



From Copenhagen to Copenhagen: the Danish Role in Eastern Enlargement

Mechteld Bous (3015947)

03-05-2015

Utrecht University

Professor: Dr. M.L.L. Segers

Content

Introduction.....	5
1.1 Historical overview.....	6
1.2 Structure.....	10
1.3 Methodology.....	11
Part I.....	14
Chapter 1: Academic debate and theories.....	15
1.1 Integration debate.....	15
1.1.1 Neofunctionalism.....	15
1.1.2 Realism.....	17
1.1.3 Liberal intergovernmentalism.....	19
1.1.4 Institutionalism.....	20
1.2 Debate on enlargement.....	22
1.3 Case study: Denmark and the Luxembourg Council, 1997.....	27
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework and terminology.....	29
2.1 Terminology.....	30
Part II.....	31
Chapter 3: The Danish context.....	32
3.1 Historical context.....	32
3.2 Domestic context.....	35
3.2.1 Danish democracy, nationalism and welfare state.....	35
3.2.2 Foreign policy.....	37
3.2.3 European policy priorities.....	39
3.3 Normative context.....	40
Chapter 4: Rationalist interests.....	42
4.1 National interests or the greater good?.....	42
4.2 Security considerations.....	43
4.3 Pressures from United States.....	44
4.4 Economic interests.....	44
4.5 Widening vs. deepening.....	45
4.6 Rationalist vs normative?.....	46
Part III.....	47
Chapter 5: Arguments for Eastern Enlargement.....	48
5.1 A duty to unite Europe.....	48
5.2 Rhetorical action.....	51
5.3 Reactions to the Danish approach.....	53

5.3.1 Sweden and Finland	54
5.3.2 United Kingdom.....	55
5.3.3 Italy and the Mediterranean countries.....	55
5.3.4 France and Germany	56
5.3.5 The Netherlands	58
5.4 Rhetorical action?	58
Chapter 6: Conclusion	61
Bibliography.....	65

Introduction

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the fall of Communism shortly afterwards, the face of Europe has changed. The European Community changed its name to European Union in 1991, with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty, or Treaty on European Union. This treaty opened several new chapters for the Union. First of all, it opened the doors towards a single currency and the EMU. The treaty outlined the criteria for the adoption of the Euro and defined the obligations the member states were subjected to in order to procure a structured adoption process. Even though this was a remarkable achievement, the Maastricht Treaty was an equally important starting point for future enlargement of the Union, stating that 'any European State which respects the values referred to in Article 2 and is committed to promoting them may apply to become a member of the Union'¹. Article 2 refers to principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law, principles which are common to the member states². This statement allowed the former-communist states to apply for membership of the European Union (EU).

Twenty-five years later, many former communist states have joined the EU and others are candidate members, or potential candidates. Some countries have flourished as an EU member state: Poland, for example, has experienced an impressive economic growth and was able to converge living standards steadily towards the EU average³. Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia and Latvia have all adopted the Euro, which means that these countries all were able to fulfil the criteria set in Maastricht. Lithuania will follow in 2015⁴. However, not all new member states are a success story. Bulgaria and Romania, who joined in 2007, are systematically prevented in joining the Schengen agreement. Even though these countries have met the requirements, the member states have vetoed the accession to the Schengen zone⁵. France and Germany, among others, fiercely object to the accession for the passport free zone may have an impact on the migration Roma populations in the two countries, as well as that illegal migrants can more easily enter the EU if both countries were to be included in the Schengen Area⁶. In addition, Romania and Bulgaria are still very corrupt, according to the yearly corruption perception index (CPI) published by Transparency International on December 3, 2014⁷ and to the scandals concerning corruption of highly ranked officials⁸. The newest member of the Union, Croatia, does not fare much better since joining: the country has slipped in a recession for the sixth year in a row⁹.

It is not only the newer members that are struggling. The Euro crisis has had its effects on every member of the Union. Greece has been saved by EU emergency funds multiple times, Spain has to deal with the consequences of recession, as well as Ireland and France. Italy's economic performance is patchy at best and the country can be seen as equally corrupt as Bulgaria, Romania and Greece, according to the CPI¹⁰. All in all, one can conclude that the EU is not as stable as one would wish it to

¹ European Council, 'Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union', *Official Journal of the European Union*, Article 49 (2008)

² European Council, 'Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union', *Official Journal of the European Union*, Article 2 (2008)

³ OECD press release, *Economic Survey of Poland 2014* (March 3, 2014)

⁴ European Council press release, *Lithuania to adopt the Euro on 1 January 2015* (July 23, 2014)

⁵ Joe Sutherland, 'Bulgaria made wait for Schengen access', *Euroviews* (April 22, 2014)

⁶ Reuters press release, *France against Romania, Bulgaria joining Schengen Zone* (September 30, 2013)

⁷ Transparency International, *Corruption perception index* (December 3, 2014)

⁸ Euronews press release, *Irony as organised crime prosecutor arrested for corruption in Romania* (November 12, 2014)

⁹ Guy de Launey, 'Croatia and the EU- what difference has a year made', *BBC News* (September 25, 2014)

¹⁰ Valentina Pop, 'Italy seen as corrupt as Greece, Romania and Bulgaria', *EU Observer*, (December 3, 2014)

be. Even in countries that were less severely hit by the crisis, the economy has suffered enormous consequences as a result of the integrated market and euroscepticism is increasing everywhere, as can be seen by the European parliament election results. In addition to a historically low turnout, parties like UK Independence Party in Great Britain, Front Nationale in France and Alternative für Deutschland, all Euro-sceptic at the least, were very popular among voters¹¹.

In the light of the events outlined above, it is interesting to look back on the past decade to try to reconstruct the reasons why the EU has become what it is today. Many problems have already been thoroughly investigated and reforms have been set in motion, like the Banking Union and the Structural Aid Fund. It has often been argued that the lack of supervision on various levels have led to these crisis events. The Eastern Enlargement rounds of 2004, 2007 and 2013 could also be seen as destabilizing factors in European integration, but they are hardly ever used as an argument to explain the situation in Europe nowadays. Even though there were doubts that the EU structures could absorb the enlargement, as well as doubts on the economic and political capacity of some potential members beforehand, the process is not often referred to as a mistake¹². Various member countries actually fought hard for the enlargement to the Eastern European states, but as problems continue to arise on European level, the question why these countries did this arises as well.

I.1 Historical overview

To find an answer to the question above, one has to know what the expectations of the Eastern enlargement were. Hence, there should be some kind of research on the process of enlargement. Enlargement is indeed a process, for it happened in several steps.

When analysing the process, one should start at the Strasbourg European Council meeting in December 1989, just a month after the fall of the Berlin Wall. At this meeting the Council emphasised a commitment to co-operation with the post-Soviet countries.¹³ Soon after their independence, the Central and East European countries (CEECs) openly expressed the hope that they could join the European Community, having established liberal democracies and market-based systems¹⁴. The initial response of the Community focussed on economic and technical assistance, in the form of the PHARE-programme. However, pressures from the CEECs for closer economic and political ties, as well as pressures from various member states – specifically Germany, Denmark and the United Kingdom, led the Commission to propose a new approach towards the CEECs. The new countries were offered association agreements, also called ‘Europe agreements’, that were based on an asymmetrical, and long, transition process towards free trade, in which the European Community would lower its barriers more quickly than the CEECs were required to do. Moreover, the countries would receive increased economic and financial assistance. However, the European Community was reluctant to discuss membership issues, since they were preoccupied with other matters, like the Maastricht Treaty and EFTA enlargement (the accession of Sweden, Finland and Austria)¹⁵.

¹¹ John Harris et al, ‘If this was the rejection election, where do mainstream politics go’, *The Guardian*, (May 28, 2014)

¹² Remarks have been made about the accession of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia by some officials, for example the Belgium Secretary to European Affairs – source: Sofia News Agency, *Belgium: Bulgaria, Romania EU entry was a Mistake, Lesson*, (March 10, 2010)

¹³ European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency*, (Strasbourg, December 8-9, 1989) IV.B

¹⁴ Neill Nugent, ‘Introduction’ in Neill Nugent (ed), *European Union Enlargement*. (Palgrave 2004), 24

¹⁵ Nugent, ‘Introduction’, pp. 35 or Michael Baun, ‘Eastern Enlargement’, in Laura Cram, Desmond Dinan, and Neill Nugent (eds), *Developments in the European Union*. (Macmillan Press Ltd 1999), 273

From that point on, according to Nugent, a process “rhetorical ratcheting up” began to unfold, in which specific promises about membership were made¹⁶. The Maastricht treaty in 1991 can be seen as a starting point of this process, which concluded that “Any European State which respects the values referred to in Article 2 and is committed to promoting them may apply to become a member of the Union”¹⁷. A more explicit reference towards EU membership on the CEECs was made at the Council meeting in Copenhagen, which stated that “Associated CEECs that so desire shall become members of the EU”¹⁸. The accession would take place as soon as a country had complied with the conditions the Council had set to ensure that enlargement would not threaten the functioning and development of the EU. These conditions, known as the Copenhagen criteria, emphasised that potential candidates should adopt the EU laws and policies (the *acquis communautaire*) and that they should develop stable institutions that would guarantee democracy, the rule of law and respect for and protection of minorities. Moreover, the countries should have a functioning market economy that would have the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces of the EU. Lastly, the countries should adhere to the aims of political, economic and monetary union¹⁹.

The conclusions of the Council meeting in Copenhagen marked a turn in the behaviour of the EU towards the CEECs: where membership was not being discussed before, with this meeting membership was a definite possibility for the CEECs and high on the EU agenda. The next important questions were: which countries should join, which approach towards accession should the EU take and when should enlargement actually take place²⁰. No specific reference to these issues had been made by the council. Some scholars, for instance Friis, argue that by offering membership as a result of a long transformation process, CEECs would be discouraged to join the EU immediately²¹. Nonetheless, at the 1994 European Council meeting in Corfu, the Council officially requested the Commission to work out a strategy to prepare the CEECs for accession. This was also the key goal for the German presidency in the second half of 1994, that concluded with the Essen European Council, that decided to give a further stimulus to the enlargement process by defining a ‘pre-accession strategy’²². This was a new development in the Union’s history: never before was such a formula applied. The formula combined two elements: the development of ‘structured relations’ between the EU institutions and the associated countries and the CEECs’ preparation for their integration into the EU internal market. Moreover, Essen underlined that one of the important conditions which would determine accession was that the applicant countries must not bring unresolved problems to the EU with them²³.

In the meantime, the 10 CEECs had officially applied for membership between March 1994 and January 1996, joining Malta and Cyprus, who had applied in 1990 and Turkey that had applied in 1987. The European Council of Madrid in 1995 formally reacted to this wave of applications, by

¹⁶ Nugent, ‘Introduction’, 35

¹⁷ Official Journal of the European Union, *Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union*, Article 49 (2008)

¹⁸ European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency* (Copenhagen, June 21-22) 7, A, III, (1993).

