU attitudes has, in recent years, witnessed a slow but consistent decline. Since 1996, fewer than 25% of Danes feel that they have not benefited from membership. Impressions that the EU is a 'waste of money' decreased by three percentage points between 2003 and 2005, while perceptions of a negative effect of the EU on specific economic areas dropped by up to nine percentage points between 1983 and 2005. The result is that contemporary Danish economic euroscepticism is low in both absolute and relative terms. In summary, there has been a notable long-term decrease in economic and democratic euroscepticism in Denmark, as well as in the level of hard euroscepticism.

This contemporary portrait of relative Danish euroscepticism makes it difficult to sustain the general assumption that Denmark is a particularly eurosceptic member state—indeed, as we saw, it is only with regard to sovereignty-based euroscepticism that the Danes are relatively sceptical. Before turning to the examination of the possible links between Danish euroscepticism and the euroscepticism of other EU member states, it is notable that a seemingly low

11 This does not contradict the finding that there is a low level of economic euroscepticism in Denmark: What it suggests is that, among the (relatively low) percentage of Danes who reject the benefit of the EU, there are a high number who do not consider membership itself a good thing.

level of euroscepticism in a country does not imply that an EU referendum in that country would easily be won. To the extent that the day-to-day euroscepticism reflected in opinion polls is indicative of voting behaviour,¹² a referendum outcome will still depend on how the particular issue is framed. In the Danish case, an issue directly or indirectly evoking concerns about national sovereignty seems as unlikely to be publically endorsed in Denmark today as it was twenty years ago.

EXPLAINING EUROSCEPTIC PATTERNS

What, if any, cross-national patterns of euroscepticism exist? Popular expectations regarding such patterns include the idea that the Nordic countries are particularly eurosceptic, that the EU is more attuned to Catholics than to Protestants, and that poorer countries are less eurosceptic than more affluent countries since they depend on the EU economically to a larger extent. Academically, although variation in euroscepticism at the aggregate country level has long been recognized, disagreement continues as to the determinants of this variation. While domestic economic conditions are cited in one study,¹³ national traditions play a decisive role in another.¹⁴ In yet other studies, the timing and length of membership¹⁵ and the size of a country¹⁶ are argued to be important criteria to include in any explanation of cross-country eurosceptic variation.

The argument that the domestic economic conditions of a country explain its population's attitudes towards the EU departs from the understanding that a prime rationale for European integration has been, and is, economic. Integra-

12 Importantly, no direct equation can be drawn between the two. One notable difference is that studies of voting behaviour need to consider a possible strategic dimension that is arguably weak in public opinion polls. This includes the protest thesis, which holds that EU referendums and elections are 'second order' votes that dissatisfied citizens use as a means to punish their government (see, for instance, Schmitt, 2005). Another important difference is that the very act of calling a referendum is likely to inspire people to give more thought to, for instance, possible future developments of the topic in question, which may affect responses.

13 Gabel, 1998.

14 Eichenberg & Dalton, 1993.

15 Anderson & Kaltenthaler, 1996.

16 Deflem & Pampei, 1996.

tion started with coal and steel co-operation, and still today economic growth and development are central motivations for integration, and among the key responsibilities of the EU. We saw above that economic concerns represent a coherent and independent type of euroscepticism. The question, therefore, is how the domestic economic situation impacts on economic euroscepticism as well as the other types of euroscepticism. The argument has been put forward by Christopher Anderson and Karl Kaltenthaler that, if the domestic economy is doing well, citizens look favourably upon the integration process. Conversely, if it is doing poorly, “they will view European integration in a more negative light, wondering why it is not improving their country’s economic performance”.¹⁷ The reverse situation, however, can also be envisioned: the more affluent a country is, the more its citizens feel they can manage without (deeper) European integration. As Mathieu Deflem and Fred Pampei argue, since affluent countries are often countries with extensive social guarantees, they are more likely to resent European integration if it is seen as interfering with domestic welfare.¹⁸ Regardless of the direction of the causal arrow, the hypothesis adopted in this article is that domestic economic affluence shapes citizens’ EU attitudes.

Other scholars emphasize the role played by national traditions and characteristics in influencing public impressions of the EU.¹⁹ Richard Eichenberg and Russell Dalton explain the seemingly EU-sceptic stance of many British citizens with reference to Britain’s ‘traditionally insular’ approach to the EU,²⁰ which, in addition to geographical location, is “partially the result of traditional British strategy with respect to the European balance of power, as well as its legacy of empire”.²¹ Increasingly, scholars are demonstrating that attachment to such national traditions is an important component of euroscepticism²² and, as pointed out above, sovereignty-based concerns have been confirmed as a coherent and independent type of euroscepticism. The question here is how

17 Anderson & Kaltenthaler, 1996: 177.

18 Deflem & Pampei, 1996.

19 E.g. Eichenberg & Dalton, 1993.

20 *Ibid.*: 525.

21 *Ibid.*

22 See, for instance, McLaren, 2007; Hooghe & Marks, 2004, 2005; Smith, 2005.

national traditions influence euroscepticism, or more specifically, whether variation in comparable national traditions has a similar effect on scepticism in all member states. For reasons of time and space, this article limits its investigation to the indicators of dominant religion, political system, geographical location and population size. I am aware that this is not a full list, and the intention is merely to provide an idea of the comparability of national characteristics in shaping euroscepticism.

In particular, I am aware that, given this aim, I have chosen indicators of the role played by national traditions and characteristics that are easily operationalisable and thus more easily comparable. Lene Hansen's work shows through the case of Denmark that a country's dominant EU attitude is likely to depend on how the idea of the state, the nation and the people has evolved into a specific conceptual constellation.²³ A country's particular constellation determines how the EU is approached. If a country's national identity is constructed around the idea that international cooperation is a foundation for peace, it could be thought to inspire a largely pro-EU background. A more eurosceptic background would follow if a country's national identity was constructed around a feeling of national self-sufficiency. As national self-sufficiency is a compound concept, made up of a variety of complex factors, it would, however, not be possible to test it with the data-material used for testing the other hypotheses engaged in this study. This would make cross-country comparisons difficult from a methodological point of view. To ensure maximum comparability, I have therefore restricted myself to the above-mentioned individual factors of religion, political system, geography and size as indicators of how national traditions and characteristics may be accounting for eurosceptic patterns.

Finally, a largely exogenous explanation of euroscepticism patterns was put forward by Anderson and Kaltenthaler, in addition to their economic argument set out above. It concerns the timing of entry, and time since entry, of individual countries. Anderson and Kaltenthaler contend that "the time a state enters the European integration process is a valuable predictor of support for European integration",²⁴ and they expect to find high EU support in founding

23 Hansen, 2002.

24 Anderson & Kaltenthaler, 1996: 177.

member states, low support in those countries that joined in the 1970s round of enlargement (where a negatively predisposed public opinion had constrained elites' aspirations to join early), and again high support in the countries joining in the 1980s, as they entered the Union late not because of any lack of enthusiasm for the EU as an organisation, but because their membership was prevented by the other member states for political reasons.²⁵ Published in 1996, the article does not include figures for the enlargement with Austria, Finland and Sweden in 1995, nor the Eastern enlargements in 2004 and 2007, but, following the authors' reasoning, the former three countries would be expected to be highly eurosceptic, as their late accession was not a product of external hindrances, while the opposite should be the case for the latter group of twelve countries. It thus follows from the timing of entry hypothesis that recent experience with dictatorship in a country could be a contributing factor in explaining positive EU attitudes.

Andersen and Kaltenthaler add that length of membership is also an important explanation of EU attitudes: on an EU-optimistic note, they argue that membership "starts a domestic socialization process, which leads to greater awareness and appreciation of the benefits derived from integration, and the set of institutions making up the EU more generally", meaning that "higher levels of support can be observed over time".²⁶ This part of their argument appears not to be confirmed by later empirical events, but it was not uncommon among EU scholars in the 1980s and early 1990s.²⁷

I argue that these different expectations regarding what shapes euroscepticism in a country, and thus what eurosceptic patterns we are likely to observe, have to be re-evaluated on the basis of the four types of euroscepticism introduced above. Existing studies have used, as a basis for their conclusions, a dependent variable reflecting only one, or unconsciously a mix, of the four types the independence of which I have since confirmed. We gain a better understanding of eurosceptic patterns once we depart from an understanding of the multifaceted nature of euroscepticism.

As I return to discussing in the conclusion to this article, acceptance of the

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid.

27 See especially Reif & Inglehart, 1991.

explanatory power of country-specific traits on euroscepticism of course risks the finding that comparisons of euroscepticism across populations are in fact meaningless. Idiosyncratic pasts, memories, political systems, size, religion and geographical location may *in combination* produce EU attitudes that are fundamentally incomparable across borders. The failure to confirm any of the possible patterns of euroscepticism discussed here would point to the validity of this 'null hypothesis'.

METHODOLOGY

To investigate the extent to which the above theoretical hypotheses hold true in light of the typology of euroscepticism adopted by this article, I first examine the euroscepticism profiles of the fifteen 'old' EU member states using the Eurobarometer indicators listed in Annex 1. Subsequently I group these countries along the various hypotheses sketched in the above section.

The hypotheses are operationalised as follows:

- H1: *Time of entry*: Founding member states, 1973 enlargement, 1983 and 1986 enlargements, 1995 enlargement. Here also: *Recent experience with dictatorship*: Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain.
- H2: *Domestic economic situation*: GDP per capita.
- H3: *Population size*: Large: above the EU average. Small: below the EU average.
- H4: *Geographical location*: Northern (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, the UK), Central (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands), Southern (Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain).
- H5: *Political system*: Constitutional monarchy, republic, federal republic.
- H6: *Dominant religion*: Catholicism, Protestantism (incl. the Church of England), Greek Orthodox.

The inquiry is limited to the fifteen older EU member states, as there is simply still not enough long-term data for the newer member states. Unfortunately, the data for the old member states is even insufficient for the long-term measure of social euroscepticism, as this particular concern has only recently started

to be polled by Eurobarometer. I apply the longest time span possible for each indicator.²⁸

In investigating the hypotheses, there are two interesting patterns to look out for. Indeed, while similarities are predominantly sought in terms of the contemporary euroscepticism profiles of EU15 (if countries share the same combination of euroscepticism), similarities regarding the way in which these types develop over time, regardless of their initial strength, are also noteworthy, as they inform us of the likely stability of, and future direction of, a country's euroscepticism.

Grouping EU15 member states alphabetically, we obtain the following table for each pattern.

Table 3. *Pattern I: Type of euroscepticism.*

Type	Economic	Sovereignty	Democracy	Social	Degree
Austria	Yes	Partial	Partial	No	Mixed
Belgium	No	No	No	No	Low
Denmark	No	Yes	Partial	No	Mixed
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Mixed
France	Partial	No	Partial	Yes	Low
Germany	Partial	No	No	No	Low
Greece	No	No	No	Partial	Low
Ireland	No	No	No	No	Low
Italy	No	No	No	No	Low
Luxembourg	No	No	No	Yes	Low
Netherlands	No	No	Yes	No	Low
Portugal	No	No	No	Partial	Low
Spain	No	No	No	Yes	Low
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Mixed
The UK	Partial	Yes	No	No	High

On a general level we can observe that, in terms of type, no other population of EU15 fully matches the Danish euroscepticism profile. Finland and Sweden arguably come closest to the Danish profile, as they share a strong sovereignty-based euroscepticism, a higher than average democratic euroscep-

28 Given the various EU enlargements, development figures for the older member states necessarily reflect the longest time span. Up until the early 1990s, German figures are only pertinent to West Germany.

ticism and some degree of hard euroscepticism. Only two pairs of countries share exactly the same euroscepticism profile: Finland and Sweden on the one hand, and Portugal and Greece on the other.

Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain are characterised by a relative lack of economic, sovereignty-based and democratic euroscepticism, a low level of hard euroscepticism, and a relatively prominent level of social euroscepticism. Germany and the Netherlands are distinguished by one relatively prominent type of euroscepticism each, namely economic euroscepticism in the German case, and democratic euroscepticism in the Dutch case. The prominent social euroscepticism in France, combined with the absence of sovereignty-based euroscepticism, adds a distinct flavour to French euroscepticism. It makes little sense to speak of a relative Belgian, Irish or Italian euroscepticism, as these are not distinguished from the EU average in any of the four types, nor as regards the level of hard euroscepticism.

Table 4. **Pattern 2: Development of euroscepticism.**

Development	Economic	Sovereignty	Democracy	Social	Degree
Austria	↑	↑	↔	n/a	↔
Belgium	↓	↑	↔	n/a	↔
Denmark	↓	↔	↓	n/a	↓
Finland	↑	↑	↔	n/a	↔
France	↑	↔	↓	n/a	↑
Germany	↓	↓	↔	n/a	↔
Greece	↔	↑	↓	n/a	↔
Ireland	↔	↔	↔	n/a	↔
Italy	↑	↔	↓	n/a	↑
Luxembourg	↔	↔	↓	n/a	↔
Netherlands	↑	↔	↑	n/a	↔
Portugal	↑	↔	↔	n/a	↑
Spain	↓	↑	↓	n/a	↔
Sweden	↓	↓	↔	n/a	↓
The UK	↓	↔	↓	n/a	↓

Here, one country, namely the United Kingdom, shares the same pattern of euroscepticism as Denmark. In both countries, euroscepticism is decreasing in the economic and democratic types of scepticism, while it is stable with regard to sovereignty-based euroscepticism. The level of hard euroscepticism is also

decreasing in both countries. Together with Sweden, Denmark and the UK are the countries witnessing the most general decrease of euroscepticism across types.

In contrast, euroscepticism is increasing within most types in Austria, Finland, and the Netherlands (increase in scepticism levels with regard to two types, with the other types remaining stable). In France, Italy and Portugal, economic euroscepticism is increasing together with the level of hard euroscepticism. Belgium, Greece and Spain are experiencing an increase in one type of euroscepticism, namely sovereignty-based euroscepticism. Ireland, Germany and Luxembourg share a generally stable or decreasing development of euroscepticism.

Following this overview of the patterns of euroscepticism, it is appropriate to turn to a test of the six hypotheses identified above.

EUROSCEPTIC PATTERNS

Hypothesis 1. The ‘timing of entry’ hypothesis, allowing also for tests of the ‘length of membership’ and ‘recent dictatorship’ hypotheses.

Table 5. *Hypothesis 1: Time of entry.*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard	Dev.	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
B	No	No	No	No	No	B	↓	↑	↔	n/a	↔
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No	Fr	↑	↔	↓	n/a	↑
D	P	No	No	No	No	D	↓	↓	↔	n/a	↔
It	No	No	No	No	No	It	↑	↔	↓	n/a	↑
L	No	No	No	Yes	No	L	↔	↔	↓	n/a	↔
Nl	No	No	Yes	No	No	Nl	↑	↔	↑	n/a	↔
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P	Dk	↓	↔	↓	n/a	↓
Ie	No	No	No	No	No	Ie	↔	↔	↔	n/a	↔
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes	Uk	↓	↔	↓	n/a	↓
Gr	No	No	No	P	No	Gr	↔	↑	↓	n/a	↔
P	No	No	No	P	No	P	↑	↔	↔	n/a	↑
E	No	No	No	Yes	No	E	↓	↑	↓	n/a	↔
A	Yes	P	P	No	P	A	↑	↑	↔	n/a	↔
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Fi	↑	↑	↔	n/a	↔
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Sw	↓	↓	↔	n/a	↓

Note. First category: founding members (1957). Second category: 1973. Third category: 1983/86. Fourth category: 1995.