¹⁹ Baun, ‘Eastern Enlargement’, 275

²⁰ *Ibidem*, 275

²¹ Lykke Friis, ‘The End of the Beginning’ of Eastern Enlargement - Luxembourg Summit and Agenda-setting.’ *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 2, 7, (1998b), 1-15, p. 6

²² Marc-André Gaudissart and Adinda Sinnaeve, ‘The Role of the White Paper in the Preparation of the Eastern enlargement’, in Marc Maresceau (ed), 1997, *Enlarging the European Union. Relations between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe* (Longman), 42-43

²³ Alan Mayhew, *Recreating Europe. The European Union’s Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*. (Cambridge University Press 1998) 1-426

requesting the commission to investigate the implications of enlargement for the Union²⁴. The Commission complied and introduced 'Agenda 2000: for a stronger and wider Union' on July 16th, 1997. This paper describes the overall prospects for the development of the European Union and its policies, the horizontal problems occasioned by enlargement and the shape of a future financial framework for the first seven years of the new millennium, in the context of an enlarged Union. The Commission simultaneously made known its opinions on the accession applications of the ten countries of Central and Eastern Europe²⁵. The Commission concluded with a recommendation that negotiations should be opened with just half of the applicants: Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia and Cyprus. This approach is known as the 5+1 approach. The accession strategy that the Commission recommended was focussed on increased aid for agriculture and infrastructure development. Additionally, the Commission recommended the creation of bilateral accession partnerships. These are commitments by the applicant to meet political and economic goals by specific deadlines and a timetable to adopt the *acquis communautaire*. In response, the EU would give the applicant countries financial and technical assistance²⁶. As a reaction to the recommendations of the Commission, the half a year leading up to the Luxembourg Council as well as during the council itself, the EU15 member states were focussed on two issues. First of all the concern for the non-recommended applicants. Member states feared that these states would be excluded from accession or permanently issued towards a slow track for membership²⁷. Moreover, member states expressed fears for the stability of these countries and the creation of 'a new Yalta'²⁸. Another concern was the question of whether or not negotiations should be opened with Turkey²⁹. *Agenda 2000* met opposition, especially of Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Italy, who launched a competing idea of the enlargement process, arguing that the negotiations should be opened with all applicants, in order to secure the future stability of Europe. This approach is known as the regatta approach³⁰.

During the Luxembourg Council, a number of historic decisions were made regarding the Eastern enlargement. First of all, the accession process would start late March, 1998, with a meeting of the foreign ministers of the EU15 and the 10 CEEC applicants and Cyprus. After this event, bilateral intergovernmental negotiations would begin with the recommended states. The other states would be granted a slower track membership. They would participate in a screening process that assessed their compliance with the *acquis*. These countries would be able to join the negotiation process once enough economic and political reforms had been made.

During the European Council meeting in Helsinki in 1999, it was decided that negotiations with the second wave of countries would be opened in February 2000. This would include Bulgaria and Romania, even though they did not yet fully comply with the criteria. The Council stated that the accession of the CEECs would be based solely on their progress in the negotiations and not on when the negotiations were opened. Peter Ludlow calls 1999 a turning point, for in this year the Commission changed – Romano Prodi became President – and the presidency by Germany in the first half of 1999 and Finland in the second half speeded up the enlargement process considerably.

²⁴ Nugent, 'Introduction', 36

²⁵ Summaries of EU Legislation:

http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/enlargement/2004_and_2007_enlargement/l60001_en.htm

²⁶ European Commission, 1997, *Agenda 2000. For a stronger and wider Europe*. Referred to in Baun, 'Eastern Enlargement', 277

²⁷ Baun, 'Eastern Enlargement', 277

²⁸ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 9

²⁹ Baun, 'Eastern Enlargement', 277

³⁰ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 6

Moreover, the candidate states were making enormous progress and, most importantly, the war in Kosovo provoked new debate about the purpose and the scope of EU enlargement³¹. In 2000, when the negotiations were opened with all candidates, the 'Luxembourg Six'³² met in Ljubljana and send a message to the European Council, arguing that the pace of the negotiations could and should be enhanced. In reaction to this, the Commission issued an Enlargement Strategy paper in autumn 2000. This paper was a revision of the earlier strategy and introduced a road map towards the end of the negotiations. The paper aimed to end the negotiations by the end of 2002. This would lead to an accession big bang in 2004³³. Finally, during the presidency in Copenhagen in the second half of 2002, the negotiations were concluded and all the applicant countries, except Romania and Bulgaria would join the EU in 2004³⁴.

When looking at the chronology, there are three European Council meetings during these 15 years that are specifically important for the Eastern enlargement process. First of all, the Copenhagen Council in 1993, which placed enlargement on the agenda and laid down the criteria for the applicant states to fulfil. Secondly, in Luxembourg (1997) when the leaders of the EU-15 member states decided to open negotiations with all the applicant states, against the recommendation of the Commission. Finally, during the presidency of Denmark the second half of 2002, the negotiations were concluded and the Council decided that the accession treaty would be signed in April 2003, allowing accession for all applicants except Romania and Bulgaria.

When looking at the historical overview, several things stand out. First of all Denmark played an active role in the enlargement process. Their two presidencies in this timeframe was devoted to promoting the enlargement process. First in 1993, the Copenhagen Council decided that the EU should enlarge and the convened leaders drew up the conditions and requirements on which membership would be granted. In 2002, the Danish presidency prioritized the closure of the accession negotiations, procuring that the CEECs would become a full member of the Union by 2004.

The presidencies were not the only time that Denmark was able to make a stance in favour of enlargement. In the run up to the Luxembourg Council in 1997, as explained above, the Danes lobbied vehemently for enlargement to include all CEECs and not only those selected by the Commission. This role as promotor (or 'driver' as referred to by Schimmelfennig) of the enlargement process, is not a logical one for the Danes. First of all, enlargement would not lead to much economic benefit for Denmark. On the contrary, the country would become one of the net contributors to the EU, instead of the recipient they used to be. Moreover, reform of the Common Agricultural Policy that would take place in the case of enlargement, would mean that Denmark would be receiving less funds than they would have if enlargement would not take place³⁵. Secondly, enlargement would change the structure of the EU decision making process, leading to a lessened influence of the member states, due to the introduction of Qualified Majority Voting (QVM). In concrete terms, this would mean that Denmark was to lose its veto power in certain policy areas³⁶. Finally, from a realist

³¹ Peter Ludlow, *The Making of the New Europe. The European Councils in Brussels and Copenhagen 2002*. (EuroComment 2004), 1-390

³² Ludlow, *The making of the New Europe*, 1-390: The Luxembourg Six are Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia and Slovenia. The Helsinki Six are Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania and Malta.

³³ Ludlow, *The making of the New Europe*, 1-390

³⁴ Nugent, 'Introduction', 37

³⁵ Marianne Riddervold and Helene Sjursen, 'Between Security and Human Rights: Denmark and the Enlargement of the EU', in Helene Sjursen, *Enlargement in Perspective* (Arena, Oslo 2004), 103-128, p.109

³⁶ Andrew Moravcsik and Milada Anna Vachudova, 'Preferences, power and equilibrium. The causes and consequences of EU enlargement' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*. (Routledge 2005), 314-339, p.329

perspective, one would not expect Denmark to take a leading role in promoting enlargement, for there were no direct security threats and if there would be, it would be logical that neighbouring countries would feel the threat the strongest, which would propel them into action. In this case it would be Germany or Austria that would devote itself to the promotion of Eastern Enlargement. However, it was Denmark who did this.

Another aspect that should be noted is that European enlargement was a European Council decision. This is an important notion, since a Council decision calls for unanimity. The Council is an intergovernmental institution within the EU. Every member state has the power to veto a decision they do not agree with and the member state had sufficient reasons to do so³⁷. But none of them ever did.

Lastly, there are various Council decision that were of great importance to the enlargement process. First of all, of course, Copenhagen 1993, in which the EU first officially stated that enlargement was an option. The other Council meetings leading up to accession all underlined the importance of the criteria formed in Copenhagen. But maybe even more important that Copenhagen was the Luxembourg Council in 1997, even though this council is not as thoroughly explored by scholars of European integration. The Luxembourg Council stands out, because it broke with tradition. Where the member states had been supporting the gradual approach to enlargement, as advocated by the Commission, in 1997, several member states 'broke ranks'³⁸. The new option introduced by Denmark, Sweden and Italy accelerated the enlargement process considerably and broke the process open to conclude every applicant state – something that was not even thought of before. The most interesting part is that this approach was in fact accepted and embedded in the enlargement process by the European Council in Luxembourg, thereby stepping away from the Commission's approach to enlargement. This was an unprecedented event in the history of enlargement.

Still, questions remain. Why did Denmark not support the Commission's approach and launch a competing approach? Why was Denmark such a strong supporter for enlargement with all CEECs? What reasons did Denmark give for doing so? And what made other countries support this approach during the Luxemburg Council meeting? These are the central questions of this thesis.

1.2 Structure

In order to answer these four questions, I have divided my research in three parts. The first part is divided in two chapters. The first chapter will focus on the current debate concerning the European Union, enlargement and will elaborate on the current literature of the case studies Denmark and the Luxembourg Council meeting. The second chapter will explain the terminology that is used throughout this thesis. Part II, chapters three and four, focusses on Denmark. In the third chapter, I investigate the (domestic) context of the Danish decision to promote enlargement. First of all I sketch the history of Denmark and the European Union, in order to determine whether this support of enlargement and the active promotion of it is persistent with the role Denmark has played on the European level. This is the historical context. Furthermore, I will elaborate on the normative context to the Danish decision. In order to do so, I investigate what makes Denmark 'Danish', by analysing the Danish national identity. This national identity is reflected in the domestic and foreign policies of the various Danish governments and shine a light on the Danish priorities in both areas. Analysing these priorities, I come to find that Danish believe themselves 'special' and that they believe strongly in solidarity. In the fourth chapter, I will elaborate on whether this normative context is all there is to

³⁷ David Phinnemore, 'Beyond 25—the changing face of EU enlargement: commitment, conditionality and the Constitutional Treaty.' *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 8, 1 (2006) 7-26, p.8.

³⁸ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 10

it, or whether there are any economical, geopolitical or other interests backing the Danish decision to promote Eastern enlargement. I found that there is a special interest to include the Baltic States in the enlargement process, for their economic history with Denmark. However, this does not seem a reason to open up the process to all CEECs. Another important driver for Denmark is the conviction that EU membership would stabilize the area by creating market oriented democracies that are less prone to internal strife and are therefore less likely to disrupt the continent. By combining the normative context and the Danish interests, it is possible to explain the Danish position in 1997.

The third part of the thesis, chapter five, will elaborate on the way on which Denmark promoted their approach to Eastern enlargement in 1997. The chapter will explain which arguments were given by the Danish representatives, in order to determine how Denmark justified its position. Schimmelfennig states that the 'drivers' of enlargement were able to entrap the 'brakemen'³⁹ using normative arguments. This chapter will determine if the Danes indeed did this and, more importantly, if the normative arguments are genuine, or merely used as tools to support the Danish interests.

In this last chapter, I will also look into the position of the other member states. Sweden and the Great Britain were supportive of the Danish approach from the start. Italy was also an early supporter of full enlargement, but Spain and Portugal were heavily opposed it, as was France, but for other reasons. The Netherlands and Germany were undecided: they were in favour of enlargement, but not directly supportive of the Danish approach. This last chapter will explain the positions of the member states and zoom in especially on the switch that led to the acceptance of the Danish approach.

1.3 Methodology

The literature on the topic of Eastern enlargement is vast and there are multiple ways to investigate the Enlargement, as stated by John O'Brennan. In his book he explains that there are five leading streams of literature that analyse enlargement⁴⁰. First of all, there are various empirical analyses of the process that seek to describe the evolution of the enlargement process and the development of relations between the EU and the applicant states. In the same category fall analyses of the various EU policy areas and the potential impact of enlargement on these areas. O'Brennan calls these works general texts. Another type of research are the so-called country analyses. These works focus on the (potential) effects of the EU on the (new) member states, the negotiation strategies and studies of public opinion. This type of research provides important information on the developments in the candidate member states, but much less on the developments on member state level within the EU. The third stream of literature originated in the field of economic integration, focussing on the impact of eastern enlargement on the main policy areas of the European Union, i.e. the Common Agricultural policy. Various scholars in this field focussed on investment flows as well. The next category of literature focusses on the EU level policies and the extent to which they are effective. The effects of EU conditionality, for example, are a popular topic in this field, as are the measurements of successful and failed policies⁴¹.