To facilitate the search for a time of entry pattern, the above graphs show the type and development of euroscepticism grouped according to the year of entry of the fifteen oldest EU member states.

Focusing first on type, the timing of entry hypothesis is to a large degree confirmed. With Ireland and France as important outliers, the expectation that the original member states, as well as those member states joining in the 1980s, do not share an extensive euroscepticism and that, conversely, those member states joining in the 1970s and in the 1990s share an extensive euroscepticism, holds true. Austria, Finland and Sweden on the one hand, and Greece, Portugal and Spain on the other, in fact have very similar euroscepticism profiles.

We may note that social euroscepticism, which is the type of euroscepticism with the lowest correlation with the level of hard euroscepticism,²⁹ is only found among the founding members and the countries joining in the 1980s.

Looking more closely at the five member states with a recent experience of dictatorship, namely Germany, Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain, we find a generally low degree of euroscepticism in each country. However, as we find the same situation of low euroscepticism in countries with no recent experience of dictatorship, notably Belgium and Ireland, further study would be required to single out this experience as decisive for shaping euroscepticism. I would like in this connection to stress the difference between a study of EU support and euroscepticism: it is indeed plausible that some factors investigated here impact more clearly on patterns of EU support than of scepticism.

Looking at the development of euroscepticism over time, the timing since entry pattern dissolves. Time of entry does not shape any particular pattern of increasing, stable or decreasing euroscepticism across the four types, nor with regard to the level of hard euroscepticism. As pointed out above, euroscepticism even increases the most in Finland and Austria and decreases the most in Sweden—three member states that joined the EU at the same time.

As regards the length of membership hypothesis, as expected and already pointed out above, it can be ruled out. The graph of the types of euroscepticism show that it is still prevalent and strong in member states with a long history within the EU, and the development graph shows increasing euroscepticism in nine member states.

29 See Annex 1.

Table 6. *Hypothesis 2: Affluence.*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard	Dev.	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
L	No	No	No	Yes	No	L	↔	↔	↓	-	↔
Ie	No	No	No	No	No	Ie	↔	↔	↔	-	↔
Nl	No	No	Yes	No	No	Nl	↑	↔	↑	-	↔
A	Yes	P	P	No	P	A	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P	Dk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
B	No	No	No	No	No	B	↓	↑	↔	-	↔
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes	Uk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Sw	↓	↓	↔	-	↓
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Fi	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
D	P	No	No	No	No	D	↓	↓	↔	-	↔
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No	Fr	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
It	No	No	No	No	No	It	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
E	No	No	No	Yes	No	E	↓	↑	↓	-	↔
Gr	No	No	No	P	No	Gr	↔	↑	↓	-	↔
P	No	No	No	P	No	P	↑	↔	↔	-	↑

Note. European Commission figures. GDP per capita in PPS, 2005 (average for EU25).

With regard to types of euroscepticism, a pattern seems to be emerging with regard to the ‘affluence hypothesis’. Seemingly, there is more, and generally stronger euroscepticism in those member states with a GDP per capita above the EU25 average—in other words, economic dependency on the EU does seem to foster less euroscepticism. Only with regard to social euroscepticism, which, as pointed out above, is the type of euroscepticism with the lowest correlation with the level of hard euroscepticism, is there some euroscepticism in the lesser affluent member states. There are, however, notable exceptions among the more affluent countries. In the two most affluent countries, Luxembourg and Ireland, there is hardly any euroscepticism. The same is the case for the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany. It is possible, therefore, that affluence is merely a spurious explanation for the pattern observed here. I return to an overall evaluation of the hypotheses below, following inter alia a discussion of the geography hypothesis.

Examining the development of euroscepticism over time, moreover, it is plausible that the pattern of an affluence-based euroscepticism is not stable. Euroscepticism is increasing across the types in both the more and the less affluent countries. If this development continues, the hypothesis will no longer hold true. The lesser affluent EU15 member states, for instance, will be characterised by greater differences with regard to their type and strength of euroscepticism.

Table 7. *Hypothesis 3: Population size*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
D	P	No	No	No	No
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes
It	No	No	No	No	No
E	No	No	No	Yes	No
Nl	No	No	Yes	No	No
Gr	No	No	No	P	No
P	No	No	No	P	No
B	No	No	No	No	No
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
A	Yes	P	P	No	P
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
Ie	No	No	No	No	No
L	No	No	No	Yes	No

Dev	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
D	↓	↓	↔	-	↔
Fr	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
Uk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
It	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
E	↓	↑	↓	-	↔
Nl	↑	↔	↑	-	↔
Gr	↔	↑	↓	-	↔
P	↑	↔	↔	-	↑
B	↓	↑	↔	-	↔
Sw	↓	↓	↔	-	↓
A	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Dk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Fi	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Ie	↔	↔	↔	-	↔
L	↔	↔	↓	-	↔

Note. European Commission figures from 2006.

The above graphs list the member states according to size of their population. It is difficult to establish any clear pattern as regards either type or development of euroscepticism. There is strong and increasing euroscepticism in both larger and smaller countries. In other words, population size does not seem to matter when it comes to shaping euroscepticism.

Table 8. *Hypothesis 4: Geographical location.*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
Ie	No	No	No	No	No
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes
A	Yes	P	P	No	P
B	No	No	No	No	No
D	P	No	No	No	No
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No
L	No	No	No	Yes	No
Nl	No	No	Yes	No	No
E	No	No	No	Yes	No
Gr	No	No	No	P	No
It	No	No	No	No	No
P	No	No	No	P	No

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
Dk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Fi	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Sw	↓	↓	↔	-	↓
Ie	↔	↔	↔	-	↔
Uk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
A	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
B	↓	↑	↔	-	↔
D	↓	↓	↔	-	↔
Fr	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
L	↔	↔	↓	-	↔
Nl	↑	↔	↑	-	↔
E	↓	↑	↓	-	↔
Gr	↔	↑	↓	-	↔
It	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
P	↑	↔	↔	-	↑

Interestingly, quite a few patterns seem to be shared by countries with a similar geographical location. The four countries with a clear sovereignty-based euroscepticism are all northern European countries. Of the five countries with a relatively pronounced level of hard euroscepticism, four are northern European countries. Social euroscepticism seems to be more pronounced the further south a country is located.

The picture is clearest for the four southern member states and the three northern member states that are also part of the Nordic countries. The southern member states are all characterised by the absence of a pronounced economic, sovereignty-based and democratic euroscepticism, while the Nordic EU members are united by a strong sovereignty-based euroscepticism, a somewhat strong democratic euroscepticism, no relative social euroscepticism and a higher than average level of hard euroscepticism.

Again, Ireland is a prominent outsider.

Table 9. *Hypothesis 5: Political system.*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
B	No	No	No	No	No
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P
E	No	No	No	Yes	No
L	No	No	No	Yes	No
Nl	No	No	Yes	No	No
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No
Gr	No	No	No	P	No
Ie	No	No	No	No	No
It	No	No	No	No	No
P	No	No	No	P	No
A	Yes	P	P	No	P
D	P	No	No	No	No

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
B	↓	↑	↔	-	↔
Dk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
E	↓	↑	↓	-	↔
L	↔	↔	↓	-	↔
Nl	↑	↔	↑	-	↔
Sw	↓	↓	↔	-	↓
Uk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Fi	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Fr	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
Gr	↔	↑	↓	-	↔
Ie	↔	↔	↔	-	↔
It	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
P	↑	↔	↔	-	↑
A	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
D	↓	↓	↔	-	↔

Note: First category: constitutional monarchy. Second category: republic. Third category: federal republic.

The organisation of a member state’s political system in the form of a constitutional monarchy, republic or federal republic does not seem to impact on the type or development of euroscepticism in a country.

Table 10. *Hypothesis 6: Dominant religion.*

Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard	Type	Econ	Sov	Demo	Soc	Hard
A	Yes	P	P	No	P	A	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
B	No	No	No	No	No	B	↓	↑	↔	-	↔
E	No	No	No	Yes	No	E	↓	↑	↓	-	↔
Fr	P	No	P	Yes	No	Fr	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
Ie	No	No	No	No	No	Ie	↔	↔	↔	-	↔
It	No	No	No	No	No	It	↑	↔	↓	-	↑
L	No	No	No	Yes	No	L	↔	↔	↓	-	↔
P	No	No	No	P	No	P	↑	↔	↔	-	↑
D	P	No	No	No	No	D	↓	↓	↔	-	↔
NI	No	No	Yes	No	No	NI	↑	↔	↑	-	↔
Dk	No	Yes	P	No	P	Dk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Fi	↑	↑	↔	-	↔
Sw	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	P	Sw	↓	↓	↔	-	↓
Uk	P	Yes	No	No	Yes	Uk	↓	↔	↓	-	↓
Gr	No	No	No	P	No	Gr	↔	↑	↓	-	↔

Note. First category: predominantly Catholicism. Second category: mix of Catholicism/Protestantism.
Third category: predominantly Protestantism. Fourth category: Greek Orthodox.

There is most euroscepticism in those of the EU15 member states that are predominantly Protestant. However, as the remaining religious categorizations do not seem to have much in common with regard to euroscepticism, the coincidence of Protestantism with euroscepticism cannot be seen in isolation. Inter alia, the three EU15 countries in which Protestantism is dominant are also Nordic countries. Before turning to a discussion of the overall conclusions from this examination of hypotheses of eurosceptic patterns, the article takes a closer look at Nordic scepticism specifically.

NORDIC EUROSCEPTICISM

From the above analysis, an immediate conclusion seems to be that there are notable similarities among the euroscepticism profiles of Danes, Finns and Swedes, but also differences between them.³⁰

What all three Nordic EU members share with regard to their euroscepti-

30 For in depth accounts of the Nordics and European integration see Ingebritsen 1998; Hansen & Wæver, 2002.

cism is a strong sovereignty-based hesitation towards integration, the absence of a social euroscepticism and a higher than average level of hard euroscepticism. This portrait of euroscepticism makes the three countries belong amongst those EU15 member states with the most euroscepticism from an overall perspective (alongside Austria, France and the EU).³¹

Importantly, however, the Danes differ from the Finns and the Swedes by sharing a less pronounced democratic euroscepticism and in not being eurosceptic within the economic type. Nonetheless, a long-term perspective on Danish euroscepticism shows that the two areas where Danes today are less distinguished by their euroscepticism than Finns and Swedes are precisely areas where Danish scepticism was indeed pronounced in early decades (as noted above, Danish economic and democratic scepticism has steadily decreased over time). This suggests that Finnish and Swedish euroscepticism will in time come to resemble Danish euroscepticism, and thus that it may be possible to speak of a uniquely Nordic euroscepticism profile. The decreasing level of democratic euroscepticism in both Sweden and Finland, as well as the decreasing level of economic euroscepticism in Sweden, seems to support this expectation, as does the general finding that newly acceded member states are characterised by an initially high level of euroscepticism, which somewhat decreases over time.³²

On the other hand, several considerations warn us against the expectation that Finnish and Swedish euroscepticism will develop along the same lines as Danish euroscepticism has done. To begin with, early Danish economic euroscepticism never reached anything near the same high level shared by the Swedes up until at least the mid 2000s. Two years following its accession, the perception in Denmark that membership had not been beneficial was shared by 27% of the population. Two years following the accession of Sweden, the equivalent Swedish figure was at 55%. Finland also contrasts with the Danish pattern of euroscepticism in that it is experiencing increasing economic euroscepticism, something that Denmark has never done.

These findings suggest that it is events, rather than time alone, that explain the gradual decrease in Danish economic and democratic euroscepticism. Indeed, it is a central assumption of the paper that public euroscepticism is a

31 These countries all share a stronger than average euroscepticism in more than one type.

32 For example, Eurobarometer polls show that levels of euroscepticism reached one-off high levels in the first years following accession in for instance Denmark, Greece and Spain.

reflection of how the EU at the present day is perceived on an abstract level. Today's EU is substantially different from the EU of twenty years ago. I return to this discussion in the conclusion.

Finally, even though the euroscepticism profile of Finland and Sweden seems similar today – meaning that it might, at least, be meaningful to speak of a non-continental Nordic euroscepticism – a closer look at the figures reveals important nuances.

Perhaps the most significant difference is that Swedish euroscepticism has generally been on the decrease, while Finnish euroscepticism has increased or remained stable. While the Swedes, as alluded to above, started their membership with a degree of scepticism that, within most types, was higher than in Finland, they terminated their first decade in the EU by being generally in line with or less sceptical than the Finns. The figures below illustrate this.³³

Economic euroscepticism:

In 1998, 55% of the Swedes and 31% of the Finns thought that their country had not benefited from membership.

In 2007, the figure had decreased to 43% in Sweden and increased to 41% in Finland.

Sovereignty-based euroscepticism:

In 2002, there were 5 percentage points more Finns than Swedes who wanted cooperation to be purely decided at the national level (within the six areas: social welfare, immigration, environment protection, research, unemployment, and education).

In 2007, the distance had increased to 14 percentage points.

Democratic euroscepticism:

Between 1998 and 2007, the amount of citizens dissatisfied with EU democracy decreased in both Finland and Sweden, but whereas the decrease amounted to 13 percentage points in Sweden, it was at 5 percentage points in Finland.

33 Due to the infrequent polling of indicators of social euroscepticism between 1995 and 2007, it was not possible to measure the development of this type in Finland and Sweden.

Hard euroscepticism:

In 1997, 41% in Sweden and 23% in Finland thought membership was a bad thing.

By 2007, the Swedish figure had dropped 18 percentage points to trail the stable Finnish level at 24%.

These differences suggest that today's similarities between the euroscepticism profiles of the Nordic EU member states may be short-lived, and that the geographical explanation for euroscepticism patterns has its shortcomings. This conclusion is also supported by the continued non-membership of the EU of the other Nordic countries, Iceland and Norway. In these countries, opposition to membership itself, or hard euroscepticism, is seemingly considerably stronger and more rooted than in the cases of Denmark, Finland and Sweden. I now turn to a discussion of the consequences of the general difficulty of identifying clear cross-national eurosceptic patterns.

DISCUSSION

The above findings provide a generally pessimistic perspective on the ability to establish cross-national euroscepticism patterns. While some pattern hypotheses produced no meaningful pattern, even the hypotheses that fared the best had notable outliers, suggesting that further study is needed to account for the differences shown. Perhaps an inductive approach – in which the questions of, for instance, what it is that Belgium, Ireland and Italy have in common that provides for their general absence of euroscepticism, and whether there is anything other than time of EU entry that unites Sweden, Finland and Austria, are in focus – would lead to the determination of new, more adequate, pattern expectations.