The last type of research is theoretical research. Various theoretical works are written on enlargement, from different point of views. I am of the opinion that this category should be mentioned first, as it includes the former categories as well. Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier think

³⁹ Frank Schimmelfennig, 'The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', *International Organization*, 55, 1 (2001) 47-80, p.72

⁴⁰ John O'Brennan, *The Eastern Enlargement of the European Union* (Routledge 2006) 3-4

⁴¹ O'Brennan, *The Eastern Enlargement*, 3-4

along this line, stating that there are four kinds of focus within the academic literature on enlargement. First of all, the focus on the applicant's enlargement politics, which overlaps with what O'Brennan calls the country analyses. Secondly, the focus on the enlargement politics on member state level, although the writers admit that this focus is scarce among the bulk of literature. Most scholars investigate the EU enlargement politics, which can be on the macro dimension, in other words, the politics of enlargement on polity level. The writers argue for a second dimension, the substantive, or policy, dimension, focussing on the enlargement politics on a policy level. This EU level approach partly overlaps with the economic and the EU approach mentioned by O'Brennan. Finally, there is the focus on impact of enlargement⁴². The authors clearly connect the different focus points of the research to a theoretical framework, arguing that analyses of EU enlargement should be located within the mainstream of the International Relations theorizing⁴³. In the same issue of the *Journal of European Public Policy*, Helen Wallace complements that argument by stating that the study of enlargement and its domestic politics should be placed in the field of comparative politics, for there is much room for cross country and interpretive analysis⁴⁴. She elaborates on four types of comparative analyses that could be used to research EU enlargements. The first is the comparison of the EU to other institutions. Along this line, Schimmelfennig compares the EU enlargement to the enlargements of the NATO and the Council of Europe to test the liberal community hypothesis⁴⁵. However, Wallace argues that such comparisons can miss the point, since the NATO is a single issue organisation and the EU is a multi-issue organisation. In other words, it is only possible to compare the issue that the organisations have in common, and this is a limited approach to explaining the European enlargement process⁴⁶. Another potential comparison is between the various rounds of EU enlargement, in other words, a view over time. In his study, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier compare the Mediterranean enlargement with the Eastern enlargement to find that each enlargement round had other reasons and factors that enabled them⁴⁷. It should be kept in mind, however, that the EU changes over time and with every enlargement as well. Phinnemore argues the Eastern enlargement was subjected to stricter conditions due to the accession of a new commission⁴⁸. Therefore, comparisons over time should always be done with regard to the context⁴⁹. Furthermore, Wallace argues that comparison between EU membership and alternatives, for applicants as well as for member states, can be an interesting way to analyse preference formation. Moreover the comparison between the weight of political or economic factors is persistent in the study on enlargement, for it is difficult to evaluate which arguments are propelling integration forward. Wallace argues that in the existing literature too much emphasis is placed on the political factors. Since economic factors are of vital importance as well, the weight of both factors should be compared equally⁵⁰.

My analyses will be a country analysis. First of all, a large component will exist of researching primary sources to fully understand the views of the Danish government and the other member states on the

⁴² Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 500-528, pp.504-507

⁴³ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement', 508

⁴⁴ Helen Wallace, 'Enlarging the European Union: reflections on the challenge of analyses', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 658-665, p.665

⁴⁵ Frank Schimmelfennig, 'Liberal community and enlargement: an event history analysis', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 598-626, p.599

⁴⁶ Wallace, 'Enlarging the European Union' 659

⁴⁷ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement' 524

⁴⁸ Phinnemore, 'Beyond 25', 18

⁴⁹ Wallace, 'Enlarging the European Union' 665

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, 664

enlargement issues. The primary sources found in several bundles and in online archives give access to a great numbers of speeches, phone calls and press releases, which enable a detailed insight into the aims and expectations of the political and economic elite of these countries. The empirical information will enable me to compare the political, economic and normative arguments the Danish had for introducing their approach, as well as clarifying the position of the other member states. I have used several official Commission and Council documents to determine the position of the European institutions and the exact outcome of the meetings during the 1990s. Additionally, statistics and opinions provided by the Commission are used to support the empirical evidence and the conclusions I have drawn from it.

The bulk of this thesis will be based on earlier research done by scholars of European integration and enlargement, as well as research on Denmark and the 'Danish way'. These essays enable me to create the wider context on which my own research is built. Moreover, they provide insides in the various aspects of Denmark and the enlargement process that can be used as arguments in this thesis, when combined with the empirical evidence. These essays are primarily found in journals and magazines. I will also use various books that are bundles of different essays or that provide a background to the research I am conducting.

Part I

Chapter 1: Academic debate and theories

When analysing the theories on Eastern enlargement, it quickly becomes apparent that the topic falls into the wider debate on Integration Theory, since it is an important part of integration. Since the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) much has been written on the reason why the 6 countries chose to integrate and enlarge over time, how they have done so and what is likely to happen in the future, in other words, the possible end-state of European integration. Therefore, one should keep in mind the broad debate, while investigating the dynamics of European enlargement.

1.1 Integration debate

The debate on European integration started with the start of the cooperation. The different opinions on integration, its start, its dynamics or its reasons are a vast amount, therefore I shall only discuss the most popular currents of academic thinking. The federalist school has been neglected in this overview, as is the Marxist theory, for they are very specific and not often used to explain the EU enlargement. Therefore they need not be explained as a background. However, by no means do I wish to discredit them.

1.1.1 Neofunctionalism

In the 1970s, various theoretical works on explaining the European integration (EI) process were written, based on the first decade of European Union. The theory most connected to this early period is the neofunctionalist theory, introduced by Ernst Haas in 1958, when he published his book *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950-1957*. In this work, Haas explains that EI is a group driven process. Institutions are established because important political groups see socio-economic advantages in joint governance in specific areas. In turn, these (federal) institutions affect the interests of groups that respond by organising across boundaries and pushing for more integration, with stability as its end goal.⁵¹ In turn, the response of these groups has two results. First of all, it leads to the creation of a transnational elite, which is no longer connected to national interests. This elite develops a new identity through the process of socialization, which can be explained as a form of habituation. Since this elite no longer feels connected to their home country and the national interests, new interest will develop, that are not connected to the member states. These interests will be strongly advocated by the new elites. This will lead to a continuing integration process, since each new policy or decision on institutional level will lead to spill-overs. This is the second result. The integration process starts in certain areas of low politics, so-called sector integration, and due to spill-overs the process will expand, eventually spilling over to the high politics⁵². This view on EI is very progressive as well as deterministic: due to the spill-overs, the result of the integration can only be a supranational union, where the member states grow increasingly redundant.

This vision was supported by Leon Lindenberg in his book *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration* (1963). Lindenberg draws on Haas' definition of political integration and continues to identify conditions for integration. Central institutions, political groups and member states all play their own role in this progress, for instance, member states must have a will to proceed if integration is to continue. However, spill-overs will propel integration forward, leading to

⁵¹ Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950-1957* (Stanford University press 1958) 1-568

⁵² Ernst B. Haas, 'The Challenge of Regionalism', *International Organization*, 12 (1958) 440-458, 450

a European project that promised to “move beyond the nation-state”⁵³. Haas complements this study with his article ‘Beyond the Nation-State’⁵⁴. Neofunctionalism is, as the name implies, a new form of functionalism. David Mitrany was the leading author of the functionalist school, arguing that competing political units were the root of conflict. A federalist government of the world would overcome these divisions, but is impossible to establish due to nationalism and “disregard for constitutions and pacts”⁵⁵. However, international activities and agencies would gradually integrate the interests of all nation states. These agencies would be pragmatic and technocratic. Mitrany argued the possibility of one authority coordinating the various agencies, but this form of government was not a necessity⁵⁶. The difference between functionalism and neofunctionalism lies in the role of the institutions and the development of the political elite that would pursue its own, transnational interest. In the functionalist vision, this elite would be an automatic result, instead of the result of a process based on socialization⁵⁷.

Because of his work Haas is seen as the founder of the Neofunctionalist School. The theory is important in the study of EI for it proved fertile and flexible in the 1960s and early 1970s. Moreover, the theory is connected to the strategies of important players in the foundation of the EC, like Jean Monnet⁵⁸. However, this early attempt to capture the process of EI in a theory has been met much criticism in the past decades. Even Haas himself concluded that the theory had various holes in it that would render the theory obsolete. The theory was not so much wrong as inapplicable to the circumstances of complex interdependence among advanced capitalist countries⁵⁹. The values of the explanatory variables had become weak: spill-overs did not have the foreseen effect, for they required political activism and were therefore not the automatic results of policies or decisions⁶⁰. Moreover, the theory did not explain why the member states chose to unite and start the integration process. The neofunctional approach starts when the institutions are already in place, so the moment of ‘take off’ remains unexplained. Even though the theory was deemed obsolete by its creator, it did not vanish.

After slumbering for a more than a decade, various scholars initiated the revival of the neofunctionalist theory, led by an article in *World Politics* (vol. 41, no.1) by Wayne Sandholtz and John Zysman in 1989⁶¹. They explained that the 1992 was a product of a new bargain between business elites, member states and the European Community, stressing the roll of transnational business interest and supranational institutions. They argue that the 1992 project was first and foremost a project of elites, but they conclude that the elite is unlikely to hold this monopoly, suggesting that the European Community will take it up⁶². This last suggestion is the reason that the study is often referred to as supranationalist, even though it does have many neofunctionalist

⁵³ Leon N. Lindberg, *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration* (Stanford University Press, 1963) 1-999

⁵⁴ Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, (St. Martens Press 2000) 54

⁵⁵ David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System* (Quadrangle Books, 1966) 1-999

⁵⁶ Brent F. Nelson and Alexander Stubb, *The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration* (Palgrave Macmillan 2003), 93-113

⁵⁷ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 57

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, 52

⁵⁹ James Caporaso, ‘Regional integration theory: understanding our past and anticipating our future’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 1 (1998) 1-16, p. 6

⁶⁰ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 71-72

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, 51

⁶² Wayne Sandholtz and John Zysman, ‘1992: recasting the European bargain’, *World Politics*, 41, 1 (1989) 95-128

qualities⁶³. A decade later, Sandholtz, in collaboration with Alec Stone Sweet, published his book *European Integration and Supranational Governance*, moving beyond his former, more vague, publications and offering a modern neofunctionalist account of the development of the EU⁶⁴. According to the authors, integration is caused by an increase in cross-border exchange that creates political pressures on governments to regulate international transactions. The governments respond by establishing supranational institutions, which meet the direct needs, but also reveal other needs. At this point, spill-overs will increase the power of these institutions⁶⁵. The classic spill-over effect and the deterministic view resemble that of Haas in 1958. What is new in this view is that the moment of take-off is more adequately explained. Moreover, the theory is simple and testable⁶⁶.

Many other scholars followed the example to revisit the neofunctionalist approach to integration. Ben Rosamond, for instance, argues that scholars should take neofunctionalism into account when researching EI, for the emergence of the ECSC is closely connected to neofunctionalist theory⁶⁷. Additionally, Schmitter writes that neofunctionalism is often the underlying base of articles, even though it is not specifically referred to⁶⁸. He argues that the neofunctionalist theory is a reflective one, and therefore always open for adjustment. For example, he explains that, due to empirical evidence, the faith in “automaticity and uni-directionality” has not been lost, but adjusted: spill-overs are no longer taken for granted⁶⁹. This doesn’t mean, however, that the possibility should not be considered. He concludes by stating that empirical research are able to prove other theory at a certain point in time, but also he implies that empirical research can be framed to fit the theory. Since no single theory can fit the case of EI, Schmitter states that neofunctionalism remains an interesting tool for explaining it, especially due to its reflective side⁷⁰.

1.1.2 Realism

Neofunctionalism was aimed at replacing the power politics that were the core of the realist arguments⁷¹. The realist theory argues that EI, and on a larger scale International Relations, are the result of interaction between self-interested states who protect their sovereignty in an anarchic world. In this context, the alliance between the six West European states and their efforts on integration should be seen as a choice in which each member state saw security benefits. The institutions created are not of consequence in this theory⁷². Steven Walt describes two ways in which alliance forming is used to protect a state’s sovereignty and power, based on the assumption that states have a crucial interest in maintaining the balance- of- power, or *status quo*. First of all, states can form an alliance to balance another state. Through the alliance, they form a bloc that has equal, or more, power than the state they balance against, and therefore the risk is small that they would be victim of this state’s expansion. The opposite state is often perceived as threatening and for that reason an alliance is sought. Another phenomenon is so-called bandwagoning: in this case, weaker state ally with the threatening power, so they will not be overrun when the state would be annexed

⁶³ Ioannis N. Kallianiotis ‘The Generative Motive of European Union and its Latest Struggle for Survival’ *International Journal of Business & Commerce*, 1, 6 (2012) 1- 24, p. 9

⁶⁴ Nelson and Stubb, *The European Union*, 1-400

⁶⁵ Wayne Sandholtz and Alec Stone Sweet (eds.), *European Integration and Supranational Governance* (Oxford University press, 1999) 1-400

⁶⁶ Nelson and Stubb, *The European Union*, 1-400

⁶⁷ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 52

⁶⁸ Philip. C. Schmitter, ‘Neo-Neofunctionalism’ in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford University Press 2004) 45- 72, 46

⁶⁹ Schmitter, ‘Neo-Neofunctionalism’, 65

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, 70-71

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, 46

⁷² Caporaso, ‘Regional integration theory’, 9

by this other state. The logic behind this is that, when weak states are overrun, they lose their sovereignty, while if they ally with the threatening power, they can maintain most of it⁷³. This balance-of-power thinking was introduced by Hans Morgenthau. He is a well-known advocate of the 'Classical Realism' school in the International Relations that had its heyday after World War 2. This theory was not aimed at explaining EI, since it was developed before the ECSC was founded. Nevertheless, this theory is of great influence on the early EI theory formation, with the publication of the views of Stanley Hoffmann in 1966⁷⁴. In a reaction to the 'empty chair crisis', created by Charles de Gaulle in 1965, Hoffmann argued that the member states were still self-interested entities with clear interests, despite their willingness to cooperate in areas of low politics. Sovereignty was still of tremendous importance to them. This is the reason that high politics – foreign policy, the use of force and national security – were not lifted towards the European level. They bargained reluctantly over aspects of their economies in exchange for material benefits⁷⁵. In this way, Hoffman supersedes realism: his view that integrations occurs when sovereign states, pursuing their national interests, negotiate cooperative agreements can be labelled as intergovernmentalism. Hoffmann can be seen as the first intergovernmentalist to provide a theoretical counter to neofunctionalism⁷⁶. After its heyday, the realist theory greatly lost its appeal, but it was never completely eliminated. In 2011, Rosato published an essay in which he argues that the EU has been fraying since the turn of the century. His theory to explain this development is based on the assumption that the institutions largely reflect the distribution of power⁷⁷. The states of Europe organised to oppose the power of the Soviet Union, and integrations was the most efficient way to do so. The collapse of the Soviet Union altered the balance of power, since it eliminated Europe's shared adversary. Lacking an adversary, the Europeans had no longer a compelling geopolitical reason to preserve their economic community⁷⁸. This view is supported by Belgium scholar Jonathan Holslag, who argues the case that the shared European affairs cannot compete with the fixation of the member states on their own national interests, arguing that the EU should work together to balance the rise of China⁷⁹. These statements are based on the realist assumption first made by Kenneth Waltz, that a bipolar world is more stable than a multipolar one⁸⁰. John Mearsheimer made this assumption his starting point in his article 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War', analysing the dynamics of the EU member states after 1991. His theory on the end of EI, created around the assumption that the distribution and character of military power are the root causes of war and peace, is a pessimist one, concluding that Germany will once again prove a threat to European stability, since they are the most powerful state. At a point in time, EI will not continue to suit the German interests, so it will stop working⁸¹. Mearsheimer, and his student Rosato, have been heavily criticized by various important scholars in the field of international relations. These critiques focus on the conclusions and arguments as well as the methodology of the articles. For instance, Hoffman states that Mearsheimer

⁷³ Steven M. Walt, 'Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power', *International Security*, 9, 4 (1985) 3-43

⁷⁴ Nelson and Stubb, *The European Union*, 1-400

⁷⁵ Stanley Hoffmann, 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the case of Western Europe', *Daedalus*, 95, 3 (1966) 862-915

⁷⁶ Nelson and Stubb, *The European Union*, 1-400

⁷⁷ Sebastian Rosato, 'Europe's Troubles. Power Politics and the State of the European Project', *International Security*, 35, 4 (2011) 5-86, p.46

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 47

⁷⁹ Jonathan Holslag, *De kracht van het Paradijs: Hoe Europa kan overleven in de Aziatische Eeuw* (Bezige Bij, Antwerpen 2014) 1- 606

⁸⁰ Stanley Hoffman, 'Correspondence – Back to the Future, Part II: International Relations Theory and Post- Cold War Europe', *International Security*, 15, 2, (1990) 191-192

⁸¹ John J. Mearsheimer, 'Back to the Future: instability in Europe after the Cold War', *International Security*, 15, 1, (1990) 5-56, p. 33

uses examples to show the advantages of bipolarity, that in other contexts have proven to lead to war, rather than improving the stability⁸². Andrew Moravcsik accused Rosato of “shopping for evidence”, and thereby creating a bias towards realism, that is far from the truth⁸³. The realist school has sustained a large array of criticism, but it remains a dominant theory in the field of International Relations. However, one can argue that it is less applicable in explaining the European Integration.

1.1.3 Liberal intergovernmentalism

Some strong criticism to the neofunctionalist and the realist approach has been voiced by the intergovernmentalist school, with Andrew Moravcsik as its most famous speaker. Moravcsik introduced a completely new vision of the EI process. On many accounts, he shares the view of Hoffman, for he too assumes that integration is first and foremost a result of member states negotiations, which he refers to as ‘grand bargaining’. On the other hand, he combines this with the liberal assumption of preference formation on the domestic level, thereby creating a new current: liberal intergovernmentalism⁸⁴. According to Moravcsik, his liberal approach has three core assumptions:

1. The basic actors in politics are rational, autonomous individuals which interact on the basis of self-interest and risk-aversion;
2. Government represent a subset of domestic society whose interests constrain the interests and identities of states internationally;
3. State behaviour and patterns of conflict and cooperation reflect the nature and configuration of state interests⁸⁵.

In his earliest work he analyses the negotiations on the Single European Act (SEA) in 1985. He denies that transnational groups had any influence on the passing of the white paper and the creation of the SAE, a direct denial of the applicability of neofunctionalist approach. He argues that the heads of the member states had the final word, elaborating on the bargaining between the French, Germans and British. During the bargaining process, Germany and France threatened to proceed with the plans without Britain, which would exclude them from a say in the internal market reforms, in which it had great interest. The result was that Britain agreed to plans they would normally have fought. Moravcsik call this ‘lowest-common-denominator bargaining’, which means that fundamental decisions at EU level are made by the largest, most powerful member states, based on their socio-economic preferences, and the smaller states receive a side payment. The institutions play a coordinating role in this bargaining process, but are unable to really influence it⁸⁶. In reference to this last statement Moravcsik argues that the institutions do⁸⁷. In his book, *The Choice for Europe*, Moravcsik claims that he doesn’t articulate a grand theory, but rather a multicausal explanation of one aspect of integration: the grand bargain. His emphasis on the decisions of national governments, however, sets him apart from the majority of EU scholars, who highlight the independence of supranational actors⁸⁸. The fact that Moravcsik does grant a role to the institutions sets him apart

⁸² Hoffman ‘Correspondence’, 191-192

⁸³ Andrew Moravcsik, ‘Did Power Politics Cause European Integration? Realist Theory Meets Qualitative Methods’, *Security Studies*, 22, 4 (2013) 773-790, p. 774

⁸⁴ Thomas Risse-Kappen, ‘Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34, 1, (1996) 53-80, p. 56

⁸⁵ Andrew Moravcsik, ‘Liberalism and International Relations Theory’, *Harvard University Center for European Studies*, Paper, no. 52 (1993b) 1-54, p6-8

⁸⁶ Andrew Moravcsik, ‘Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, 4, (1993a) 473-524

⁸⁷ Moravcsik, ‘Preferences and Power’, 474

⁸⁸ Nelson and Stubb, *The European Union*, 1-400

from the realist school, for these institutions modify the anarchic environment in which states pursue their interests⁸⁹. One could say that Liberal Institutionalism sees EI as a politicized project.

1.1.4 Institutionalism

Moravcsik and his liberal intergovernmentalism are triggered many reactions. Various critiques on Moravcsik's approach have been formulated and published, especially by scholars of either the Neofunctionalist School, or the Institutional School.

Institutionalist approaches are based on the claim that institutions matter. They matter primarily because they have an impact upon political outcomes⁹⁰. The institutionalist literature is diverse and does not provide a single theory. On the contrary, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier indicate that three different currents exist within this theoretic school: historical, social and rational choice institutionalism⁹¹. Hall and Taylor recognize the same three divisions of institutionalism, and see them as autonomous developments joined together by a common interest in the role of the institutions, as a reaction to Moravcsik's liberal intergovernmentalist theory⁹².

Historical institutionalism grew out of the critiques of group theories of politics⁹³. It analyses the EI as a process, in which the institutions grow increasingly stronger due to path dependency and non-decisions⁹⁴. Historical institutionalism concentrates on the origins and development of the institutions themselves, seen as institutional structures and processes, which are explained by the (often unintended) outcomes of purposeful choices and historically unique initial conditions⁹⁵. Paul Pierson wrote a leading article expressing this view in 1996. He argued that, since the heads of government are primarily concerned with short term politics and interests, and moreover, since governments tend to change their course often, many summits and meetings, that are intergovernmental, do not yield direct results or decisions. Pierson calls this 'non-decisions', for in these cases the decision is usually postponed and often a research committee is formed to investigate the topic. When this happens, gaps will appear that can be filled by institutions, since they have grown increasingly autonomous over time, and have grown into actors that can hold their own against the member states⁹⁶. For example, the European Commission can frame its own visions by appointing the members of such a research committee. Moreover, when a decision is made, the interpretation of this decision lies with the EC and in cases with the European Court of Justice (ECJ)⁹⁷. In addition, every decision that is made tends to have unintended consequences, that open new gaps. These unintended consequences can be compared to the spill-overs in neofunctionalist theory. Pierson argues that if a gap appears, it is difficult to close it, due to opposition of the supranational actors, the institutional barriers to reform and the growing costs of an exit. This creates a path

⁸⁹ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 1-240

⁹⁰ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 1-240

⁹¹ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement', 504

⁹² Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, 'Political Science and the three New Institutionalisms', *MPIFG Discussion Paper*, 96, 6 (1996) 1-32, 5

⁹³ Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, 1-240

⁹⁴ Paul Pierson, 'The path to European Integration: a Historical Institutional analysis', *Comparative Political Studies*, 29, 2, (1996) 123-163

⁹⁵ Vivien A. Schmidt, 'Approaches to the study of European Politics – introduction', *ECSA Review*, 7, 2, (1999) 2-9

⁹⁶ Pierson, 'The path to European Integration' 123-163

⁹⁷ George Tsebilis and Geoffrey Garret, 'The Institutional Foundations of Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism in the European Union', *International Organization*, 55, 2 (1999). 357-390

dependency towards further integration. In short, the daily life of the 'Euro- polity' will pave the way for deepening integration⁹⁸