On the basis of the above analysis, the answer to the question of whether or not there is such a thing as a particularly Nordic form of euroscepticism can only be a partial yes. Denmark, Finland and Sweden are indeed united in sharing a strong sovereignty-based euroscepticism, the absence of a social euroscepticism and a level of hard euroscepticism above the EU average. But the three countries are distinguished by unique patterns within these types of scepticism,

as well as, in the Danish case, by a generally weaker economic and democratic scepticism. Uneven dynamics in the development of the various types of euroscepticism means that there are no clear signs that Nordic euroscepticism is developing towards a unifying pattern.

In the absence of being able to confirm a clear overarching pattern of euroscepticism, the above analysis nevertheless revealed some interesting trends. We saw, for instance, that those countries traditionally seen as having strong euroscepticism, namely Denmark, Sweden and the UK, are precisely those countries where euroscepticism is decreasing the most currently, while it is on the other hand increasing considerably in countries previously not known to be eurosceptic, such as Portugal. Most apart with regard to their development of euroscepticism are countries like Sweden and Finland, which we otherwise saw shared exactly the same profile of euroscepticism.

The explanation proposed here for the unclear patterns of euroscepticism is that populations position themselves according to different overarching perceptions of what the EU is, as well as different visions about what the EU should be. Perhaps as the product of idiosyncratic national identities, or different lessons of the past,³⁴ these perceptions and visions vary considerably from country to country. Put crudely, all citizens evaluate the EU's economic utility, its impact on national sovereignty, its democratic standing and its ability to produce politics in accordance with their standpoint. In addition, they have their own ideas about the extent to which the EU should be useful, how far it may impact on national sovereignty, and how far it should be democratic and in accordance with certain political orientations. Shortcomings between ideal and perception result in euroscepticism: in other words, euroscepticism arises if the EU is perceived to be out of touch with one's own vision. However, as perceptions of the EU are not stable, euroscepticism is likely to be influenced by notable changes in the EU.

In this respect, an event like EU enlargement plays a large role. In that it changes the nature of EU integration and is something that many citizens react to on an abstract level. Enlargement, for instance, may shift perceptions of the degree to which the EU is social, democratic, useful and supranational. Put crudely, based on this analysis, EU enlargement is apparently bringing the EU

34 Mouritzen & Wivel, 2005: 38-40; Wallace, 1999.

closer to the EU vision of the Danes, Swedes and British, while the opposite seems to be the case for countries like Portugal, but also Austria and Finland.

The existence of different EU perceptions and visions means that it is crucial for those involved in communicating the EU to be sensitive to the unique euroscepticism situations of different countries. As we have seen, euroscepticism is diverse even across the Nordic member states: although Finland and Sweden share the same types of euroscepticism, they are almost as far apart as it is possible to be when it comes to the development of euroscepticism. This suggests that the EU visions of Swedes and Finns are after all different. Although the two neighbours certainly have more in common with each other in terms of euroscepticism than with, for instance, the southern member states, a different EU role is apparently still being sought.

As the strongest conclusion of this article is that the euroscepticism of a country cannot be adequately explained without regard to a combination of factors that are unique to that country, it may be towards a more in-depth and qualitative study of domestic EU visions that future research should be encouraged. Importantly, this focus should not be restricted to the study of how national identity reacts in the face of European integration.³⁵ What is needed is research that combines the study of how country-specific factors influence public perceptions of the EU with the study of public perceptions of on-going EU initiatives. Indeed, the ebbs and flows of public opinion towards the EU can only be mapped if both EU-specific and country-specific factors are taken into account. As these factors may impact differently on different types of euroscepticism, the recognition of the multifaceted nature of euroscepticism is a necessary precondition for such studies.

A fully drawn-up map of contemporary euroscepticism and its dynamics is likely to simultaneously have constraining and facilitating consequences for national governments in conducting their European policies. It will, for instance, affect the ability of politicians to justify their reluctance to specific integrative initiatives with the reference to a sceptic domestic population. Recently, 'red lines' at intergovernmental conferences have been justified as the means to secure that a proposed treaty did not trespass perceived public concerns, as presented by for instance former British Prime Minister Tony Blair during

35 Here, a number of seminal studies already exist; see, for instance, Ingebritsen, 1998; Hansen & Wæver, 2002.

the closing of the negotiations on the Constitutional Treaty. Swedish Prime Minister Frederik Reinfeldt justified his reluctance to accept a proposal on improving decision making in Justice and Home Affairs with the argument that he “did not have the support of the public to accept it”.³⁶ Detailed knowledge about the loci and foci of euroscepticism necessarily restricts the scope of such arguments, but it simultaneously improves the compelling power of arguments that have a base in actual figures.

Moreover, the impact of EU campaigns improves with the identification of the particular euroscepticism profile of citizens. This, of course, is applicable for campaigns of both pro- and anti-EU orientation. If, for instance, there is no pronounced economic euroscepticism in a country, a ‘no’ campaign would not maximise its impact if it directed itself to allegations that EU membership is expensive. Similarly, if there is no pronounced democratic euroscepticism in a country, arguments about more power to the European Parliament will not be a compelling argument for a ‘yes’ campaign.

While there is certainly no guarantee that campaigns directed to the particular euroscepticism profile of a country will succeed in convincing their target group, such campaigns are at least likely to take place closer to the actual concerns of citizens. It is in this way that this article holds that knowledge about the extent to which, where and why specific combinations of euroscepticism occur assists in bringing the EU closer to its citizens.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Christopher J. & Karl C. Kaltenthaler (1996), ‘The Dynamics of Public Opinion toward European Integration 1973-93’, *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 2, no. 2: 175-199.
- Deflem, Mathieu & Fred Pampei (1996), ‘The Myth of Postnational Identity: Popular Support for European Unification’, *Social Forces*, vol. 75, no. 1: 119-143.

36 Quoted in EUobserver, 15 December 2006.

- Eichenberg, Richard C. & Russell J. Dalton (1993), 'The Dynamics of Public Support for European Integration', *International Organization*, vol. 47, no. 4: 507-534.
- Gabel, Matthew (1998), 'Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories', *Journal of Politics*, vol. 60, no. 2: 333-354.
- Hansen, Lene & Ole Wæver (eds) (2002), *European Integration and National Identity. The Challenge of the Nordic States*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, Lene (2002), 'Sustaining sovereignty: the Danish approach to Europe', in Lene Hansen & Ole Wæver (eds), *European Integration and National Identity. The Challenge of the Nordic States*, London, New York: Routledge: 50-88.
- Hooghe, Liesbet & Gary Marks (2004), 'Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration?'. Online, HTTP: [www.apsanet.org] (accessed 20-05-2008).
- Hooghe, Liesbet & Gary Marks (2005), 'Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration', *European Union Politics*, vol. 6, no. 4: 419-443.
- Ingebritsen, Christine (1998), *The Nordic States and European Unity*, Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
- McLaren, Lauren (2007), 'Explaining Mass-Level Euroscepticism: Identity, Interests, and Institutional Distrust', *Acta Politica*, vol. 42, special issue: 233-251.
- Mouritzen, Hans & Anders Wivel (2005), 'Constellation Theory', in Hans Mouritzen & Anders Wivel (eds), *The Geopolitics of Euro-Atlantic Integration*, London, New York: Routledge:15-43.
- Ray, Leonard (2007), 'Public Opinion, Socialization, and Political Communication', in Knud Erik Jørgensen et al. (eds), *Handbook of European Union Politics*, London: Sage Publications.
- Reif, Karlheinz & Ronald Inglehart (1991) (eds), *Eurobarometer: The Dynamics of European Public Opinion*, London: Macmillan.
- Schmitt, Hermann (2005), 'The European Parliament Elections of June 2004: Still Second-Order?', *West European Politics*, vol. 28, no. 3: 650-679.
- Smith, Anthony D. (2005), 'Set in the Silver Sea': English National Identity and European Integration', Paper presented at Workshop: National Iden-

tity and Euroscepticism: A Comparison Between France and the United Kingdom, Centre for the Study of Democratic Government, Oxford University, May 13.

Szczerbiak, Aleks & Paul Taggart (2003), 'Theorising Party-Based Euroscepticism: Problems of Definition, Measurement and Causality', *Sussex European Institute*, working Paper, no. 69.

Sørensen, Catharina (2007a), *Euroscepticism: A Conceptual Analysis and a Longitudinal, Cross-Country Examination of Public Scepticism towards the European Union*, Ph.D. Thesis, Copenhagen University.

Sørensen, Catharina (ed) (2007b), *50 år med EU. Danske perspektiver*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).

Wallace, William (1999), 'Small European States and European Policy-Making: Strategies, Roles, Possibilities', in Wallace et al. (eds), *Between Autonomy and Influence: Small States and the European Union*, Arena Report, no. 1/99, Oslo.

ANNEX I: INDICATORS OF EUROSCEPTICISM

The indicators, four Eurobarometer opinion poll questions for each type, are:

Economic euroscepticism 1) Feeling of benefit from membership, 2) Meaning of the EU: 'A waste of money', 3) Effect of the EU in specific economic areas: 'Bad effect' and 'Very bad effect', 4) Role of the EU in different areas: 'The economic situation – negative role';

Sovereignty-based euroscepticism: 1) Support for an EU government, 2) Reasons for opposing the Constitutional Treaty: 'Loss of national sovereignty', 3) EU integration is a threat to national identity: 'Agree', 4) Joint or national decision-making (17 policy areas): 'national level only';

Democratic euroscepticism: 1) Satisfaction with EU democracy, 2) Reasons for opposing the Constitutional Treaty: 'Not democratic enough', 3) Is the EU democratic?: 'No', 4) The European Parliament's ability to protect citizens: 'Not well' and 'Not at all well';

Social euroscepticism: 1) Priorities of the EU: 'The EU should give more help to poor and socially excluded in the EU'/'EU should pay less attention to the economy and more to social justice', 2) Reasons for opposing the Constitutional Treaty: 'Not enough social Europe', 3) Fears about the EU: 'The loss of social benefits', 4) EU propositions: 'There should be closer cooperation between member states in social matters: 'Agree'.

Finally, the four indicators for the level of hard euroscepticism: 1) Opinion about membership of the EU: 'Bad thing', 2) Reasons for opposing the Constitutional Treaty: 'Against Europe/European construction/European integration', 3) Personal feelings about the EU: 'Rejecting it', 4) EU referendum: 'Leave the EU'.

I conclude that euroscepticism is partially present if a population is more sceptical than the EU average on two of the four indicators, the remaining indicators being neutral. A country is eurosceptic if all four indicators point in a sceptical direction.

At EU level, the correlation between hard euroscepticism and the four types is strong with regard to economic and sovereignty-based euroscepticism, weaker with regard to democratic euroscepticism and low with regard to social euroscepticism. This means that in only a few cases may social euroscepticism result in a desire to leave the EU.

Chapter 2

Selected Documents

The Israeli-Arab conflict · 117

Address by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller on the Israeli-Arab conflict at the 'Madrid -15 years later' Conference, Madrid, 11 January 2007

Danish Domestic and Foreign Policy · 119

Speech by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at a meeting with foreign ambassadors to Denmark, Copenhagen, 12 January 2007

Human Rights · 128

Statement by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller at the fourth session of the UN Human Rights Council, Geneva, 14 March 2007

Africa and China · 132

Speech by the Danish Minister for Development Cooperation Ulla Tørnæs at a seminar at Aarhus University on Africa and China's role, Aarhus, 17 April 2007

Women in Africa · 138

Opening statement by Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the eighth Africa Partnership Forum, Berlin, 22 May 2007

Climate Change and Foreign Policy · 142

Speech by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller entitled 'Climate Change: Politics versus Economics' at the Chatham House Conference, London, 26 June 2007

Mitigation · 152

Statement by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Roundtable session on mitigation at the UN Climate Summit, New York, 24 September 2007

NATO and Public Diplomacy · 154

Speech by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller at the Seminar on 'Public Diplomacy in NATO-led Operations', Copenhagen, 8 October 2007

NATO and Public Diplomacy · 158

Speech by the Danish Minister of Defence Søren Gade at the Seminar on 'Public Diplomacy in NATO-led Operations', Copenhagen, 8 October 2007

Climate and Africa · 161

Speech by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen on Climate Change and Energy at the EU-Africa Summit, Lisbon, 8 December 2007

Climate · 164

Plenary Statement by the Danish Minister for Climate and Energy Connie Hedegaard at the UN Climate Conference, Bali, 12 December 2007

THE ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT

Address by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller on the Israeli-Arab conflict at the 'Madrid -15 years later' Conference, Madrid, 11 January 2007

Ministers, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

Some 15 years ago, the eyes of the world were directed towards this renowned city, hoping that progress could be made in solving what many then perceived – and still do – as the core source of continuing instability in the Middle East.

But despite several sincere efforts the Israeli-Arab conflict continues to fester. Our presence here today is however a clear and unequivocal expression of our collective conviction that progress towards a just and lasting solution involving not only the Israeli-Palestinian conflict but also the Lebanese and Syrian tracks is possible and indeed realistic.

What we need – not least in this region – is not antagonizing foes – but cooperating partners. What we need is not animosity – but generosity.

Since 1991 substantial progress has been achieved. Most importantly, there is universal agreement among all responsible parties that the goal is a two-state solution – Israel and Palestine – living side by side in peace and security. The Arab League's 2002 Beirut Initiative builds on this fundamental principle. Furthermore, a Roadmap for Peace has been formulated, endorsed by the UN Security Council, and accepted by the primary parties as the basis for how to reach that elusive, but desirable goal of two viable and sustainable states. In other words, we all know more or less what the solution will look like – the problem is how to get there.

Even if we have a Roadmap, that should show the way, the movement towards the goal has hardly begun! Too many has sought to block progress of the peace process. But we must never leave the initiative and the decisions in the hands of those forces that feed off continued conflict and confrontation.

Outside pressure and intervention is vital, but it cannot replace the responsibility of the primary concerned parties themselves to seek a way forward.

The strategic choice of peace and cooperation also means avoiding actions that contradict or counter the goal. Actions that undermine the future per-

spective of two sustainable states are not in the long-term interest of either party. While security concerns and self-defence are legitimate interests, they must respect the boundaries long established in international law. New Israeli settlements on the West Bank and disproportionate use of force run counter to this, as does the Hamas-led Palestinian government's repeated refusals to recognize Israel's right to exist. Hamas may have won an election almost exactly one year ago, but it is not working in the interest of the Palestinian people when it rejects the three Quartet principles.

Still, we have some good reason to have some hope for the future. The recent meeting between Prime Minister Olmert and President Abbas testifies to a shared understanding of the need to keep channels of communication open despite the circumstances. A fragile cease-fire in Gaza seems to hold, despite repeated attempts by radical elements to provoke its collapse.

It is encouraging to see how more and more moderate Arab states now openly counter the obstructive agenda of both state and non-state actors whose goals differ fundamentally with those of peace, reconciliation and justice. This aspect was quite clear from the deliberations in the UN Security Council last September, which gave rise to renewed hope for the peace process.

Before I leave the floor to my friend and colleague from Sweden, allow me to highlight one more issue that is of paramount importance. Peace will not be sustainable if it is not supplemented by a robust economic development that can provide social stability and economic freedom to growing populations in the Middle East.

But the absence of peace in the Middle East severely limits the economic and human potential inherent in the rich and diverse cultures of this region. The resulting unemployment, not least among the young people, in turn underpins those forces seeking confrontation and conflict, not only in the Middle East, but also with the West.

It is a vicious circle that we must break and I hope and trust that this conference will contribute towards supporting those for whom a strategic choice of peace and cooperation is more than simply words. To support them is why we are here today.

Thank you.

DANISH DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

Speech by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at a meeting with foreign ambassadors to Denmark, Copenhagen, 12 January 2007

Ambassadors, Your Excellencies,

It is a great pleasure seeing all of you at this meeting today. This is an excellent opportunity to discuss matters relating to Danish domestic and foreign policy. And I am really pleased that we have now started a new tradition. This is the second year that we meet in this setting to discuss issues of common interest.

On the domestic front the situation is comfortable.

The Danish economy is strong. We have one of the strongest economies in the EU. And future prospects are good.

The economic growth was more than 3% last year – well above the European average. More Danes are working than ever before. And the unemployment rate is still decreasing – at the moment 3.3%. In fact, unemployment is at a 30 year low.

We have substantial surpluses on the public finances and the public debt is falling rapidly. We have solid trade and current account surpluses and the Danish foreign debt is no longer an issue.

International surveys consequently label Denmark as one of the most competitive countries in the world.

These encouraging results are based on Denmark's well-developed public sector, an efficient private sector, a well educated labour force and a sound and stable macroeconomic policy. And not the least, the unique Danish model of flexibility and security in the labour market – that is, flexicurity.

But we need to prepare ourselves for future challenges and to keep ahead of the international competition. In the recent years we have initiated a number of far-reaching reforms.

Firstly, we have introduced a welfare reform to secure the future welfare. The demographic changes pose new challenges. Soon, we will – as in many other countries – have more senior citizens and fewer people of working age.

The reform will allow a gradual increase in the retirement age. And we have made the changes in time to allow people to adapt to them.

The welfare reform is based on a broad political agreement following a long period of public debate, which was indeed intended to take place to pave the way for this comprehensive reform.

Secondly, we have started the implementation of a globalisation reform.

The purpose of this reform is to prepare Denmark for the future as globalisation places increasing pressure on Danish competitiveness and challenges Denmark's position as one of the richest countries in the world.

The aim is to further improve our position as one of the most competitive countries in the world while maintaining our socioeconomic aims and ideals. Education, knowledge, innovation and entrepreneurship are the keys to Denmark's future. We believe that our focus on enhanced education and research will optimize both our flexibility and social security.

The globalisation reform means that we will invest 39 billion DKK in total over the next 7 years.

Thirdly, Denmark needs a modern and efficient public sector to maintain its sound economic development. Therefore, we have also carried out an extensive reform of the public sector and local governments with effect from New Year's Day 2007, which give us bigger and more efficient municipalities with focus on renewed and improved citizen service.

The government has, as you can tell, already completed a wide range of reforms. Actually, the reforms completed by this government are the most extensive reforms in decades. However, we will not stop here. We are still facing new challenges that need to be addressed.

The first challenge is to ensure Danish citizens a continued high level of welfare despite the fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult to hire a sufficient number of employees in the public sector. Over the next 10 years every fourth employee in the public sector will retire. It will be a huge challenge to fill vacancies as the work force decreases.

Therefore, the road to better public service is not more money and more employees. Instead, the challenge is to achieve higher quality in the public service for the money currently spent. Therefore, the government is preparing a quality reform. The purpose of the reform is to ensure high quality public

service even though we are faced with a decreasing work force.

This brings me to the second challenge. That is to ensure a sufficient labour force in general. Not only in the public sector – but also in the private sector.

Especially, we need to focus more on the immigrants and their descendants in Denmark. More than 3 out of 4 Danes are employed. Among the immigrants and their descendants it is only about 2 out of 4 that are employed. In this group we have a big labour force reserve that we unfortunately do not fully benefit from today.

At the same time it is necessary to attract more highly educated and skilled foreigners to Denmark. That is why we are expanding the existing job card system and are introducing a so-called green card system, which makes it possible, for especially qualified foreigners, to seek jobs in Denmark.

The third challenge I will mention is the future energy supply. Denmark has now a favourable position because of the large quantities of oil and natural gas in the North Sea. But we must already now prepare our selves for the time when the energy reserves in the North Sea have been emptied.

The government will set ambitious, long term objectives to make Denmark self-sufficient with environmental compatible energy.

Our point of departure is good. 15% of our energy consumption comes from renewable sources. And we are a world leader in energy efficiency. Our economy has grown approximately 70% over the last 25 years without an increase in the consumption of energy. In this way we demonstrate that there is no contradiction between economic growth and zero growth in energy consumption.

We will in the near future present a long term energy plan. The energy plan will include a markedly extensive use of renewable energy. We will set ambitious objectives for more energy efficiency. We will also increase research, development and innovation with the purpose of developing further the existing as well as new renewable energy sources.

We will combine political regulation and market mechanisms. We want to get as much clean energy as possible for the money spent.

But – and it is important to underline that – a long term energy policy also depends on international cooperation. Therefore, we need to agree on ambitious objectives within the EU. Denmark believes that the aim of a common Energy Policy should be to reduce the EU's dependence on fossil fuels. This

will significantly enhance the EU's energy security and its contribution to the fight against climate change.

Denmark also attaches great importance to the realisation of a genuine and liberalised internal EU market for gas and electricity.

Energy and climate change are closely linked challenges. As you may be aware, Denmark recently offered to host and chair the UN Climate Change Conference in 2009. We hope that we can contribute to facilitate an ambitious post-Kyoto framework. It is indeed a global task. We should aim at taking on board all the major emitters of green house gasses in a post-2012 framework.

Ambassadors,

Naturally, having an open economy and being part of a globalised world influences the way we act in our foreign policy. In my opinion the best way to address the challenges from globalisation is through an active foreign policy based on clear values and strong engagement. Let me mention three important elements:

- Free exchange of goods, services and ideas to further prosperity and the dynamic use of foreign aid to foster such development.
- Strong multilateral cooperation.
- Further European integration.

Many have predicted the 21st century to be the century of Asia. And there can be little doubt that many of the Asian countries are benefiting tremendously from globalisation. There are those who think that we in Europe would have an interest in trying to slow down this development through a protectionist approach.

My approach is the exact opposite. Rather, we must actively take part in the positive development in Asia through increased cooperation and more trade.

My visits to the region during the last couple of years have been an important source of inspiration to the work my Government has undertaken in preparing the Danish society for globalisation.

This spring I plan to visit two countries in Latin America: Argentina and Brazil. I am looking forward to getting a first hand experience of a region that has become an important global player.

There are parts of the world which are not reaping the benefits of globalisation. We need to support the African countries in getting integrated into the global economy.

I can assure you that Africa will be very high on our agenda in the coming years.

The private sector in Africa must be strengthened and the regional trade among the African countries must increase. And the developed countries should demonstrate a much stronger political will to ensure inclusion of Africa into the world market. The EU has already taken initiatives in that regard, and I urge other countries to follow. The planned EU-Africa summit in the second half of 2007 will provide a very good opportunity for a strong focus on this and the important issue of dealing with illegal immigration.

Multilateral cooperation is a cornerstone of Danish foreign policy. Being an active member of the UN, NATO and the European Union allows us to exercise an influence that far exceeds what can be expected from a small country with around 5 mio. inhabitants.

For the past two years Denmark has been a member of the UN Security Council. Allow me to highlight some areas that we have put special emphasis on or that I find have been important achievements for the international community.

Combating terrorism was one of our main priorities and the chairmanship of the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) played a central role during our two years in the Security Council. We took a number of initiatives to assist those countries willing but not able to counter terrorism. But we also achieved concrete results concerning the protection of human rights in the fight against terrorism.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was another Danish priority.

The unanimous Security Council decisions concerning North Korea and Iran were major achievements for the international community.

The Security Council also reached a unanimous decision on Darfur, but unfortunately we still do not have an agreement that allows us to send UN troops. It is an utter disgrace that we are forced to stand back as the killings continue.

We intend to follow up actively on the results of the Security Council membership with a continued strong focus on Africa, conflict solution and the promotion of human rights.

Thus, Denmark is a candidate to the UN Human Rights Council in the upcoming elections in 2007. As a member of the Council, Denmark will continue to contribute to making the Council credible, effective and operative. I very much hope you will support us in our efforts to ensure election.

Active multilateralism also implies the willingness to contribute with military means. Our main contributions are in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq.

In Kosovo we fully support the UN Special Envoy Matti Ahtisaari in his efforts to determine Kosovo's future status. We must ensure that the settlement in Kosovo promotes a multi-ethnic and democratic society based on rule of law. In order to achieve this, a continuation of the international presence will be needed. And we are ready to contribute.

Together with NATO, Denmark is engaged in solving a vital task in Afghanistan. It is of utmost importance for our own security that Afghanistan does not – once again – become a safe haven for terrorists.

Afghanistan is a prime example of the way security and development goes hand in hand. Therefore, we put special emphasis on ways to enhance civil/military cooperation.

The situation in Iraq is grave and the need for reconciliation among the Iraqi people continues to be the key political task for the democratically elected Government of Iraq. I share the vision of President Bush of a free, united and democratic Iraq.

I hope that 2007 will be the year when the Iraqis are able to assume responsibility for the security in Southern Iraq, where United Kingdom and Denmark are currently cooperating. As the Iraqis themselves gradually take over responsibility, we shall be able to reduce the number of British and Danish soldiers and adapt the nature of their assignments. But I would like to underline that Denmark will continue its support to Iraq.

Denmark was among the first countries to decide to contribute to the enlarged UNIFIL force in Lebanon in 2006. We are ready to continue with this assistance in 2007 and are considering the possibilities for financial assistance in other areas.

Progress in the Middle East is highly dependent on the peace process. And

it is my hope that the peace process will be reactivated in 2007 through the Quartet. It is crucial that progress is made. Denmark would like to see two democratic states – Israel and Palestine – living side by side in peace and security.

In general, we will continue our strong engagement in the Arab world. This engagement is not limited to government to government cooperation but involves dialogue at all levels of society; youth, media, religious communities and religious authorities, political parties and NGOs.

To further this approach we are planning to open three new embassies in the region in 2007 in Morocco, Jordan and Lebanon. At the same time, we are also continuing our efforts within the Partnership for Progress and Reform programme.

Let me conclude by outlining three important issues on the EU agenda during the German Presidency.

Firstly, the question of the new EU treaty. My government and a very broad majority of the Danish parliament believe that the Constitutional Treaty is an excellent basis for the future cooperation in the EU. It should be the natural point of departure for the negotiations ahead on a new EU Treaty.

The Constitutional Treaty addresses the main challenges Europe faces. Most importantly it contains provisions for more effective and democratic decision making. These provisions are necessary if we are to enable the enlarged EU to deliver the results that the European citizens are expecting.

At the same time, however, we have to respect the outcome of the referenda in France and the Netherlands. And frankly speaking we cannot expect the French and Dutch governments to present the same text to their electorates again.

It will not be easy to find a solution to the question of the future of the Constitutional Treaty. But I am confident that the German presidency will be able to bring the matter forward.

Secondly, the need for an enhanced EU Neighbourhood Policy. The EU has to make a much greater effort to develop an attractive Neighbourhood Policy. A policy that offers instruments for reform leading to increased stability in the countries East and South of the EU that may not be considered for member-

ship of the EU or only have a long term EU accession perspective.

The EU should offer increased access for the neighbourhood countries to the EU's internal market, increased economical support for reforms, lay the ground for increased people-to-people contacts, and initiate agreements with the neighbourhood countries on cooperation in special areas such as energy, environmental and climate change issues, border control, and migration.

Denmark will support efforts to strengthen the Neighbourhood Policy along these lines.

Thirdly, the German Presidency has also highlighted the need for closer EU-US cooperation, especially in the economic sphere. I fully share this view.

Today, we often focus on emerging economies particularly in Asia. And as I have already stressed this is an important focus point. But we should not forget that the EU and the United States are responsible for two fifths of world trade and we are each other's largest trading and investment partners.

I have on several occasions promoted the vision of a Transatlantic Marketplace. We need a Marketplace without barriers to trade and investment. This would bring increased economic prosperity on both sides of the Atlantic.

However, the Transatlantic Marketplace is a long-term vision that can only be achieved through cooperation and dialogue in concrete areas. A step-by-step approach is needed.

I therefore share the German Presidency's ambition of initiating a dialogue focussing on increased convergence and cooperation in a few concrete areas to begin with. These could be intellectual property rights, financial regulation and harmonisation of standards as well as energy and environment.

During the German EU-presidency – and in the years to come – we should make the vision of global free trade and a Transatlantic Marketplace a key vision.

The need for free trade is as important as ever. We have a common interest in giving the WTO-negotiations priority. What is needed to make progress, boils down to political will.

We all have an interest in free trade. Rich as well as poor countries. We in the more prosperous countries should open our markets to the developing countries. And – not least – the developing countries should open their markets to each other.

There is a huge potential for increased prosperity and stability in increased

free trade across the world.

At the same time free trade is the best way to enhance cooperation and enhance cultural understanding between our nations.

I see free global trade as a common challenge for all of us. And I invite all of you to take part in the important mission to bring down trade barriers and to expand the area of freedom and free trade.

Thank you.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Statement by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller at the fourth session of the UN Human Rights Council, Geneva, 14 March 2007

Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished members of the Human Rights Council,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Initially I wish to endorse fully the statement by Dr. Steinmeier on behalf of the European Union. With globalisation and new issues on today's international agenda, we need strong multilateral cooperation. With more and more problems being of transnational character, we need international organisations that are geared to meet the new challenges.

Denmark worked hard to establish the new Human Rights Council and it is a privilege to address the Council today. The Council must be the central human rights body of the United Nations. We need to make it effective, credible and operative.

Denmark stands ready to shoulder its responsibility and is therefore candidate for a seat on the Human Rights Council at the upcoming elections. A joint candidate of the Nordic countries, that is. Our policy to this effect is explained in detail in our written pledges and commitments.

Mr. Chairman,

Dialogue and consensus must be at the core of the Human Rights Council, as it is in Denmark's own human rights policy. An open, transparent and genuine dialogue with all actors lies at the heart of this principle.

If consensus cannot be reached however, we must not remain paralysed. If dialogue within the Council has failed and action needs to be taken, the Human Rights Council should stand ready to act in the interest of the victims of human rights violations and the credibility of the Council.

The will and the ability of the Council to address specific human rights problems is crucial. But it is also important that the Council is able to offer ways and means to alleviate the root causes of such problems. How could this

be done? We believe by integrating offers of technical assistance in the Council's toolbox.

The Human Rights Council should assess needs, *inter alia* through the Special Procedures and the Universal Periodic Review, and recommend specific measures to be taken in cooperation with the country in question.

Our dialogue should not only be a dialogue among states. Human rights affect civil society. And NGOs and National Human Rights Institutions are strong voices of civil society and very often the victims of human rights abuses. These voices need to be heard in the Council. Their expertise and commitment are important to us, and they deserve our full attention. This is also true for the indigenous peoples. The commitment of Denmark to the worldwide aspirations of the indigenous peoples remains unabated.