In rational choice institutionalism, the status of the institutions generally remains secondary to that of individual, material interests. Institutions are treated as intervening between the interests and the environment of actors on the one hand, and the collective outcomes on the other⁹⁹. In contrast with the roll given to institutions with historical institutionalism, in the case of rational choice institutionalism, the institutions mainly provide constraints and incentives for action. They do not provide reasons for it. Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier argue that they alter cost/ benefit calculations, not identities and interests¹⁰⁰. Most of the work in this field of institutionalism is based on John Nash's pioneering idea that players adjust their strategies until none any longer can gain from shifting¹⁰¹. Shepsle is an important scholar of rational choice theory, in his various analyses of American politics, he argued that actors act according to the assumption that their opponents will act rationally, following the logic of consequence. Their own actions will be based on the assumed actions of another rational party¹⁰². Interestingly, he also argues the importance of agenda setting, for example of his analyses of US political committee¹⁰³, stating that committees set the agenda for their own purposes, and that this often leads to passing the bill of their preferences. In European context, agenda setting can actually be seen as a part of polity life, thereby strengthening the historical institutionalist theory. However, the rational choice approach to decision-making differs significantly from the historical approach. Taylor and Hall state that "in general, the relevant actors have a fixed set of preferences or tastes (...), behave entirely instrumentally so as to maximize the attainment of these preferences, and do so in a highly strategic manner that presumes extensive calculation¹⁰⁴". This division of institutionalism finds its foundations in economic theories, especially the 'new economics of organization' which emphasizes the importance of property rights, rent-seeking, and transactions costs to the operation and development of institutions¹⁰⁵. The actors take decisions based on their potential cost or gain, and all actors try to minimize their own costs, within the framework of the institutions. In a sense, this theory overlaps a great deal with the liberal intergovernmentalist approach of Moravcsik, for the theories share the view that the member states' concern for autonomy is strong and the international organisations are clubs, which is voluntary groups that try to maximize their gain. Thus, an organizational structure is explained by reference to the way in which it minimizes transaction, production or influence costs¹⁰⁶. The existence of the institution is explained in reference to the value those functions have for the actors affected by the institution. This formulation assumes that the actors create the institution in order to realize this value, which is most often conceptualized, as noted above, in terms of gains from cooperation¹⁰⁷. Rational choice institutionalism works best at identifying the interests and motivations behind

⁹⁸ Pierson, 'The path to European Integration', 123-163

⁹⁹ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement', 509

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem, 509

¹⁰¹ Ira Katznelson and Barry R. Weingast (eds), *Preferences and Situations. Points of intersection between Rational Choice and Historical Institutionalism*, (Russel Sage Foundation, New York 2005), 1-345

¹⁰² Kenneth A Shepsle, 'Studying Institutions: Some Lessons from the Rational Choice Approach', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1, 2, (1989) 131-147.

¹⁰³ Kenneth A. Shepsle and Barry R. Weingast, 'The Institutional Foundations of Committee Power', *The American Political Science Review*, 81, 1, (1987). 85-104

¹⁰⁴ Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and the three New Institutionalisms', 12

¹⁰⁵ Ibidem, 11

¹⁰⁶ Paul Milgrom and John Roberts, 'Bargaining Costs, Influence Costs and the Organization of Economic Activity' in James Alt and Kenneth Shepsle (eds.), *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990) 57-89.

¹⁰⁷ Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and the three New Institutionalisms', 13

rational actor's behaviour within given institutional settings. The deductive nature of its approach to explanation means that it not only is tremendously helpful at capturing the range of reasons actors would normally have for any given action within a given institutional incentive structure and at predicting likely outcomes, but also at bringing out anomalies or actions that are unexpected given the general theory¹⁰⁸.

Social Institutionalism stands in stark contrast to this rationalist variation. Sociological institutionalism concerns itself with culturally framed actions, ideas, and identities that follow from culturally-specific rules and norms. These may or may not be "rational" in the stricter rational choice sense or predictable by way of universal generalizations, although they may be "expectable" within a given cultural context¹⁰⁹. According to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, the sociological explanations of integration do not start with actor preferences, but at the organizational level¹¹⁰. Normative arguments are seen to be the drivers of EI, and the institutions can play an important role in the formation of meaning and the assimilation of culturally specific practices that have symbolic value into the organizations with a view to enhancing their legitimacy¹¹¹. The normative side to integration cannot be overlooked, according to Scharpf, since norms may define both necessary conditions for particular actions and the ends that the actions are aiming to reach¹¹². Thomas Risse- Kappe states that there is a lack of empirical literature focussing on 'rule-guided behaviour and the logic of appropriateness as a mode of social rationality', for most scholars have researched a bottom- up approach, i.e. how member states influence the institutions. Therefore, he argues that a top down analyses of the influences of the institutions in the member states will lead to understanding of the normative dimension of integration¹¹³. Sociological institutionalism, finally, works best at delineating the shared understandings and norms that frame action, shape identities, influence interests, and affect what are perceived as problems and what are conceived as solutions.¹¹⁴

Like every theory mentioned above, the three forms of institutionalism are heavily criticized, both by scholars of other theories, and among themselves. For instance, sociological institutionalism is seen as too specific. Additionally, rational choice institutionalism is seen as too limited. Historical institutionalism can be seen as too broad, and is seen as historical deterministic¹¹⁵. Each institutionalism explains a different dimension of EI, each with different objects, goals, and terminology. Each form has its advantages and disadvantages. Schmidt states that one can only gain a full sense of the political reality by combining the three¹¹⁶.

1.2 Debate on enlargement

When zooming in at the specific debate on (eastern) enlargement, it is possible to identify the most, if not all, theories mentioned above. Leading among the larger debate, are the following two sub-debates, which I will focus on, for they outline the debates that are at the foundations of this thesis. The first debate focusses on the reasoning behind enlargement: the rationalist – constructivist debate elaborates on the various reasons to enlarge member states, applicant states or EU

¹⁰⁸ Fritz W. Scharpf, 1997, *Games Real Actors Play*, (Boulder CO: Westview Press 1997) 1-318

¹⁰⁹ Schmidt, 'Approaches to the Study of European Politics' 2-9

¹¹⁰ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement', 513

¹¹¹ Thomas Christiansen, Gerda Falkner & Knud Erik Jørgensen, 'Theorizing EU Treaty Reform: beyond diplomacy and bargaining', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 1 (2002) 12-32

¹¹² Scharpf, 1997.

¹¹³ Thomas Risse- Kappen, 1999, 'Approaches to the study of European Politics – introduction', *ECSA Review*, 7, 2, pp.2-9

¹¹⁴ Schmidt, 'Approaches to the Study of European Politics' pp. 2-9

¹¹⁵ Ibidem, pp. 2-9

¹¹⁶ Ibidem, pp. 2-9

institutions had. These can be rationalist, based on cost- benefit analyses, or constructivist, based on shared norms and values, as is discussed above. The second debate focusses on the dynamics of decision-making: bargaining, negotiation or argumentation, i.e. liberal intergovernmentalist – institutionalist – deliberate supranationalist. Other debates on enlargement focus on the effects of conditionality, or the effect of enlargement on the functioning of the EU. More recent debate also focus on the functioning of the East European member state within the EU framework and their domestic transitions. I will leave these other debates for what they are, since they are of limited importance to the research area of this thesis: the reasons for enlargements and the way enlargement decisions were negotiated.

Schneider argues that enlargement rounds succeeded, despite distributional conflicts because government managed to redistribute the gains among the applicant countries and member states, and from the relative winners to the relative losers among member states. She describes a bargaining process, in which differentiated membership served as an instrument of redistribution. The enlargement gains can be reallocated in favour of adversely affected members at the expense of the candidates, by granting the newcomers temporarily restricted membership rights. An example is French and Irish refusal to accept Spain, due to their interests in the Common Fisheries Policy. As a compromise, Spain was not integrated in this policy during the first ten years of its membership. Whether candidates are forced to accept these kinds of limitations depends on their bargaining power and the importance of enlargement for relative winners of the enlargement¹¹⁷. This is an example of liberal intergovernmentalist theory, combined with a rationalist approach. Moravcsik and Vachudova share the opinion that enlargement decisions are primarily a result of bargaining power. They argue that basic bargaining theory is applicable to analyse the enlargement negotiations: The countries that gain the most through more intense interstate cooperation will have the most intense preferences for agreement, and therefore are willing to compromise the most to further it. This is a form of asymmetrical interdependence, where the more interdependent countries tend to benefit more from liberalizing markets, and are thus willing to make concessions to achieve liberalization¹¹⁸. They claim that EU bargaining has been characterized by the same pattern since the beginning: concessions and compromises tend to reflect the priorities of the EU's core countries, which are the most powerful. The enlargement negotiations track this pattern. The applicant states possessed less bargaining power than the EU states, and had most to gain. For this reason, they made concessions to be included, with as result that they were forced to accept agreements that were not specifically well suited for their domestic situation¹¹⁹. Based on this logic, the writers argue that the reason for applicant states to join the EU was its expected gains and the membership was of such importance that these states were willing to give up other aims in order to achieve it. The reason that the EU accepted enlargement was more of a puzzle, according to Moravcsik and Vachudova. They explain the choice by arguing that the costs and impact of enlargement would be little, since the new members represent less than 5% of the EU's GNP in 2002. Moreover, there were significant material benefits to the EU, as well as that the geopolitical stabilization and economic revitalization of the EU borderlands was likely to dampen nationalist conflict and make illegal immigration more manageable. They continue stating that highest costs would be political, for enlargement was unpopular. For this reason, the earlier mentioned asymmetry enabled the EU to prevent the new

¹¹⁷ Christina Schneider, *Conflict, Negotiation and European Union Enlargement*. (Cambridge University Press 2009) 1-228

¹¹⁸ Andrew Moravcsik and Milada Anna Vachudova, 2002, 'National interests, state power and EU enlargement', *Perspectives*, 21- 31

¹¹⁹ Moravcsik and Vachudova, 'National interests, state power and EU enlargement', 25

member to gain accession to Schengen and to set conditions on membership¹²⁰. Additionally, David Phinnemore elaborates on the concept of conditionality, arguing that its existence raises questions about the commitment and capacity of the EU to enlarge. After the Eastern enlargement the costs of further enlargement appeared to have grown, and therefore an 'enlargement-fatigue' hit the EU member states¹²¹. The conditionality set on the accession of Romania and Bulgaria, he argues, could be seen as a way to lower the costs of enlargement. Other than Moravcsik and Vachudova, or Schneider, he places this rationalist approach to enlargement in a historical intergovernmentalist framework. This shows in his treatment of the enlargement as a process, stating that, due to the consequences of earlier enlargements, admission become harder for aspiring member states, because they will try to minimize the costs of the admission. In additions, Phinnemore grants an important role to the European Commission.

Many other scholars seem to support the idea that enlargement should be seen from a historical institutionalist perspective. First and foremost, Lykke Friis argued that the EC had a large influence on the proceedings at the Luxembourg Summit, due to their agenda-setting. The investigation by the EC of the applicant member states and their proposal to start negotiations with a part of them gave the member states a middle road: instead of being in favour or against enlargement, they could now chose a third option, without loss of credibility at home, and with the other member states. Friis argues that the pre- negotiation phase carves out a role for agenda setting, not only by the EC, but also by various member states. She states that this is a critique of the liberal intergovernmentalist approach, for governments enter with unfixed preferences, due to the amount of uncertainties that come with the enlargement, and governments with weaker bargaining power are able to influence the proceedings, rather than just accept the side payment¹²². She emphasises that the EU is a negotiation game. When entering a new negotiation, each member state has to take into account what she calls "the shadows of the past, present and future"¹²³. These shadows can be explained as follows: every negotiations is tied to earlier negotiations on the enlargement, parallel negotiations on topics that can be influenced by the decision to enlarge (i.e. the CAP or EMU negotiations). In addition, the attitude of the member state now may influence future negotiations, so no negotiation ever stands just on itself¹²⁴. Christiansen *et all.* strengthen the institutionalist argument by adding that the intergovernmental conferences, in which the final decisions are made, are subject to and limited by the presence of rules and established practices. Moreover, the time of the conference is limited, which enforces the negotiations to find a centre ground on which all participants can agree¹²⁵. Moreover, the authors connect the dynamics of the IGC to constructivism, treating the IGC as a social context, in which ideas play an important role, on the one hand forming the identities of the actors, which in turn shape their interests, which shape the policy- making. On the other hand, ideas become embedded in the EU organisations, which in turn influence the power and information of the actors, and thus their perception of self- interest and their preferences¹²⁶.