Mr Chairman,

Denmark considers respect for human rights, democratisation and good governance as keys to development. And development assistance is an important instrument to support respect for human rights.

Denmark remains one of the world's largest bilateral donors of development assistance per capita. In this context Denmark also provides significant voluntary contributions to UN funds, programmes and agencies. This includes *inter alia* the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Voluntary Fund for Torture Victims and the funds assisting indigenous peoples, as well as the High Commissioner's activities at country level.

Mr. Chairman,

Independent and effective monitoring is of the essence in constructing and working with the instruments of the Human Rights council. All states need to cooperate fully and in good faith with the monitoring procedures and the mechanisms for individual and inter state applications under the human rights conventions.

Sudan's reaction to the request to visit Darfur by the HRC mission does not represent cooperation in good faith. The mission concluded that the Government of Sudan has manifestly failed to protect the population of Darfur from large-scale international crimes and has itself orchestrated and participated in these crimes. The Government of Sudan must comply with its obligations un-

der international law and ensure the free and safe movement of human rights monitors as well as afford full cooperation with ICC. We expect the Council to draw the appropriate consequences.

Strengthening the international legal order was a cross cutting priority for Denmark during its membership of the Security Council 2005 – 2006. In June 2006, the Security Council under Danish presidency adopted unanimously a presidential statement, which underscored the imperative of fighting impunity for the most serious crimes under international law and of upholding procedural rights in the sanctions regimes against terrorism. And as chair of the Security Council Terrorism Committee in the same period, Denmark worked resolutely to strengthen respect for human rights in the fight against terrorism and succeeded in the end of this year in establishing a ‘delisting mechanism’.

Mr Chairman,

Regrettably torture is a problem on the rise, not a problem in decline – despite the entry into force 20 years ago of the UN Convention against Torture. But this year the Subcommittee for the Prevention of Torture under the Optional Protocol to the Convention is commencing its work. This is indeed an innovative and proactive instrument focused on prevention rather than condemnation. The EU Policy Guidelines against torture are another example of a practical approach to fighting torture. The Human Rights Council as well as the bilateral development assistance could develop frameworks for bilateral cooperation against torture on the ground.

The death penalty is a problem closely related to torture. Denmark is strongly committed to the abolition of capital punishment. Taking someone’s life to make the point that killing is repulsive does not make sense.

Mr Chairman,

The duty to ensure respect for human rights rests with the respective national authorities, and nations need assistance to shoulder this obvious human obligation. But it is also a global human responsibility, which rests upon all of us. And when nations fail, we cannot sit idle by and observe. It is our common and individual duty to act in the face of human rights violations. That is why the Human Rights Council was established. That is why we need to make

the Council effective, credible and operative and that is why it is imperative to work together to make sure it will.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

AFRICA AND CHINA

Speech by the Danish Minister for Development Cooperation
Ulla Tørnæs at a seminar at Aarhus University on Africa and China's role, Aarhus, 17 April 2007

Let me begin by expressing my thanks to Århus University for inviting me to take part in this seminar on Africa and China's role. And thanks to Jim Adams for making some interesting and very important remarks on the role of China in Africa.

I would like to start by inviting you on a journey. Try to imagine for a moment how Africa looks. What comes to your mind? Is it the positive story of vast resources and an increasing number of democratic countries through the last decades? Or is it war, conflict, hunger and disease? For most people it is the last. An important reason for this is that Africa is often portrayed in the media as though there are no good stories at all. That is not the truth. Africa is lagging behind all other continents. No doubt about that. But there are many signs that the tide is turning.

Most of Africa's violent conflicts have ended. Most of the countries have democratically elected leaders. The economic growth is speeding up. And above all there is a new determination in Africa amongst many of its leaders to work together through the African Union and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) to resolve conflict, tackle bad governance and corruption, build a sustainable economy, and strengthen economic ties and integration. This positive development can be sustained and strengthened with help from the international community so that Africa really moves into the mainstream of globalisation. That is fundamentally why I use all possibilities to ensure that Africa remains high on the international agenda.

A coherent Danish Africa Policy.

The present Danish Africa Policy from 2004 brought for the first time foreign, development, trade and security policies together into a coherent strategy. To my mind this is the only way of looking at our relations with Africa. It makes no sense to invest in development if conflicts are on-going. Security and development goes hand in hand. Peace is a precondition for development. And

without development, stability and peace will eventually be threatened. Trade is closely linked to security and development – and so forth. In that perspective it is somehow hypocritical if we give development assistance with one hand and hamper African agricultural exports with the other. Likewise we should be prepared to help Africa build capacity in the security sector as well as in the health sector.

As you may know we are working on a new Danish Africa Policy with an even stronger commitment to act in a coherent manner. To my mind we have to get out of the donor box, so to speak, and develop relations between Europe and Africa that addresses the multitude of challenges we are all facing in today's globalized world. The challenges that Africa faces are our challenges as well, and vice versa. Global warming, pandemics, unemployment, insecurity, fundamentalism and terror are but some of our common concerns.

Youth and employment – tomorrow's concern.

Economic growth and democracy are advancing and the number of conflicts in Africa is decreasing. This is very positive. But Africa is still faced with very big challenges, which must be dealt with in order to reach the MDGs and secure development and security in Africa.

One of the absolute most important challenges concerns youth and employment. There are 750 million people in Africa. Nearly half of them are children and young people below 15 years old. And this number is increasing. By 2015, it is estimated that youth (15-24 years) will constitute more than 20% of the Africa's population. By 2050, African youth will become the world's largest regional cohort, with 400 million people. Calculations show that there is need for creating 11-15 million new jobs a year if today's children are to get a job when they get older. That is a huge challenge. And if we do not succeed it may very well influence security and stability in Africa and elsewhere.

Imagine a democratic Africa where politicians respond to people's needs and desires. With unemployment rates of some 30 – 50%, all leaders in Africa will have to face the challenge of job creation or loose elections!

Women as drivers of change.

A second very important challenge concerns women and gender inequality in Africa. Women possess a huge potential as drivers of change all over Africa. Still

we witness that women's fundamental rights are being violated on a daily basis, and that they are not given equal opportunities to participate in economic and political life.

We *know* about the unacceptable costs of inequalities.

We *know* about women's potential for poverty reduction and growth.

We *know* about the constraints for promoting women's economic empowerment.

We *need* more action to support women in making a difference.

We *need* stronger political leadership and determination both among donors and partner countries.

In May, when the Africa Partnership Forum meets in Berlin, I will chair the session on women together with Liberia's President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. I am confident that we will send a strong message to the world and to the G8 Summit a few days later about women's empowerment as a prerequisite for sustainable development.

In Denmark, we intend to increase our development assistance to Africa significantly over the coming five years. Our challenge is to specify objectives and modalities for rapidly growing programmes so that they target the challenges for Africa in the best way. And our engagement goes beyond aid. We also intend to strengthen our political and business engagement with the purpose of getting Africa into the mainstream of globalisation. That is needed if we are to ensure that the tide now turns to the benefit of Africa. And Denmark is not alone in this endeavour. In the EU we will also strengthen our efforts. And we will have a EU-Africa Summit by the end of this year. Latin America has strengthened its relations with Africa as we saw it at the Africa-Latin America Summit last November. The US has followed and so has China. The EU most also follow that path.

Chinas role as a new donor to Africa, donor coordination.

Now, let me turn to China in Africa. The growing role of China and the role of emerging donors in Africa have come to the forefront of the development discussion in the past two-three years. The discussion is often characterized by stereotype perceptions where the influence of emerging donors is either seen through very negative glasses or through very positive ones.

Let me make it clear from the outset that Denmark welcomes China's in-

creased engagement in Africa. I see it as a positive development that we are faced with a number of actors that have stepped up their engagement in Africa such as China as well as India, Brazil and some Arab countries. Those donors have the potential to play a positive and constructive role in Africa. Not least when it comes to China who is already a very significant player in Africa.

It is, however, necessary, that those new donors play by the same rules as other partners. By in some instances neglecting human rights and good governance the Chinese presence in Africa could risk undercutting efforts by other development partners. In a few instances we have seen China cushion non-democratic dictators in Africa and that is very counterproductive. But these instances are exceptions from the main picture. The challenge is that development assistance is not contributing to its full potential if it is not coordinated with other partners.

Therefore we need to draw China and other donors closer into the established country-based and multilateral coordination-processes. Instead of using the megaphone diplomacy I believe that we must encourage China to participate in the day-to-day work and in the ongoing dialogue between donors and the African partner countries. This goes both ways. We must also encourage African countries to include China in the daily coordination and cooperation. The basis for this cooperation should be the widely accepted Paris-declaration. With this declaration in hand we have clear directions for both donors and partner countries on how aid should be delivered and managed most effectively. I will discuss this with my Chinese counterparts when I meet with them in Beijing this week. At the same time I have instructed our embassies in our African partner countries to work for increased coordination with China.

Does Chinese-African trade relations benefit Africa?

We must also acknowledge that China for a long time has had close links with Africa. China has helped to construct Africa's transport infrastructure for instance by building the railway linking Zambia with Dar es Salaam. Today – as Jim Adams has explained – China has extensive commercial interests in Africa due to its growing need for African resources to increase their own economy. The volume of trade between China and Africa has quadrupled since 2001, standing at almost 40 billion US dollars in 2005. China expects this figure to reach 100 billion dollars within the next five to ten years. More than eight

hundred Chinese companies are operating in Africa. And Chinese investment is increasing significantly these years, helping to fuel strong growth in many African countries. Where these investments are in transport infrastructure, particularly for landlocked countries, it may help stimulate further growth in internal trade between African countries. And that is an area, which is still under-developed for many economies on the continent.

However, statistics also reveal that trade patterns between Africa and China are of such a nature that Africa is exporting raw materials to China while China is exporting manufactured goods to Africa. That has led South Africa's president Mbeki to warn that if Africa is just exporting raw materials to China while importing Chinese manufactured goods, the African continent could be 'condemned to underdevelopment'. In his words, such unequal trade could simply mean a replication of Africa's historical relationship with its former colonial powers. And nobody wants that.

Although there may be some truth in his words the picture is probably not just black and white. I would like to reiterate that Africans themselves are the primary players when it comes to dealing with new partners like China. And that many African leaders today have shown strong ownership and commitment to take the lead and work for good governance and sustainable development in Africa.

Closing remarks, Chinese influence is here to stay.

There can be no doubt that China has emerged as a leading member of the international community. As the world's fourth largest economy, what happens in China will have an impact across the globe, and its responsibilities will grow with it day by day. Despite China's rapid growth about 750 million Chinese people still live in rural areas earning very little. One hundred and thirty-five million Chinese, that is around 10% of the population, live on less than one dollar a day. If China keeps up its present growth rate those figures are likely to fall rapidly. That in itself puts great pressure on resources also in Africa.

China has a growing need for Africa's resources as much as Africa needs China's markets for their mutual growth. The challenge is how to manage that growth in a sustainable way. Managed successfully we all benefit. Managed poorly we all may suffer. If we are to achieve our shared objective of helping millions of Africans have a better life, it is in our mutual interest that we work

together locally and globally to that end. That is a message that I take with me when I meet with my Chinese counterparts in Beijing.

Thank you for your attention.

WOMEN IN AFRICA

Opening statement by Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the eighth Africa Partnership Forum, Berlin, 22 May 2007

Dear Chancellor Ms. Merkel,
Dear President Mogae,
Dear Minister Mr. Akufo-Addo,
Dear Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul,
Dear Minister Tørnæs,
Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

A new leadership is asserting itself in Africa. And women are increasingly in front of that leadership. And not only in Africa, I may note. Also here in Europe strong women provide excellent leadership as the presence of you, Chancellor Merkel illustrates.

And this makes it all the more appropriate to focus in my intervention here today on women as a prime driving force in development.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I highly appreciate the opportunity to address the 8th Africa Partnership Forum and to engage with African leaders. We have a solid platform for strengthening our partnership to promote economic growth and inclusive development in Africa. Also at the bilateral level, Africa is a Danish priority. This is reflected as we take on the responsibility as co-chair of the African Partnership Forum. And it is reflected in our development assistance of 0.8% of GDP where Africa counts for almost 2/3 of our bilateral assistance.

The four themes of the next days' debate in this Forum: investments, peace and security, climate change and gender – all represent major challenges to development in Africa. We are here because we are all committed to take on these challenges.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In my brief intervention I would like to place the issue of gender at centre stage. For two reasons:

Firstly, because empowerment of women to my mind is one of the most important driving forces of economic growth and poverty reduction. In other words: Giving women equal opportunities to educate themselves and better access to financial resources is a key to achieving our development goals.

And secondly, because gender discrimination is simply unjust and can slow down development. Mainly it is unjust to the women and girls affected, but also to society at large. We share international legal obligations to the fundamental human rights principle of non-discrimination.

Women's economic empowerment benefits not only the individual, but also her family, community and country. Indeed, that is the indisputable experience from the Scandinavian countries, including Denmark. Let me mention a couple of examples.

In 1960 Danish women represented only one out of four of the total workforce. Today women and men are almost equally represented in the labour market. During the same period we have seen a considerable increase in women's education. And today the number of highly educated young women even slightly exceeds that of young men. There is no doubt that this development has been an important factor for the economic growth in Denmark.

We have come a long way in providing rights and equal opportunities – not least through a combination of strong legal protection and an emphasis on enforcement of equal treatment in public services – such as free education for all. Naturally, the current situation has not come about overnight – but the main transformation has taken place in a few decades.

Much can be achieved in a relatively short time span. But it takes strong political leadership. And in particular it takes responsibility to ensure that gender equality is recognised as the way forward for society at large.

There are many impressive women leaders, politicians and entrepreneurs all over Africa. I have had the pleasure of meeting some of them and have been encouraged by talks with for instance women bankers in Tanzania, and with women ministers and heads of governments like Prime Minister Louisa Diogo of Mozambique. These women serve as important role models for African women. I think this potential could be put to even better use.

Gender gaps exist in all countries. But in the African context the gap is considerable. Although African women participate in many sectors of the economy, the majority operate in the informal sector related to agriculture. It is estimated that women account for 60 – 80 percent of the African agricultural labour force and indeed of the food production. In fact, they work to the extent that time-poverty is a real issue.

But at the same time they do not enjoy important basic rights on an equal level. They own but a tiny fraction of the land. And they have no or only limited access to financial services and productive resources. Lack of education and employment opportunities for women in Africa has reduced annual per capita.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

A well-educated population can be the strongest asset of any country. And highly skilled human capital is key to attracting foreign investments. More education for women and girls is an investment in human capital. And also, education has well-known positive impact on child mortality and to the health and nutrition of the family. Education reduces fertility rates and helps lower the risk of HIV/AIDS. And education improves women's job opportunities and thus the income of families.

Investing in education and investing in job opportunities – especially for women and girls – is really smart economics. In short, investing in women is an investment in – not only one – but in all of the Millennium Development Goals.

Therefore, I want Denmark to remain at the forefront of putting the empowerment of women at the heart of our partnership with Africa. We all know the tremendous potential gains. We share obligations and joint commitments. And we know what it takes to ensure an effective implementation.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

What we need to provide now is strong joint political leadership. The Africa Partnership Forum is important for consolidating and further developing our partnership in this regard. I encourage you to ensure that strong messages on empowerment of women and gender equality are sent to the G8 Summit, to the AU Summit and to the EU-Africa Summit in December this year.

It is time to act. We owe it to the African women and men and to the development of the whole continent.

Thank you very much.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Speech by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller entitled 'Climate Change: Politics versus Economics' at the Chatham House Conference, London, 26 June 2007

Distinguished participants, ladies and gentlemen,

Introduction / key messages

Thank you very much for the kind introduction. I have really looked forward to addressing the famous Chatham House. The ambitious aim of this Institute is to be "at the forefront of developments in an ever-changing and increasingly complex world". So this is a very appropriate place to take a hard look at the complex challenges linked to climate change.

Today, climate change is at the top of the international agenda. The reason is well known: The world's increasing use of fossil fuel and the increase in greenhouse gas emissions is impacting our living conditions and threatening our aim of achieving stability and security, human well-being, global freedom, and prosperity. And we are faced with a dilemma: With increasing use of energy from fossil fuels we are gradually undermining our very existence. Without energy, our societies will come to a stand still. Both questions are unacceptable, so what to do?

In contrast to traditional foreign policy and security threats, climate change is not caused by 'hostile' enemies. It is different from terrorism, which we can fight, and weapons of mass destruction, which we can destroy. This time it is not about political values. It is about our production and consumption patterns. This time it is not about military defence of a way of life. It is about changing it.

Today, I wish to send three messages:

1. Climate change is a global challenge calling for global solutions. We must engage all nations through an effective UN system.
2. Human behaviour is part of the problem, – but it is also part of the solution. Climate friendly policies offer clear win-win opportunities,

and

3. Foreign policy must play a strong role to boost international action.

Sustainable development

“Peace, development, and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible”. This statement is not a conclusion from the climate change debate in the Security Council earlier this year. It is one of the Principles agreed at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

When I participated in the Rio Summit as environment minister, awareness of climate change was limited compared to now. And yet, in realizing the potential threat of climate change, we gathered in Rio to initiate global action and sign the Climate Convention.

The Brundtland report was a fresh backdrop to the Rio Summit. Climate change was treated in the broad global context of sustainable development. 15 years later, this is as relevant as ever before.

Before, history has shown us examples of the fatal consequences of over-exploitation of natural resources. We can for instance think of the Sumerians in Mesopotamia, the Mayans in Central America, and the culture at Easter Island. These civilizations all went down because of their inability to strike the right balance between economy and the long-term ecological goals.

Before it was only some local cultures, which went down, but today we will all go down because of today’s inter-linkage of the whole world. Today, climate change is a global threat and the future of the entire ‘Mother Earth’ is at stake. Therefore urgent action is needed, not by one culture, but the whole culture.

The broader picture: development, stability, security

Climate change sets the world’s carrying capacity under increasing pressure. The ecosystems that provide food, water, and fuel are being degraded by an unprecedented combination of climate change and associated disturbances. Loss of biodiversity can be predicted. Up to 30 percent of plant and animal species are threatened by extinction.

Up to 250 million Africans may experience water stress and people in dry and tropical regions risk hunger due to decreasing crop productivity. Millions of people in mega-deltas of Asia, Africa, and in small islands risk flooding due to sea-level rise. In poor and vulnerable regions of the world, the climate haz-

ards interact with poverty, globalisation, conflict, HIV/AIDS and population growth – the latter, which I call the great wheel of history, will only intensify the competition for the world's resources. Some day 'nature strikes back', which intensifies the link-ages between climate change and security.

In many parts of the world, environmental degradation will ultimately leave people with no other option than to migrate. We see this in the drought affected areas in Africa, and this will be a reality for people in low-lying territories that disappear as a consequence of sea level rise. Estimates indicate that at least 160 million people in coastal areas are at risk. Hurricane Katrina is a striking example. It caused the largest number of people in American history – around 1.5 million – to temporarily leave their homes.

In the Arctic region, a range of climate related challenges are emerging. From several trips to Greenland – last year together with Senator John McCain and others – I have seen how the ice sheet is melting, how glaciers are retreating, and how the changes in the natural ecosystems change peoples' lives. By the way, I happened last year to meet David Cameron at Svalbard, where he was to study exactly climate change!

Melting sea ice and thawing permafrost, however, have wider geo-strategic implications. They include competition over new accessible natural resources, rights to new shipping routes, and disputes over maritime zones and land territories formerly covered by ice. These challenges are different from those affecting millions of people in the developing world. But they have one thing in common: They are potential security risks. We will soon have to discuss and decide: who owns the North Pole. That, by the way, I think we do!

The combination of these factors is alarming. Are we heading towards a global catastrophe? In 1993, I wrote a book on this very question. I gave a somewhat optimistic answer, because we know the problems and the solutions, but I did raise the question: will we solve them, before it is too late? We have four major problems: (1) the ecologic, (2) the economic, (3) the demo-graphic and (4) the democratic. If we solve one, we will make the next worse, which means we will have to solve them simultaneously and in due time. I, therefore, pointed out that the answer depends on our determination and political will to change the course. I believe this is still valid.

Our vision and ambitions

We must set a new course. A course based on our vision of where to go. For us, freedom, security, and prosperity are overriding goals. We must stay alert against ‘enemies’ of these universal values and goals. Climate change, although not a visible enemy, poses a threat also to these goals.

The ultimate objective of the Climate Convention is as relevant today as when we wrote it in Rio 15 years ago. In summary, it states that concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere must be stabilized to prevent dangerous human interference with our climate and to ensure sustainable food production and economic development.

To achieve this, a new and ambitious global climate deal is needed. This is the objective of the Danish government. And this is the aim of the European Union. The energy and climate package decided by the European Council in March clearly demonstrates the EU’s determination to pursue climate friendly development through ambitious cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. And I compliment the British Government that has played a strong role in pushing this agenda in the right direction.

Denmark will host the 15th UN Climate Conference in 2009, where a future climate agreement must be successfully concluded. This will be a huge challenge for Denmark and for the EU. A challenge that we take very seriously. Already now, we have adopted an extremely ambitious schedule for reaching a successful outcome of the Conference.

How do we get there?

Climate challenge is much more than an environmental issue. Since we are in the United Kingdom, let me quote foreign secretary Margaret Beckett, who last year said: “Being a credible foreign minister means being serious about climate security”. I could not agree more.

Let me mention five areas where foreign policy instruments can play an important role in enhancing the international response to climate change.

First, we must make better use of foreign policy and diplomatic channels.

Foreign service networks are well suited to pave the way for tackling climate change. Areas of work include:

- building coalitions;

- ensuring an effective multilateral system
- creating a shared vision and coherent approach
- increasing awareness through public diplomacy;
- integrating trade and economic policy as well as development cooperation.

I will elaborate on some of these points in a moment.

Second, energy security is at stake all over the world and has become a foreign policy matter. In wealthy countries, energy security is a challenge, but the challenge is of different proportions to our fellow citizens in the developing countries. Here, 1.6 billion people live without access to modern energy.

The daunting need for energy in China, India and other developing countries is a challenge. But it is also an opportunity. Now is the time to craft climate friendly energy policies. Now is the time to diversify our supply of energy from being mainly dependent on fossil fuels. Now is the time to leap frog into an era of climate friendly energy solutions, because if we don't, the fast developing economies will create gigantic ecological problems, but there are also solutions to this. In Denmark, while our economy has grown more than 70 percent in real terms during the past 25 years, we have not increased our energy consumption. We have managed to disconnect economic growth from growth in energy consumption.

Third, the security dimensions of climate change must be addressed. I am pleased that the European Council last week invited the High Representative and the European Commission to present a joint report on this issue to the European Council in March 2008. Climate change is of course not the sole cause of insecurity and conflicts. But climate change can aggravate tension, and increase the severity, duration and collateral impacts of a conflict.

Darfur is an example of such a development. According to a new report by the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) the scale of climate change recorded in Northern Darfur is almost unprecedented. The impacts are closely linked to conflict in the region, as desertification has added significantly to the stress on traditional agricultural and pastoral livelihoods.

The ultimate threat is loss of territory and disputes over land and maritime borders. Ask people in Tuvalu or low-lying Bangladesh. Their land, their homes, their nation and their survival are at risk. The enemy is invisible, and

they cannot send the navy to fight greenhouse emissions or sea level rise.

Ask the Egyptians: Climate change is life and death. The Egyptians have depended on the annual floods of the Nile for thousands of years and the risk of rising sea level in the Nile delta in the North is of growing concern.

Earlier, I mentioned the combined effects of climate hazards, scarcity of natural resources, and population growth. This is particularly worrying in the Middle East and northern Africa. Here, young people between 15 and 24 often make out more than 20 percent of the population. The effects of climate change can be the straw that breaks the camel's back. A combination of economic and environmental refugees pressing on our borders is likely to be the result, if we do not take action.

Fourth, there is a need to strengthen climate change in trade and investment policy. Many countries have a strong potential for promoting green trade and investment. In Denmark, for example, renewable energy technology has become a major export business. Every third wind turbine worldwide originates from Denmark.

Trade in clean energy must be further developed through political foresight, climate friendly regulation and a stable policy framework. But some countries fear that climate friendly policies will hamper competitiveness and economic growth. To those that are sceptical let me say: Lessons from Denmark are opposite. In Denmark, economic and environmental objectives are not only converging. They are reinforcing each other. For us good ecology is good economy, and good economy is good ecology.

In fact, we stand in front of a new industrial revolution. This time it is green. This time it is based on advances in climate friendly technology. And this time there are win-win opportunities for our economies and our environment. Fifth, climate change is a major development challenge. We need to do more to integrate climate change into development cooperation. While climate change so far has largely been caused by actions of developed countries, the developing countries are the most vulnerable and the countries that suffer the most. Development cooperation can help provide the means to assist developing countries deal with climate change.

Main actors and fora

Before I turn to proposals for the way forward, let me make some points about the major fora and actors for addressing climate change.

The European Union is a leading player. Denmark is – along with other EU member states – pursuing ambitious reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol. The Danish target is 21 per-cent compared to the 1990-level. At the European Council in March we set up new ambitious EU targets. To be credible, we must live up to those targets. Even though it wasn't an easy task to find EU agreement on the overall targets, the most difficult part will probably be to do the specific burden sharing among member states, but national egotism must not be allowed to win over global solidarity.

The EU is the world's biggest single market, the world's biggest trading block, and the world's biggest provider of official development assistance. There is still a long way to go in integrating climate change into decision making at all levels within the EU, but we are on the right course. The EU should continue to play a leading intellectual, technological, and financial role in the international response to climate change.

But the EU cannot do it alone. It is essential that other major emitters such as the US, China, and India engage in the multilateral efforts. Fortunately, we see that the momentum is increasing. The G8 sent promising signals from the Heiligendamm meeting and a breakthrough in the international climate negotiations could be on its way.

A strong response to climate change depends on effective multilateral institutions. As stated by my good friend Javier Solana: "Global governance is an awful term but a vital concept". I fully agree, and I am, therefore, pleased about the G8 agreement from Heiligendamm to work within the United Nations.

The way forward

We have witnessed several years with record-breaking warm temperatures and increasing evidence of global warming. And with the Stern report; the latest report from the UN Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); and extensive media coverage, a momentum to respond to climate change has built up.

The background is bleak. But the opportunities are bright. Let me make six proposals on the way forward.

1. Awareness must be increased. Without awareness there is no basis for action. Awareness must be knowledge-based, worldwide and engage all levels of our societies. Political recognition of the climate challenge is crucial.
2. We must unlock the Catch 22 situation that has paralysed the efforts to develop an ambitious multilateral climate agreement. Common but differentiated responsibilities must still guide our efforts and industrialized countries must continue to take the lead. But 'differentiated responsibilities' and reference to 'national circumstances' must not be used by major emitters to stay out of the multilateral efforts.
3. We must develop strategic partnerships with major greenhouse emitters. The partnerships should address common standards, regulations, and incentives to enhance climate friendly development, technology, and trade. And we should develop partnerships with countries such as Indonesia and Brazil to curb deforestation, and partnerships between oil exporting and import-ing countries to facilitate better understanding of the need for common action.
4. Massive investments, proper incentives, and a level playing field for climate friendly technology are required. Measures are needed in areas such as renewable energy, clean coal power plants, bio fuels, energy efficiency, and low-carbon transport solutions. Here, the involvement of private business and the international financial institutions is crucial.
5. A price on carbon is required to minimise the costs of climate change action. With a carbon price, companies, governments, and we as consumers are faced with the full social costs of our actions. The Clean Development Mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol should be part of these market-based efforts. In Denmark, we consider CDM as an important instrument, not only to meet the Danish reduction target, but also to foster sustainable development in developing countries.

6. The poorest countries are most vulnerable to climate change. It is essential that rich countries honour their pledges to increase official development assistance (ODA).

Denmark is among the handful of industrialized countries that have met the target to provide 0.7 percent of GDP as ODA. However, in spite of increasing ODA levels in some countries, overall ODA fell in 2006. And the track record of many donors in moving towards the 0.7 per-cent target is poor. Given the high cost of the impacts of climate change to many developing countries, a much more substantial effort by the rich countries is required, because to the third world, this is where the rich world shows its good will or the opposite. Development assistance is one of the instruments to lift the third world out of poverty and into globalisation.

Summary

In summing up, let me make three points:

1. Climate change is a global challenge for which an effective multilateral response is re-quired. There is no free ride. A global deal must be reached within an effective UN sys-tem. As host for COP15, Denmark will work hard to achieve this in 2009.
2. Human behavior is part of the problem. But also the solution. There is still time to act. There is still time to avoid a global catastrophe. We can create a win-win-situation where we can as well protect our Planet as create prosperity and security for all.
3. As foreign minister I wish to send a clear message: Foreign policy actions hold the po-tential to boost the ability and willingness of the international community to respond in a concerted manner to the climate challenge. We must use this potential.

A friend from the forests sector once asked me two questions: When did civilization begin? he asked first, – and before I got time to answer he gave the answer: It began when the first tree was cut. His second question was: When will civilization end? Again he gave his own answer: It will end when the last tree is cut!

We must treat our Planet well – for until we all have migrated to Mars, this is the only Planet we have. As an African proverb says, “The world was not given to us by our parents, but lent to us by our children.” We do not own the earth. We administer it on behalf of our successors. That is our mission. This is “The contract between generations” – to conclude with the words of our conservative forefather Edmund Burke.

Thank you for your attention.

MITIGATION

Statement by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Roundtable session on mitigation at the UN Climate Summit, New York, 24 September 2007

Thank you Mr. Chairman, dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to have this opportunity to contribute to our discussion today on the important questions regarding mitigation.

In combating climate change one of the most important challenges is: How can we reduce our green house gas emissions and at the same time ensure economic growth?

Some will argue that this is not possible. I will say: on the contrary.