Others have supported the importance of learning, framing and preference formation on the EU, and many scholars have underlined the role of ideas, norms and values in the enlargement process. For example, Frank Schimmelfennig has argued the case of rhetorical action: the use of norm- based

¹²⁰ Ibidem, 35

¹²¹ Phinnemore, 'Beyond 25', 9

¹²² Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 2

¹²³ Lykke Friis, 'Approaching the 'third half' of EU grand bargaining-the post-negotiation phase of the 'Europe Agreement game'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 2, (1998a) 322-338.

¹²⁴ Friis, 'Approaching the 'third half'', 335

¹²⁵ Christiansen et all. 'Theorizing EU Treaty Reform', 12-32

¹²⁶ Ibidem, 12-32

arguments that Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) used in order to enable their accession to the EU. These arguments found their base in the ideology of the EU itself, namely that the EU should be a pan-European community of liberal democratic states. This ideology is the base of the membership rules of the EU. Schimmelfennig claims that “since the Central and East European countries did not possess sufficient material bargaining power to attain enlargement, they based their claims on the constitutive values and norms of the EU”¹²⁷. In doing exactly this, the CEEC’s exposed the inconsistency between the EU standard of legitimacy, its past actions and rhetoric on the one hand, and the attitude towards CEEC on the other, thereby entrapping the opponents of eastern enlargement in its own rhetoric¹²⁸, in other words, shaming them by explaining they are not upholding their own standards, which would result in a loss of credibility. He continues explaining that inside the EU, geopolitical and materialist reasons seem not able to explain why some EU member states, like Britain or Denmark were drivers of enlargement, i.e. in favour, while others were brakemen. He emphasizes that there is not a single factor to explain the member states’ enlargement preferences, but following the assumption that all states wanted to be credible and act justified, the CEEC’s were able to shame them in accepting the enlargement¹²⁹. Interestingly enough, Schimmelfennig does acknowledge that shaming only works if the member states are concerned with their credibility, and they would not be so, if they did not feel connected to the European Union. Contrarily, the practice of shaming would not be necessary if the member states were completely focussed on the European goals, rather than their self-interest. Thus, Schimmelfennig concludes that the rhetorical action does neither fit rationalism and their logic of consequence, nor does it fit constructivism and the logic of appropriateness¹³⁰. Nevertheless, in other works Schimmelfennig strongly argues the constructivist perspective. Together with colleague Sedelmeier, he published several articles and books that investigate the enlargement and integration process from a social institutionalist (thus constructivist) view. In his 2002 research of the Eastern enlargement of the EU, NATO and the Council of Europe (CoE) he concludes that the liberal community thesis is to a large extent supported by these events, meaning that the organisations represent international communities of norms and values¹³¹. In the same issue of the *Journal of European Public Policy*, he argues, together with Sedelmeier, that the EU member states are more likely to accept countries that share the liberal democratic political values of the EU or the norms that underline specific policies, and moreover, that countries outside the EU that are indeed sharing these values and norms are more willing to join it.¹³² Gstöhl continues this last argument in his argument in the same issue, concentrating on the reasons that Norway, Sweden and Switzerland were hesitant to join. He concludes that the national identities and their histories of neutralism did not fit the EU identity and that these countries therefore refrained from joining the EU immediately, even though their accession would have meant large material gains¹³³.

The earlier mentioned strategy of shaming does seem to fit the logic of justification, as introduced above as deliberative supranationalism. Fierke and Wiener explain that rationalist and constructivist approaches on its own cannot explain the Eastern enlargement. They argue that constructivism focusses too much on identities, while norms and practices are a more interesting point of departure. The authors state that especially the relationship between context, speech acts and

¹²⁷ Schimmelfennig, ‘The Community Trap’, 48

¹²⁸ Schimmelfennig, ‘The Community Trap’, 70-72

¹²⁹ Ibidem, 74

¹³⁰ Ibidem, .76

¹³¹ Schimmelfennig, ‘Liberal community and enlargement’, 622-623

¹³² Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, ‘Theorizing EU Enlargement’, 524

¹³³ Sieglinde Gstöhl, ‘Scandinavia and Switzerland: small, successful and stubborn towards the EU’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 529-549.

institutional change explains why Europe chose to enlarge¹³⁴. Moreover, they underline the rhetoric action argument made by Schimmelfennig, stating that “by analysing ‘promises’ as a specific form of action, and by looking at processes by which the two institutions were held to account for their promises and normative ideals, we turn the realist argument (...) on its head¹³⁵. Helene Sjursen explains in her article that argumentation is of great importance in the negotiations on whether or not to expand. She bases herself on Habermas’ theory of communicative action, as explained above: actors are rational when they are able to justify and explain their actions. Sjursen assumes that support for enlargement can be obtained as a result of a process of deliberation, when arguments and reasons provided in favour of enlargement have to be of a type that others can support – they must be considered legitimate¹³⁶. Piedrafita and Torreblanca support this approach, stating that actions are justified if they are rights or civic- bases, i.e. if decisions are adopted despite being contrary to material interests because they are said to enhance values as democracy and human rights¹³⁷. Interests as well as shared values play an important role, according to the authors, however they deem it undeniable that the significant enlargement decisions have been reached through an exchange of reasoned reasons that could convince opponents to change their preference¹³⁸. Additionally, Sjursen emphasizes that ethical- political reasons that testify to a sense of kinship based duty are particularly important in mobilizing for Eastern enlargement¹³⁹.

The lines between the two debates above are blurred, for example, bargaining is often argued together with rationalist argument, whereas constructivism and institutionalism appear to go hand in hand. Moreover, various books exist to outline the process of enlargement, without emphasizing on the decision-making dimension, that is: using the conclusions and decisions in order to create an overview, without commenting on the strategy of the decision- making process. Markus Jachtenfuchs asks himself whether there can be a single theory to integration and enlargement. He argues that there is not, and there is not even competition between theories to achieve that status. Rather, there exist a number of different theories “that are only in part mutually exclusive or competing with each other”¹⁴⁰. In addition he claims that the rationalism – constructivism divide is not helpful in explaining enlargement, since they both offer complementary perspectives that cannot be tested against each other. Jachtenfuchs criticizes both approaches and their reaction on each other. The rationalist reactions to constructivist research cannot test the hypothesis, but instead tests a reconstruction remote from the original. Constructivism is not better, failing to take the empirical evidence into account and unwilling to formulate clear results, it sticks to “vaguely defined empirical mainstream”¹⁴¹. He concludes by stating that “actors can be rational between being either narrow minded materialists or quixotic idealists”¹⁴². He emphasizes that the research method of proving or disproving theories yields limited results and that testing theories is not the only way of doing good

¹³⁴ Karin M. Fierke and Antje Wiener, ‘Constructing institutional interests: EU and NATO enlargement.’ *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6, 5, (1999). 721-742.

¹³⁵ Fierke and Wiener, ‘Constructing institutional interests’, 737

¹³⁶ Helene Sjursen, ‘Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU Enlargement Policy’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 3 (2002) 491- 513

¹³⁷ Sonia Piedrafita and José I. Torreblanca, ‘The three logics of EU enlargement: Interest, Identities and Arguments.’ *Politique Européenne*, 15 (2005) 29-59

¹³⁸ Piedrafita and Torreblanca, ‘The three logics of EU enlargement’, 29-59

¹³⁹ Sjursen, ‘Why Expand?’, 505

¹⁴⁰ Markus Jachtenfuchs, ‘Deepening and widening integration theory’ *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4, (2002). 650-657, p.651

¹⁴¹ Jachtenfuchs, ‘Deepening and widening integration theory’, 653

¹⁴² Ibidem, 655

science. Therefore, he suggests, more emphasis should be placed on empirical research, in an open approach¹⁴³.

1.3 Case study: Denmark and the Luxembourg Council, 1997

Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier stated that there has not been many research on the motivations of member states to support enlargement¹⁴⁴. They stated this in 2002, but not much has changed since then. When looking at the debate concerning membership preferences, one might come across an analysis of German, French or British preferences, but in the case of Denmark, not much is written that adequately explains the reasoning behind the Danish role as a 'driver' of enlargement. Schimmelfennig mentions in that Denmark is indeed in favour of enlargement, but fails to explain what its motives for doing so.¹⁴⁵ Lykke Friis focusses on the way Denmark and its partners tries to frame and influence enlargement debate during the events leading to the Luxembourg summit in 1997, in order to gain support for their approach, but again, the reasons why the Danish take this stance, remains unexplored¹⁴⁶. Additionally, Henrik Larsen has made a study to compare the respective domestic backgrounds for British and Danish policies towards Europe, in order to examine how these have shaped the European policies of the two countries in the 1990s. He concludes that during the 1990s, actors in favour of the EU drew on political and security arguments for the essential character of cooperation in the EU, although in the Danish case this emphasis seemed to have developed earlier. The Danish developed a more active foreign policy after the Cold War that led to a more active role in Europe. He connects the enlargement preferences with the understanding of the EU as having a significant political role including in the field of security¹⁴⁷. Marianne Riddervold and Helene Sjørnsen explain the reasons for the Danish role, concluding that the economic considerations play a limited role in explaining this role. However, security, geopolitical, reasons do seem to have been of importance, like Larsen also stated, but these reasons cannot on its own explain why Denmark was a driver, for there were also security risks. The writers argue that a sense of solidarity triggered the Danish support to enlargement¹⁴⁸. In a later publications, the writers underline their earlier arguments by analysing the Danish reasons for wanting to include the Baltic States in the enlargement program. They state that the Danish solidarity is based on shared identity and a conception of neighbourhood¹⁴⁹. Other scholars have described the Danish presidencies (1993 and 2002) in relation to enlargement, for the first produced the Copenhagen criteria, seen as the framework for enlargement¹⁵⁰ and the latter, the association-negotiations were closed (again in Copenhagen)¹⁵¹.

On the dynamics of the IGC in Luxembourg in combination with the Danish role, only Lykke Friis has written elaborately, as described above. In various works, the IGC is mentioned as the moment that the EU adopted their approach towards Eastern enlargement¹⁵². However, there are various views on

¹⁴³ Ibidem, 656

¹⁴⁴ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU Enlargement', 506

¹⁴⁵ Schimmelfennig 'The Community Trap', 50

¹⁴⁶ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 6

¹⁴⁷ Henrik Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s: a discourse approach', *European Journal of International Relations*, 5, 4, (1999) 451-483

¹⁴⁸ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'Between Security and Human Rights' 103-128

¹⁴⁹ Marianne Riddervold and Helene Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity. Denmark as promotor of enlargement' in Helene Sjørnsen, *Questioning EU Enlargement* (Routledge, 2006) 126-162

¹⁵⁰ Mayhew, *Recreating Europe*, 1-426

¹⁵¹ Lykke Friis, 'The Danish Presidency: "Wonderful Copenhagen"', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41, 1 (2003) 49-51

¹⁵² See for instance Marc Maresceau, 'Pre-accession' in Marise Cremona (ed.), *Enlargement of the European Union* (Oxford University Press 2003) 9-42

the value of the results of this conference for the enlargement, compared to for example the results of Copenhagen in 1993¹⁵³, or emphasize that the Danish presidency in 2002 was of great importance in the enlargement process¹⁵⁴. Moreover, Lykke Friis claims that the Danish and Swedish framing of the enlargement debate leading up to the Luxembourg Summit influenced the decision, thus leading to the conclusion of the council to open negotiations with all countries, as soon as they had complied with the Copenhagen criteria. This resulted in immediate negotiation with the 6 countries in 1998, and the rest in 1999¹⁵⁵. Contrarily, Nugent claims that the European Council accepted the EC proposal of 5+1, rather than agree to negotiations with all applicants¹⁵⁶, in the way Friis described. Alan Mayhew supports this conclusion, based on the assumption that the dynamics of the European Council mean that the EC proposal is likely to be approved since moving away from it will make a decision very difficult¹⁵⁷.