It is indeed possible to pursue economic growth – while at the same time stabilizing consumption of energy and safeguarding the environment. The key tools are energy efficiency; and the use of renewable energy resources. Let me give you a concrete example: That of my own country, Denmark.

Our experience in Denmark shows that we can maintain economic growth and reduce the dependency on fossil fuels. Since 1980 Denmark's economy has grown by approximately 70% – with a nearly unchanged consumption of energy.

From 1990 to 2005 our economy grew by more than 40% while our total greenhouse gas emissions were reduced. This has been achieved while maintaining Denmark's position as one of the most competitive economies.

Two elements have been important in this effort:

Firstly, our experience shows that energy efficiency must be optimised on all levels – from production and distribution to consumption at the end user.

In Denmark we use a mix of policies and measures:

- new energy saving technologies and constant focus on innovation
- high energy standards for buildings, regulated by the government
- and economic incentives – in particular energy taxation.

This mixed approach has been fruitful in Denmark. The energy needed to produce one unit of GDP in Denmark is 40% lower than the average of other industrialised countries.

Secondly, there has been a devoted effort in Denmark to develop alternative sources of energy and especially cleaner sources of energy.

In Denmark, more than 25% – one fourth of our electricity production stems from renewable sources – in particular from wind and biomass. Of our total energy consumption 15% stems from renewable sources and by 2025 the goal is to double the share to at least 30%.

And the technology is becoming increasingly more efficient and competitive. Today, wind energy has become a commercial success.

The Danish example is not unique. Each country must pursue the common objective with different means, including different technologies, relevant for their specific national circumstances.

I fully recognise that combating poverty and seeking economic development is the overall priority in many countries. This is the way it should be. Our common challenge is therefore to find ways to delink economic growth from the emission of green house gasses. And we need to find ways to cooperate in pursuing this objective.

I hope that our experiences in Denmark can serve as an example for inspiration.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

NATO AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Speech by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller at the Seminar on 'Public Diplomacy in NATO-led Operations', Copenhagen, 8 October 2007

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, I would like to thank the Secretary-General for taking the time to be here to day and open this seminar on 'Public Diplomacy in NATO-led operations'. Your remarks have set the scene for the seminar's deliberations and discussions and have shown the importance of this subject.

I would also like to welcome you all to Copenhagen. I trust that you will add your voices to those of the speakers and chairmen and help put together viable recommendations and conclusions, which can be of use in the future work of NATO.

I had the pleasure of opening an earlier seminar on the Comprehensive Approach in this very room in June of 2005. That seminar was a stepping-stone towards the Riga Summit and demonstrated the value of having these conferences in order to establish common ground and bring new ideas to the table.

The changes that have taken place in the field of international security bring new challenges for NATO and individual allies. This emphasises the need to continue to reinforce NATO as a framework for dialogue on security matters. A framework that is more comprehensive both in terms of subjects on the agenda and in terms of geographical outreach. Today, NATO is involved in broad and far-reaching operations in areas such as Afghanistan and Kosovo. Denmark supports this broadening of NATO, and wish to see continued efforts at adapting NATO to the complexities of today's international scene.

The Alliance remains the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation, and a vital framework to counter new threats. We have a good story to tell. But we have to communicate it in a consistent and well-balanced manner. We have to do this to ensure continued support from our publics for our common endeavours in NATO.

Public Diplomacy must be based on true facts and it must rely on our common values. For it is a well-established fact that the only possible way to pro-

mote a country – or an organisation like NATO – is to build the efforts on a firm foundation of values. Socrates – not the Portuguese Prime Minister, but the Greek philosopher – put it this way: “A way to achieve a good reputation is to endeavour to be what you desire to achieve.”

In NATO we are bound together by the fundamental values of peace, liberty, democracy and the respect for human rights. Today, these common values are under pressure from ideologies based on intolerance and oppression. In countering these ideologies, North America and Europe have to stand together.

One key lesson learned from the twentieth century is that we have to respond to totalitarian ideologies head-on! We need to engage actively in furthering our fundamental values and interests. It is not sufficient that we believe we possess the right opinions – we also have to do the right things and take action, or others will seize the initiative from us and further their own and darker ends.

The challenges are many and tough. Handling them demands a broad range of instruments to help foster the necessary coherence in our efforts – not only military efforts, but political and economic efforts as well – in terms of both bilateral and multilateral approaches.

We are taking action in Afghanistan. The terrible events of 9/11 clearly show that Afghanistan cannot again be allowed to become a safe haven for terrorists and human rights abuses. Preventing this from happening requires strong commitment from all Allies, and it requires commitment for the long-term.

Afghanistan has shown the need for re-thinking traditional operations. A comprehensive approach is necessary to foster stability and security. Military means alone cannot bring success in Afghanistan, nor can reconstruction efforts provide an answer on their own. Both efforts are intrinsically linked and we need a carefully coordinated use of both – as well as close cooperation with the international community – to bring about a successful outcome for Afghanistan and her people.

We sometimes tend to forget that progress has been made in Afghanistan. (1) Under extremely difficult conditions, the Afghan people have actually managed to pull off presidential and parliamentary elections. (2) Human rights are now an integral part of the Afghan Constitution. (3) Women’s rights have been

improved and free media has been established. (4) And the number of children attending schools has increased to over 5 million – with approximately 37% of the children attending being girls, who were not allowed in school before!

These efforts to bring stability and change to Afghanistan are being fuelled by the very values that form our own societies and on which the Alliance is based.

The improvements are truly significant but we need to do more to get the message out – both to our national audiences and to the people in Afghanistan. Our approach is bringing about results! Through Public Diplomacy we must actively promote knowledge of these and other improvements in Afghanistan. We must balance the negative images that often steal the scene – both in the local and the international press.

How do we do this?

One important element is to be more active in the area of the media, the Internet and dialogue with local populations. Public Diplomacy requires providing information and presenting views and progress to a broader audience than that of traditional diplomacy. It requires that we, as NATO and individual Allies, continuously devote the time and effort to presenting our mission, level of effort and progress. And we must not limit ourselves to reacting purely defensively and in an ad hoc manner to negative images from our operational environment. By finding ways and means of informing local populations of our mandate, mission, difficulties and progress we can help foster positive engagement and cooperation in a mission area.

Furthermore, a dialogue with local representatives must be established. This is a lesson we in Denmark have learned from our own efforts to improve coordination of civil and military activities in international operations such as Afghanistan.

Work in the area of communication and Public Diplomacy is already moving forward in NATO. However, as I mentioned earlier, this seminar is meant to be an opportunity to engage further in deliberations free from institutional constraints and help provide new and constructive ideas and common ground for an even more comprehensive and effective Public Diplomacy effort within NATO.

I am confident that you will make the utmost of this opportunity to start a winning game for the sake of NATO and our security. I wish you all the best in these endeavours over the next two days.

Thank you.

NATO AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Speech by the Danish Minister of Defence Søren Gade at the Seminar on 'Public Diplomacy in NATO-led Operations', Copenhagen, 8 October 2007

Mr. Secretary General, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would also like to welcome you all to Copenhagen on this typical Danish Autumn day. As Mark Twain once said about New England: If you do not like the weather, wait five minutes and it will change!

Personally, I have looked forward to this seminar. I agree with the Secretary General that we need to further develop our Public Diplomacy efforts – especially in Afghanistan. Let me [like the Secretary General] add that the same is also valid for other current as well as for future operations. Failure to develop and improve is not an option!

We need to do better Public Diplomacy in places like Afghanistan. But Public Diplomacy is of course not a miracle drug. It is an element in the comprehensive approach that of course also contains questions of necessary civil and military assets.

The topic of communication – 'Public Diplomacy' is of course not new. NATO and member states have learned a number of lessons in the Balkans in the nineties and now also in Afghanistan. Everybody – and also politicians – feel every day the growing importance of the media, as well as the challenges coming from the home audiences and local populations in mission areas.

Today the Public Diplomacy efforts are necessary to get a grip on – also and increasingly so in matters of crisis management. I will return to that in a minute.

We – the politicians – sometimes learn the hard way that mistakes are recordable and can be transmitted very quickly no matter where you are.

[A couple of years ago I – as I am also an officer of the reserve – found it natural to carry a side-arm during a visit to Afghanistan, where we drove from Kabul to Bagram airbase. Obviously, a journalist took a picture of me and put it on the front page of his paper in no-time.

It was not my best hour as minister and I had to explain myself! To those on

the front seats here: Don't worry – I am not armed...today.

Nowadays there is a twenty-four-hour newscycle. The internet never sleeps and new ways of communication like You-tube is the order of the day.

The other side of these new conditions is of course our possibilities to be pro-active which it also provides.

It is my belief that we should constantly seek new ways to be proactive and reactive. We can always do better – and more than anything that goes for our ways of handling Public Diplomacy in terms of military engagements.

In today's world our enemies might seem very simple and crude. But in handling the media and public the enemy rarely lacks capabilities and has no moral difficulties in lying and in other ways misinforming. They master modern communication in a fully professional manner.

We – NATO – need to find an answer to this challenge. In handling the 'dark side' of globalization like international terrorism – let's take fully advantage of the good sides of globalization!

We cannot and will not play by the same rules as the extremists. For us there can be no compromise in terms of our credibility.

We must be credible!

That is why this seminar is not about spinning or propaganda but about raising awareness and explaining the results and goals of NATO's missions.

It is about how we can better explain the whole story – the balanced story – on what we are doing and by that managing expectations.

That goes for managing expectations of home audiences, the local populations and our international partners in the mission areas. It is very clear that NATO can not transform Afghanistan alone or in a very short time. We are in for a long-term effort and together with both Afghans and other international organisations.

For instance, it surprises me that our successes are sometimes quickly forgotten: In Kosovo, the KFOR-presence is a huge stabilising factor. In Afghanistan: there has been free and fair elections, . BNP has grown by hundred forty percent, the amount of children in schools has increased by a factor of five – nearly forty percent are girls, . nearly 5 million refugees have returned.

NATO has played a leading role in bringing about these changes!

I must also confess that I do not understand why the Taleban crimes in Afghanistan does not get more coverage. Last time I visited Afghanistan, I went

to see victims who had been brutally mistreated by the Taleban's.

That experience reminded me of the basic character of our mission in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Sometimes, it seems, these obvious facts are forgotten.

We owe it to our men and women in uniform to transmit even better the value of their work and the many good things that happen in mission areas. The international presence makes a difference.

I would therefore encourage you – in your talks here at the seminar – to analyse, if our PD-machinery is efficient. Does NATO – and nations – have the right capabilities and planning process to take on the task of efficient Public Diplomacy? And if not, what can we do about it?

I also expect you to analyse how better to communicate with the local population and other international actors in mission areas – be it in the Balkans or in Afghanistan. How can we improve and how can we get inspiration from other international organisations such as the EU or UN?

I expect concrete conclusions to come out of this seminar. By this we should supplement the already good thoughts and previous work NATO's International Staff has done on this issue.

I promise you that Denmark and my-self will carry the issue forward in coming meetings in NATO.

Let's do better – together!

Thank you for listening and all the best for a productive seminar.

CLIMATE AND AFRICA

Speech by the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen on Climate Change and Energy at the EU-Africa Summit, Lisbon, 8 December 2007

Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,

Please allow me to begin by extending my sincere thanks to our Portuguese hosts for bringing EU and Africa together in Lisbon today and for the tremendous effort and hard work preparing this summit.

And allow me to commend the co-chairs for the format chosen for our discussion on common key challenges. I would like to thank the speakers we have heard so far for their inspiring and thoughtful remarks. In particular I would like to mention the remarks made by chancellor Merkel on good governance, human rights and the situation in Zimbabwe. I fully agree with those remarks.

I am honoured that I have been given the task to address this Summit on some of the most challenging issues that are facing the world of today and the generations to come: Climate change and energy.

We have all experienced the extreme weather that has occurred in recent years. The link between human led CO₂ emissions and global warming has been made clear by our scientists.

The negative impact from global warming is not distributed 'fairly'. While most countries in Africa only contribute marginally to greenhouse emissions they are particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

Experts have estimated that by 2020 up to 250 million people in Africa will experience increased problems with water supply due to climate change. And in parts of Africa the harvest may be reduced by up to 50 percent in the same period of time. This will seriously hamper economic growth and the fight against poverty.

We therefore have a common interest in securing an ambitious, global and comprehensive climate agreement to replace the Kyoto protocol when it expires in 2012.

It must be an agreement that sets ambitious targets for dealing with the causes of climate change. We need to take decisive steps to reduce CO₂ emissions. And the EU has already shown its willingness to do so. We have agreed to cut the emissions by 30% in 2020 as our contribution to a global and comprehensive agreement beyond 2012.

We also need to ensure that adaptation to climate change becomes an important part of a new climate agreement. Developing countries themselves will have to be in the forefront of the efforts to adapt to climate change. But Europe will stand by and assist in the process through close partnership with developing countries.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Under the new Joint Africa-EU Strategy, the EU hopes to create a strong partnership with Africa to meet the challenges related to the international climate change and energy agenda.

Access to energy is a precondition for development. Today, only 26 percent of the population of Sub-Saharan Africa has access to electricity. Access must be improved and power provided to many more Africans. This can be achieved without drastic increases in CO₂ emissions. Therefore, one of the challenges we face is to ensure increased energy efficiency and increased access to green technology and renewable energy for African nations.

Denmark will be hosting the UN climate change conference in 2009. We are determined to do our utmost to facilitate a new comprehensive global agreement based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. To my mind, there is no doubt that this agreement will have to take Africa's particular needs, challenges and opportunities into account as well as the responsibility of developed countries.

And the work has already started. While we are gathered here, our ministers are heading for Bali, Indonesia, to take part in this year's UN climate change conference.

This conference is set to adopt a roadmap for the negotiations in the years to come. Negotiations that must result in a new international climate agreement in 2009.

With a global agreement we have a chance not only to combat a serious problem but also to initiate new mechanisms for development.

Let me therefore express my sincere request: That you all instruct your ministers not to leave Bali without an agreed roadmap that will lead us to a new international climate agreement in 2009!

Thank you.

CLIMATE

Plenary Statement by the Danish Minister for Climate and Energy Connie Hedegaard at the UN Climate Conference, Bali, 12 December 2007

Dear colleagues,

An eventful year has passed since we last convened in Nairobi in December 2006 – for better and for worse.

The fourth assessment report from the IPCC was a wake up call: Climate change is humanly induced. If we hesitate to act now, our emissions will cause irreversible changes to our eco-systems, our livelihood, our planet. This will happen at a pace that is unprecedented in recordable history.

The IPCC calls for forceful action now. It should now be obvious to all that inaction carries a moral price that only grows with continued delay and doubt.

Dear colleagues: It is no longer fair to use doubt as a reason for postponing critical decisions. In respect for future generations, we must act – and act now.

The IPCC tells us that to avoid irreversible consequences global emissions must be reduced by 50 pct. in 2050 and stabilized by 2020 – compared to 1990 levels.

This will not be an easy endeavour. We can not infringe on the overriding priority of growth and development for the developing countries. And we must accept that the developed countries have to take the lead. Science tells us that we have to make real commitments for deliverables already in 2020. And in all honesty, it is no challenge for politicians to commit to a long-term goal in 2050 – 43 years from now – when we are all gone.

But the developed countries can not tackle climate change alone. The response must be truly global. We all have to commit to action. We all have to contribute to a comprehensive, yet flexible framework that allows for diverse contributions, but with shared responsibility. Adaptation must have a more prominent role – as does finance, investments and technology. And we need to mobilize the private sector by redirecting investments to promote and develop green technology. At a time when energy prices are going through the roof, we

are embarking on a journey that holds not only challenges, but also promises of prosperity for all. For a start we need to pick the low hanging fruits of energy savings, better efficiency and renewable energy sources.

In the European Union we will cut our emissions by 20 pct. in 2020 compared to 1990. On top of this the EU has signaled that we will move to 30 pct. below 1990-levels in 2020 as part of a new global agreement. This will benefit the development of technology and increase energy security. And by setting a prize on carbon we ensure predictability for the business community.

Denmark has committed to hosting the COP15 in 2009. As the first Danish Minister for Climate and Energy, I stand ready to facilitate our common efforts as we strive to reach a new global agreement.

Dear colleagues: It is about time that we act – in a collective, constructive and timely manner. For almost a century Europe has looked to the United States for leadership and guidance in times of instability and change.

We do so yet again, as we strive to reach a truly comprehensive agreement to combat climate change. But we do so, knowing fully well that all countries – not least the largest emitters – share responsibility for the final outcome.

I urge you all to take advantage of the strong political momentum that has build up to this conference in Bali. We all have a responsibility for the outcome. We should not leave this beautiful Island – this beautiful country – without a comprehensive roadmap for a negotiation process that includes all countries and with 2009 as the end date.

Thank you.

Chapter 3

Danish Foreign Policy in Figures

Danish Official Development Assistance · 168

Danish ODA

Danish ODA (by category, net disbursement)

Danish Bilateral ODA (by country category)

Assistance under the Neighbourhood Programme · 169

Danish Official Development Assistance under the

Neighbourhood Programme (by country)

Defence · 170

Defence Expenditures to International Missions

The EU · 171

Financing of the EU budget

DANISH OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Danish Official Development Assistance (ODA) 2004-2007

(Current prices – million DKK)	2004	2005	2006	2007
ODA net disbursement	12,197.48	12,645.28	13,289.30	13,949.49

Danish ODA – by category (net disbursement) 2007

	Million DKK	Percentage
Bilateral assistance	8,982.99	64.4%
Multilateral assistance	4,966.50	35.6%
Total	13,949.49	100.0%

Danish Bilateral ODA (by country category) 2004-2007

		2004	2005	2006	2007
Least developed countries	Million DKK	2,954.9	3,317.1	3,508.2	3,898.3
	Per cent	41.1%	40.8%	40.3%	43.4%
Low income countries	Million DKK	2,082.5	2,464.9	2,970.1	2,868.4
	Per cent	28.9%	30.3%	34.1%	31.9%
Other developing countries	Million DKK	252.4	181.4	211.4	30.2
	Per cent	3.5%	2.2%	2.4%	0.3%
Other	Million DKK	1,907.6	2,176.2	2,010.3	2,186.1
	Per cent	26.5%	26.7%	23.2%	24.4%
Total	Million DKK	7,197.4	8,139.6	8,700.0	8,983.0
	Per cent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

NOTE: From the fiscal year 2005 onwards, extraordinary humanitarian assistance is included in the bilateral assistance.

Source: Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PROGRAMME

Danish Official Development Assistance under
the Neighbourhood Programme
(by country)

Disbursements 2007

Recipient Country	DKK	Percentage
Albania	1,314,000	0.85
Belarus	4,725,208	3.07
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4,136,296	2.69
Caucasus, the (Armenia, Azerbaïdian, Georgia)	15,944,309	10.36
Croatia	5,688,134	3.70
Kosovo	25,139,613	16.33
Neighbourhood countries, regional contributions	35,654,180	23.17
Russia	13,132,299	8.53
Serbia-Montenegro	16,920,997	10.99
Turkey	8,029,930	5.22
Ukraine	23,216,326	15.09
Total	153,901,292	100.00

Source: *Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Further information on www.neighbourhoodprogramme.um.dk.

DEFENCE

Defence Expenditures to International Missions

(This years prices – million DKK)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Participation in UN, OSCE, NATO and other multilateral missions ¹	1,090,4	1,009,6	837,1	914,3	958,6	961,6
NATO ²	726,0	717,9	696,2	658,4	666,2	714,3
International Security Cooperation ³	92,5	124,3	94,7	80,1	54,4	73,7
International expenditures in total	1,908,9	1,851,8	1,628,0	1,652,8	1.679,2	1.749,6

Notes:

- 1 From 2005 only additional expenditures are included in the figures, excluding notably basic salaries.
- 2 Includes 'special expenditures regarding NATO' plus expenditures for NATO staff (net).
- 3 The 2004 figure includes budget figures and accumulated reserves from previous years. For 2003-2007 account numbers have been used. For 2008 budget numbers have been used.

Source: *Danish Ministry of Defence.*

THE EU

Financing of the EU Budget 2008 (official exchange rate)

	Billion Euro	Percentage
Austria	2,549	2.20 %
Belgium	4,670	2.94 %
Bulgaria	0,334	0.27 %
Cyprus	0,179	0.14 %
Czech Republic	1,321	1.08 %
Denmark	2,369	2.05 %
Estonia	0,182	0.15 %
Finland	1,739	1.58 %
France	18,686	16.95 %
Germany	23,473	19.67 %
Greece	2,189	1.93 %
Hungary	0,991	0.85 %
Ireland	1,758	1.52 %
Italy	15,177	13.35 %
Latvia	0,222	0.19 %
Lithuania	0,302	0.25 %
Luxembourg	0,309	0.29 %
Malta	0,059	0.05 %
Netherlands	6,654	4.70 %
Poland	3,191	2.76 %
Portugal	1,550	1.42 %
Romania	1,350	1.13 %
Slovakia	0,569	0.49 %
Slovenia	0,338	0.30 %
Spain	11,003	9.58 %
Sweden	3,195	2.76 %
United Kingdom	14,548	11.41 %
Total	118,921	100,00 %

Source: EU-Tidende

Chapter 4

Opinion Polls

Iraq · 176

Afghanistan · 178

UN Mandate · 179

Attitude towards the EU · 180

The Lisbon Treaty · 181

Turkey into the EU? · 182

The Danish EU Opt-Outs · 183


Climate Change · 184

IRAQ

In June 2007, Gallup in cooperation with the Danish newspaper *Berlingske Tidende*, polled a representative sample of the Danish population (3630 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards the war in Iraq and the Danish military engagement.


Question 1:

Do you think Denmark's active participation with soldiers and materials in the war in Iraq was the right decision?




Question 2:

Do you think it was a right or wrong decision that the Danish Prime Minister is now withdrawing the Danish soldiers from Iraq?




Question 3:

Do you think it has improved or deteriorated the Danish reputation to participate in the war in Iraq?




Question 4:

Do you think the Danish mission has improved or worsened the situation in the southern part of Iraq?



Question 5:

Are you for or against Denmark from now on sending troops to hot spots around the world?




AFGHANISTAN

In February 2007, Catinét in cooperation with the Danish newsagency *Ritzau*, polled a representative sample of the Danish population (1049 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards the war in Afghanistan and the Danish military engagement.

Question 1:

In relation to the withdrawal of Danish soldiers from Iraq, the Danish government is considering sending more Danish soldiers to Afghanistan. Do you think:

1. *Danish soldiers should never have been sent to Afghanistan?*
2. *The current number of soldiers in Afghanistan is reasonable?*
3. *It is reasonable to send more Danish soldiers to Afghanistan?*
4. *Don't know.*




UN MANDATE

In October 2007, Synovate Denmark in cooperation with the Danish think-tank *Ny Agenda* polled a representative sample of the Danish population (1157 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards military operations without a UN mandate.

Question 1:

Do you think western countries and coalitions, such as the US and the EU, should be able to conduct military operations in other parts of the world without a UN mandate?




ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EU

In March 2007, Catinét in cooperation with the Danish newsagency *Ritzau* polled a representative sample of the Danish population (1060 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards the EU.


Question 1:

Do you feel mostly European, Danish or both?



Question 2:

Are you for or against Danish membership of the EU?




THE LISBON TREATY

In December 2007, Catinét in cooperation with the Danish newsagency *Ritzau*, polled a representative sample of the Danish population (1017 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards the Lisbon Treaty.

Question 1:


The countries of the EU are about to decide on a new treaty, the so-called Lisbon Treaty, and Denmark does not need a referendum according to the Ministry of Justice. The reason is that Denmark is not surrendering sovereignty in the constitutional sense.

Do you think we should have a referendum about the Lisbon Treaty regardless of the legal argument?



Question 2:

If there is going to be a referendum about the new Lisbon Treaty, would you then vote yes or no?




TURKEY INTO THE EU?

In October 2007, Rambøll Management in cooperation with the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-posten*, polled a representative sample of the Danish population (1040 persons aged 17 or older) concerning their attitude towards a possible admission of Turkey to the EU.

Question 1:

Do you think Turkey should be admitted into the EU?




THE DANISH EU OPT-OUTS

In December 2007, Greens in cooperation with the Danish newspaper *Børsen* polled a representative sample of the Danish population (885 persons aged 18 or older) concerning their attitude towards the Danish EU opt-outs.


Question 1:

How would you vote in a referendum on Danish participation in the Single European Currency?




Question 2:

How would you vote in a referendum on Danish participation in the Common Defence?




Question 3:

How would you vote in a referendum on Danish participation in the Union Citizenship?



Question 4:

How would you vote in a referendum on Danish participation in the area of Justice and Home affairs?



CLIMATE CHANGE

In October 2007, Research International, in cooperation with Nordisk Råd & Nordisk Ministerråd polled a representative sample of the Nordic populations (2500 persons) concerning their attitudes towards climate change.

Question 1:

Are you willing to pay more for electricity and gas, if it can reduce the Nordic countries' climate effect?

	Denmark	Sweden	Norway	Finland	Iceland	Total
Yes, very much	21%	13%	15%	8%	8%	13%
Yes, to some degree	51%	45%	43%	24%	37%	40%
No, not much	16%	25%	24%	40%	30%	27%
No, not at all	10%	15%	16%	24%	19%	17%
Don't know	2%	3%	2%	3%	6%	3%

Question 2:

Do you think it is possible to do something about climate change to prevent it from having serious consequences?

	Denmark	Sweden	Norway	Finland	Iceland	Total
Yes, very much	24%	35%	18%	13%	30%	24%
Yes, to some degree	58%	55%	65%	55%	57%	58%
No, not much	14%	8%	12%	22%	3%	12%
No, not at all	1%	1%	2%	4%	1%	2%
Don't know	2%	1%	3%	6%	8%	4%

Chapter 5

Selected Bibliography

The following bibliography is a limited selection of scholarly books, articles, and chapters published in English in 2007 dealing with various themes in relation to Danish foreign policy.

Andersen, Lars Erslev (2007), *Innocence Lost: Islamism & the Battle Over Values & World Order*, Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Andersson, Andreas (2007), 'The Nordic Peace Support Operations Record, 1991-99', *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 14, no. 4: 476-492.

Aunesluoma, Juhana et al. (2007), 'Deterrence or Reassurance? Nordic Responses to the First Détente, 1953-1956', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, vol. 32, no. 2: 183-208.

Bonde, Bent Nørby (2007), 'How 12 Cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed were Brought to Trigger an International Conflict', *Nordicom Review*, vol. 28, no. 1: 33-48.

Browning, Christopher S. (2007), 'Branding Nordicity: Models, Identity and the Decline of Exceptionalism', *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 42, no. 1: 27-51.

Federspiel, Ulrik (2007), 'The International Situation and Danish Foreign Policy 2006', in Nanna Hvidt & Hans Mouritzen (eds), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2007*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS): 13-30

Heurlin, Bertel (2007), 'Denationalisation of Danish Armed Forces and Militarising of Danish Foreign Policy' in Janne Haaland Matlary & Øyvind Østerud (eds), *Denationalisation of Defence*, London: Ashgate: 113-135.

- Hussain, Ali J. (2007), 'The Media's Role in a Clash of Misconceptions: The Case of the Danish Muhammad Cartoons', *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 12, no. 4: 112-130.
- Hvidt, Nanna & Hans Mouritzen (eds) (2007), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2007*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).
- Jakobsen, Peter V. (2007), 'Still Punching Above Their Weight? Nordic Cooperation in Peace Operations after the Cold War', *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 14, no. 4: 458-475.
- Justesen, Mogens K. (2007), 'The Social Choice of EU Treaties: Discrepancies between Voter Preferences and Referendum Outcomes in Denmark', *European Union Politics*, vol. 8, no. 4: 537-553.
- Larsen, Henrik (2007), 'The Cartoons Crisis in Danish Foreign Policy: A new Balance between the EU and the US?', in Nanna Hvidt & Hans Mouritzen (eds), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2007*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS): 51-85
- Lawler, Peter (2007), 'Janus-Faced Solidarity: Danish Internationalism Reconsidered', *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 42, no. 1: 101-126.
- Linde-Laursen, Anders (2007), 'Is something rotten in the state of Denmark? The Muhammad cartoons and Danish political culture', *Contemporary Islam*, vol. 1, no. 3: 265-274.
- Læggaard, Sune (2007), 'The Cartoon Controversy: Offence, Identity, Oppression?', *Political Studies*, vol. 55, no. 3: 481-498.
- Løj, Ellen M. (2007), 'Denmark's Membership of the UN Security Council: What Came out of it?', in Nanna Hvidt & Hans Mouritzen (eds), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2007*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS): 31-50
- Mouritzen, Hans (2007), 'Denmark's Super Atlanticism', *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2: 155-169
- Neumann, Iver B (2007), 'When did Norway and Denmark Get Distinctively Foreign Policies?', *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 42, no. 1: 53-72.
- Olesen, Thomas (2007), 'The Porous Public and the Transnational Dialectic: The Muhammed Cartoons Conflict', *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 50 no. 3: 295-308.
- Olesen, Thomas (2007), 'Contentious Cartoons: Elite and Media-Driven Mobilization', *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1: 37-52.

- Raunio, Tapio (2007), 'Softening but Persistent: Euroscepticism in the Nordic EU Countries' *Acta Politica*, vol. 42: 191-210.
- Rytkönen, Helle (2007), 'Drawing the Line: The Cartoons Controversy in the US', in Nanna Hvidt & Hans Mouritzen (eds), *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2007*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS): 86-109
- Tow, William T. & Russell Parkin (2007), 'Small State Security Postures: Material Compensation and Normative Leadership in Denmark and New Zealand', *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 28, no. 2: 308-329.
- Ulriksen, Ståle (2007), 'Deployments for Development? Nordic Peacekeeping Efforts in Africa', *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 14, no. 4: 553-568.
- Vreese, Claes de & Mette Tobiasen (2007), 'Conflict and Identity: Explaining Turnout and Anti-integrationist Voting in the Danish 2004 Elections for the European Parliament', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1: 87-113

ISBN 978-87-7605-273-7



9 788776 052737