In the vast debate on (Eastern) enlargement, only a small portion focusses on the role of Denmark as promoter of this enlargement and their reasons to play this particular role in the process. The scholars that focus on the Danish role in the process are mostly Danish (or Nordic) themselves and seem to support the normative approach for explaining the reasons for Denmark to promote an enlargement process with all the CEECs. It appears that the constructivist school has a firm root in the Nordic countries and it seems to rule the debate. Arguments for the importance of identity and norms and values are that the interest-based explanations leave various holes. However, the normative arguments on themselves do not seem to explain everything either. Like Jachtenfuchs has emphasized, and as noted above, the empirical findings will have to be the key to an explanation of the enlargement process.

¹⁵³ Neill Nugent, 'The Unfolding of the 10+2 Enlargement Round', in Neill Nugent (ed.) *European Union Enlargement* (Palgrave MacMillan 2004) 46-47

¹⁵⁴ Rikard Bengtsson, Ole Elgström and Jonas Tallberg, 'Silencer or Amplifier? The European Union Presidency and the Nordic Countries', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 27, 3, (2004)311-334

¹⁵⁵ Friis, 'The Beginning of the end', 9

¹⁵⁶ Nugent, 'The Unfolding of the 10+2 Enlargement Round', 46-47

¹⁵⁷ Mayhew, *Recreating Europe*, 1-426

Chapter 2: Theoretical framework and terminology

The main questions of this thesis are the following: Why did Denmark not support the Commission's approach and launch a competing approach? Why was Denmark such a strong supporter for enlargement with all CEECs? What reasons did Denmark give for doing so? And what made other countries support this approach during the Luxemburg Council meeting?

In order to answer these questions I will use various theoretical approaches. The first questions, about the Danish behaviour will not be subject to a theoretical framework. However, I will start by dividing the constructivist and realist arguments, but this divide will not be used to show which arguments are stronger. On the contrary: the divide is especially created to show the lines between the two schools of thought are blurred and one cannot argue one without the other. The theory underlying this believe is the discourse theory, introduced by Michel Foucault in 1972. He argued that discourse defines the way people of a certain group think and act. It is what the leaders advocate and what colours the group's perception of various topics¹⁵⁸. Simply put: when an actor acts, the discourse provides the context of this action. This context forms the actor, but is in its turn also formed by the actor¹⁵⁹. They cannot be analysed apart from each other. Therefore, to analyse the actor is to analyse the context.

In other words, this context influences Denmark's interests and actions. Once determined that the Danish actions are driven by a combination of normative and rational arguments, I focus on determining how the Danish government expressed its opinion and argued its case. Which arguments were used – normative or rational ones? I will analyse to what extent normative arguments were used as a tool, to enable 'rhetorical entrapment' as Schimmelfennig argued and thereby secretly promoting their own interests. To test the 'rhetorical entrapment' theory, two aspects are of importance: 1. the arguments of the Danish government should be normative ones and 2. The other states are self-interested, rational actors.

Rhetorical entrapment is the result of rhetorical action, explained by Schimmelfennig to be 'the strategic use of normative arguments'¹⁶⁰. The theory assumes that in decision-making situations, material interests tend to dominate the actors' commitment to community values and norms. The mechanism of rhetorical action describes how the actors are brought to focus on their collective interests and honour the obligations as community members¹⁶¹. In other words, the member states had made promises of membership to the CEECs on various occasions. These promises were not acted upon afterwards but were left lingering. The CEECs and the promoters of enlargement, i.e. Denmark, actively reminded the member states of these promises and that they had to be fulfilled, otherwise, the EU would lose its credibility. To a self-interested actor, the loss of credibility (and thus power) should be no option and therefore they would give in to the demands for membership. I will analyse whether the Danish arguments fit this theory and research whether this rhetorical entrapment did indeed take place, or whether other arguments than the normative one were the catalysts for a big bang enlargement. I will assume that the Eastern enlargement is a process, that the negotiations leading up to the Council meeting are just as important as the meetings themselves, for during these negotiations the member states form their preferences, choose their positions and can set the agenda. These assumptions underline Friis' arguments on agenda-setting and preference formation.

¹⁵⁸ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. (Routledge 1989) 1-256 – first published in 1972

¹⁵⁹ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 451-483

¹⁶⁰ Schimmelfennig, 'The Community Trap', 62

¹⁶¹ Ibidem, 62-64

A third theory connected to this thesis is the theory of alliance formation. In this realist theory, two things stand out. First of all, states have a crucial interest in maintaining the balance of power¹⁶². Secondly, to maintain this balance of power, states tend to balance against threatening power, or bandwagon with it¹⁶³. Alliance formation is mostly seen in this realist light. However, the EU is an alliance as well, and EU member states form alliances among each other. In 1997, states allied with Denmark and Sweden and supported their call for enlargement with all CEECs. I will investigate to what extent this alliance can be fitted in the realist framework. I will assume therefore that geopolitical arguments and threats are still of importance within the EU, although these threats might have changed their appearance. Instability can be seen as a 'new' threat, as can economic crisis. The reasoning of member states to accept enlargement with all applicant states will be the key to explaining whether the realist theory is applicable for explaining the Eastern enlargement.

2.1 Terminology

In this thesis, the term European Union (EU) will refer to the European institutions, the European Council and the member states combined. I will use the term EU, even though some scholars refer to the European Community (EC) as well. I acknowledge that after the Maastricht treaty, or Treaty on European Union (TEU) the EC decided to become the EU and therefore I will use that term.

When I am speaking of European institutions, I am referring to the European Commission (Commission), the European Parliament (EP), the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and the European Central Bank (ECB). The European Council (Council) is not seen as part of the institutions, for it is an intergovernmental council. The Council will only be referred to in terms of a meeting, or an actual decision or conclusion. In all other cases, I will just refer to the member states (or EU-15). The Council's dynamics are of course layered: the heads of government (HOG) do not simply issue their statements, but their statements are part of a wider framework of cooperation on COREPER level. For the sake of simplicity I will not go in to COREPER dynamics, but focus only on the HOG, that will be referred to by just using the countries name. So if I speak of Denmark, I speak of the Danish government, especially the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In this context, Denmark is a special case, since the Danish population is very involved with the country's politics. As will be explained later, the Danes are able to vote on major decisions and call for referenda as well. Therefore, I will not take popular opinion into consideration, since it will be mirrored in the government's actions. Moreover, enlargement is one of the European policy areas where the government does not have to involve the population by issuing referenda. For these reasons I will use the government as representative for Denmark as a whole.

The term constructivist and normative will both be used throughout the thesis to refer to norms, value or identity bases aspects and arguments. The two terms will be used interchangeably. When referring to the opposite of the constructivist dimension, I will use the terms: rational, realist and material or self-interest.

Summing up, this thesis will research the reasons behind the active Danish role in the Eastern enlargement process and the arguments Denmark used in favour of *en masse* enlargement during the run up to the Luxembourg Council in 1997. Moreover, I will focus on the response of the other member states and their preference switch that led to accepting to open negotiations with all CEECs. The research will combine empirical research with bibliography analyses to analyse whether the Danish reasons fit the theoretical frameworks presented above.

¹⁶² Kenneth N. Waltz, 'The stability of a bipolar world.' *Daedalus* (1964) 881-909.

¹⁶³ Walt, 'Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power', 3-43

Part II

Chapter 3: The Danish context

In order to understand why the Danish chose to adopt a leading role in the Eastern enlargement progress, one should first look at the context of the choice. This context can be viewed at many levels. First of all, an overview the history of post war Denmark can be used to analyse whether or not the Danish acted in a regular pattern. Secondly, the domestic context can be used to clarify the Danish priorities on an international level. Moreover, analysis of the domestic context can shed light on the norms and values that are important for the Danish society as a whole. It explains how the Danish regard certain aspects of society and most importantly: this normative context creates the playing field in which preferences can be formed.

Discourse is an important part of this context. This concept, as explained by Michel Foucault, can be understood as a limited range of possible statements promoting a limited range of meanings¹⁶⁴. Discourses dictate what is possible to say and what is not possible to say. Discourses therefore provide the basis on which policy preferences, interests and goals are constructed¹⁶⁵. Discourse can be both a constraint and a creative force in shaping policies. It is embedded in the social context but shapes this context as well. They are therefore in part a reflection of the society, but also influencing the society at the same time¹⁶⁶. Political discourse can be seen as an intersubjective concept: it is adhered to by social and political actors, as well as reproduced and changed by them. This means that individual actors can use and change the discourse with their own interpretation. It can be used as a tool to underline their interest or ideology, as well as a restriction for others, with different ideas.

Norms and values can be seen as an important part of discourse, for they shape the individual and its behaviour. Moreover, they can provide a part of the context mentioned above. According to Sjursen and Riddervold, just stating the role of norms is not enough. There are numerous rule- sets, norms and identities. All can play different roles according to how they are used. On the one hand, norms can be used instrumentally, to justify one's (self) interests. On the other hand, norm constitute the identities of the actors. They do not only function as constraints on an actor's (self- interested) behaviour¹⁶⁷. Norms can constitute the preferences of the actors. Like discourse, norms can be seen as a dual concept: they influence and can be influenced. Moreover, they can be used as justification that is either instrumental or normative. In short: both discourse and norms can be seen as a base for both rational and normative decision-making.

This chapter will analyse the policies of Denmark during the 1990s, to establish the context in which government decisions were made. First, a short overview of Danish EU history will be given to analyse the way Danish EU policy has evolved during the past century. Based on this history, I will focus on the Danish priorities on the European level, and explain them in terms of domestic priorities. Moreover, I will analyse the way norms and values act in domestic and EU policy: do they form the policies, or are they formed because of the policies. Whether or not norms are used instrumentally or not will be the focus of chapter 3.

3.1 Historical context

Denmark is often viewed as a euro-sceptic member state. This is mostly due to their rejection of the Maastricht treaty and their opt-out regarding the Economic and Monetary Union. After World War II, the Danish government gave little priority to European policy. They preferred a broad European

¹⁶⁴ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1-256

¹⁶⁵ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s', 451-483

¹⁶⁶ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1-256

¹⁶⁷ Riddervold and Sjursen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

cooperation on an intergovernmental basis¹⁶⁸. The Danish were also very reserved with regard to NATO policy. The main focus of the Danish government in these post war years was primarily to establish economic ties. As attempts to establish a strong Nordic cooperation failed and the European Free Trade Area had limited success, Denmark developed an economic interest in accessing a greater market. This led to their application to the European Community.

The Danish referendum on accession in 1972 showed a strong cleavage between the dominant pragmatic and economic policy and the Danish euro-sceptics who mainly argued in terms of autonomy and sovereignty: the European Community was seen as a threat towards Danish autonomy and sovereignty and most importantly to Danish identity¹⁶⁹. The majority voted in favour of accession, but with clear ideas on how Denmark should be involved in the Community. The Danish agriculture would become part of the common agricultural policy, a large economic advantage. Security and defence should not be part of the European portfolio, but remain with NATO. Moreover, the Danish were sceptical about supranational and federal elements.

During the 1980s the détente with the Soviet Union created prospects of a more open Europe, which had considerable effects in Denmark. The Single European Act and plans for European Political Union provoked Euro-sceptics. Nevertheless, the plans were accepted in the 1986 referendum, which meant an acceptance of some supranational elements. In 1988, Denmark's political parties reached consensus on a more positive attitude towards the European Community. The single market plans of the Community had led, according to leading parties¹⁷⁰, to an important societal change that established new international conditions¹⁷¹. Globalisation had led to a neoliberalist world, where market forces could no longer be regulated on a national basis. For this reason, Denmark became more favourable towards European regulation. This led to the acceptance of the Maastricht treaty by the major parties. The priority was to secure advantages stemming from economic integration within the European Community¹⁷². The will to take part in the political aspect of the Community resulted in a near unanimity among government and opposition on a pro- integrationist policy. Unfortunately, the Danish people were not ready to accept this change of policy and rejected the Maastricht treaty in the 1992 referendum. The EU was first and foremost seen as a problem- solving entity whose main purpose was to provide (economic) benefits for the member states. Membership was justified in such terms¹⁷³. The deepening of the Union was viewed as undesirable by the Danish population. Moreover, this was a wake-up call for the government that they had lost their popular backing, not only regarding the European policy, but on domestic level as well. Various political scandals had occurred this year, some of them concerning the Prime Minister Poul Schlüter himself¹⁷⁴. Some argue that these event were the reason for the Danish rejection of the Maastricht treaty¹⁷⁵. Whether this was the case, or not, the new Danish government reformed their European policy, stating that, Denmark should avoid participation in four key areas. These areas were the single currency, defence

¹⁶⁸ Morten Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU. A history of dualism and pragmatism' in Lee Miles (ed), *Denmark and the European Union*, (Routledge, 2014) 14-30

¹⁶⁹ Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU', 14-30

¹⁷⁰ *Social Democrats as well as the Social Liberals and the Social Democratic Party*

¹⁷¹ Jens Henrik Haahr, 'European Integration and the Left in Britain and Denmark', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 30, 1, (1992) 77-100

¹⁷² Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU', 14-30

¹⁷³ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

¹⁷⁴ Poul Rasmussen, 'Denmark approaches a change of government' *Executive Intelligence Review*, 19, 18 (1992) 40-42

¹⁷⁵ Mark N. Franklin, Cees Van der Eijk, and Michael Mars, 'Referendum outcomes and trust in government: Public support for Europe in the wake of Maastricht.' *West European Politics* 18, 3, (1995) 101-117

cooperation, common citizenship and supranational cooperation in Justice and Home Affairs¹⁷⁶. The Edinburgh decision allowed Denmark these exemptions and the Danish exceptions gained an important status domestically. They were interpreted in the Danish debate as symbolic guarantees of continued control of Danish sovereignty, and therefore found support with even the sceptical parties, most importantly the Socialist People's Party¹⁷⁷.

The rejection of the Maastricht treaty and the exemptions of participation did not lead to a passive EU membership in the Danish case. On the contrary, in the 1993 government document *Denmark in Europe*, the government states that the rejection of the Maastricht treaty "was not a 'no' to EC membership or European cooperation. The EC is the natural framework for this cooperation... Denmark shall not be isolated but play an active role in the future development of Europe¹⁷⁸" The focus of this cooperation was to be between states as was underlined by Foreign Secretary Niels Helveg Petersen in 1993, who stated that the only way the cooperation could be fruitful "by exercising our sovereignties jointly. That is what the European Union is about¹⁷⁹".

In the 1990s the support for enlargement grew. First there was the enlargement with the EFTA countries Sweden, Finland and Austria. Denmark supported this enlargement actively, for Sweden and Finland were important partners of Denmark in various aspects. Economically, Sweden and Finland were part of the Nordic cooperation. The countries also had a long history together and, moreover, had a long standing cooperation in various fields, like security and climate regulations¹⁸⁰. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Denmark was very outspoken on the subject of EU cooperation with the new, post- Soviet states. The Danish government supported the new states in their struggle for independence. This 'East Support' (*øststøtte*) consisted of aiding the new regimes with funds as well as recognition. Denmark was the first state to recognize Estonia as an independent state¹⁸¹. Moreover, the Danish government put much effort in promoting that all the Central and East European countries should be integrated in the European Union, as became clear by the non-paper that was presented to the EU-15 in November 1997¹⁸², which is the central theme of this thesis.

Looking at the historical context, a few things stand out. First of all, Denmark has been increasingly participating in the European Union since the 1980s. According to Larsen, this is due to a change in political discourse: whereas in the beginning the 'interstate cooperation discourse' was dominant in Danish politics, this eventually changed to the 'essential cooperation discourse'¹⁸³, meaning that the political actors increasingly saw the EU as the essential way to achieve their goals. Cooperation on various levels are seen as important by the Danish government, not least of all on the internal market. However, there are policy areas that Denmark does not want to be involved in on European level. First of all, they fiercely object to supranational structures, since it would limit the Danish sovereignty. Denmark was especially outspoken against the supranational aspects in the policy area of Justice and Home Affairs, due to their very specific welfare state. Secondly, the single currency, that on its own embodies more supranational cooperation, for the state would transfer its monetary policy to the European Central Bank. Additionally, the Danish were of the opinion that defence

¹⁷⁶ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s', 451-483

¹⁷⁷ Ibidem, 451 -483

¹⁷⁸ *Denmark in Europe* (1993), translation by Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 465

¹⁷⁹ Niels Helveg Petersen, cited in Nikolaj Petersen and Christian Thune (eds), *Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Arbog 1993*, (DJOF Publishing, Copenhagen 1994)

¹⁸⁰ Peter Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 35, 4, (1997) 565-595

¹⁸¹ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

¹⁸² Ibidem, 126-162

¹⁸³ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 451-483

corporation should remain within the NATO framework¹⁸⁴, an intergovernmental organisation. Finally, common citizenship would be a threat to Danish sovereignty and identity, and therefore non-negotiable¹⁸⁵. Moreover, the Danish have had an outspoken opinion on enlargement from the very start.

3.2 Domestic context

Can this EU policy of exemptions in those four areas be explained by zooming in at the domestic policies? A few things stand out as important features: the interest in maintaining the Danish sovereignty, the rejection of EU influence in their welfare state and interest in widening of the European Union. The first two can be explained by analysing two important aspects of the Danish democracy: the influence of the people through referenda and the Danish welfare state. The third can be explained in three ways, starting with a normative explanation that can be derived from the analysis of the two aspects mentioned above. Furthermore, the interest in widening can be explained in terms of geopolitical and security interests or in terms of economic interests. These interests, in turn, have a foundation in the wider Danish context, so an analysis of the domestic context is an important starting point.

3.2.1 Danish democracy, nationalism and welfare state

The Danish democratic model differs from the 'continental model' – whether it is Prussian or Jacobin. These differences become clear in a comparison between the various historical traditions and are to be observed in the present day functioning of the political system¹⁸⁶. First and foremost, the Danish democracy was not established top-down, but bottom up: in the 19th century, the peasant-class developed itself into an important political actor that was impossible to ignore by the urban elites. For this reason, the people are of enormous importance in Denmark. They are allowed to take part in the democracy directly in the form of various referenda¹⁸⁷. These referenda ensure both popular sovereignty and they allow minorities to voice their interests¹⁸⁸.

Additionally, there is a strong emphasis in the political discourse on the concept 'democracy'. According to the Danish, it can only exist in a nation state. For this reason, it is hard to fully understand local governance in for example the Faroer Islands or Greenland. They have some form of autonomy, which could define Denmark as a Federation. However, Copenhagen can never officially accept this, for the simple fact, that the constitution states that the Danish Democracy is tied to the nation state¹⁸⁹. Moreover, the democracy is primarily seen as a community of one homogeneous and solidaristic people. There is firm belief that the Danish population adheres to these requirements and therefore Denmark is seen as a real democracy¹⁹⁰. The underlying notion of Danish democracy is one of unity and of direct accordance between popular opinion and the positions of political parties and political leaders. Political leadership is therefore absent: politicians have no privileged right to define positions and to seek to persuade 'the people' of the merits of these positions¹⁹¹. Furthermore, democracy is operated in all levels of society, not only in

¹⁸⁴ Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU', 14-30

¹⁸⁵ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 470

¹⁸⁶ Niels Finn Christiansen, 'The Danish 'No' to Maastricht.' *New Left Review*, (1992) 97-101.

¹⁸⁷ Maija Setälä, 'Referendums in Western Europe – a Wave of Direct Democracy?' *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 22, 4, (1999) 327-340

¹⁸⁸ Setälä, 'Referendums in Western Europe', 327-340

¹⁸⁹ Uffe Østergård, 'The Danish Path to Modernity.' *Thesis Eleven*, 77, 1, (2004) 25-43

¹⁹⁰ Jens Henrik Haar, 'Our Danish Democracy': Community, People and Democracy in the Danish Debate on the Common Currency.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38, 1, (2003) 27-43

¹⁹¹ Haar, 'Our Danish Democracy', 27-43

parliamentary politics. It is a tradition to practice basic democracy in the work place as well as on community level¹⁹².

The Danish democracy differs from the general form of democracy due to its core principles of universalism and decommodification. Through the granting of social rights, the status of the individual *vis-à-vis* the market becomes decommodified: the individual's survival is no longer contingent upon the sale of their labour power alone¹⁹³. In other words, the individual is not subject to market forces. Universal application of those welfare rights has allowed the development of a particularly strong collective identity. In a way, the market is crowded out¹⁹⁴. Based on these differences, one can argue that the Danish democracy is strongly tied to the Danish welfare state.

The Danish national identity and political culture combine features of what is often referred to as East European integral nationalism - typical of smaller, recently independent nation states – and the patriotic context of citizenship of the older West European states. In a way, Denmark belongs to both families¹⁹⁵.

The ties between the Danish democracy and the welfare state can be seen as a result of a dominant ideology of Danish nationalism that sprang up during the 19th century (alongside the democracy itself) and was based on Lutheranism, traditional state patriotism of composite monarchy and peasant 'folk' nationalism. N.F.S. Grundtvig is seen as the father of the national identity, for he was the first to focus on the romantic idea of smallness, self-sufficiency, innate cultural traditions and a collective national spirit (or identity) to describe the Danish people¹⁹⁶. His ideology was a rejection of the traditional elite driven and multi-ethnic state. In Grundtvig's opinion, good Christians had to be profoundly self-aware. He had to be in touch with his cultural and historical background. This was the so-called folk- spirit. This ideology placed value on local customs, tight communities and self-sufficiency. Furthermore, it distrusted foreign influences¹⁹⁷. The combination of peasant and Lutheran values still constitute a hegemony across party lines¹⁹⁸. This becomes apparent in the fact that the fundamentals of the welfare state are not questioned, only the details may be attacked. The welfare state is the expression of Grundtvig's values: an expression of solidarity and respect for the individual¹⁹⁹.

This ideology, and an enormous defeat against Germany, enabled the uprising of the peasant class²⁰⁰. Peasants would be thought in special schools, so they would be able to compete with the 'educated elite' in Copenhagen. They played an increasingly important role in societal change and political struggles. In modern Denmark, influences of this ideology are still noticeable: domestic policy is focussed on house and home (*folkhem*), hospitality and local business, thereby reinforcing the power of the people²⁰¹. Moreover, it can be seen in the functioning of the welfare state and the believe in the 'Scandinavian exceptionalism'²⁰². The ideology of has changed over time, for the peasant class has changed over time. In the beginning of the 20th century, the farmers increasingly understood

¹⁹² Christiansen, 'The Danish 'No' to Maastricht', 97-101

¹⁹³ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 567-568

¹⁹⁴ Ibidem, 567

¹⁹⁵ Østergård, 'The Danish Path to Modernity', 25

¹⁹⁶ Torfinn Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox' Intolerance in the Land of Perpetual Compromise.' *Review of European and Russian Affairs*, 5, 1, (2009) 83-106, p.89

¹⁹⁷ Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox', 88

¹⁹⁸ Østergård, 'The Danish Path to Modernity', 37

¹⁹⁹ Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox', 91

²⁰⁰ Østergård, 'The Danish Path to Modernity', 31-32

²⁰¹ Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox', 89

²⁰² Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 567

themselves as the backbone of society, since the export of their products had come to be an important part of Denmark's income. A strong support for free trade was imbedded in the ideology, which is still important in the political discourse of today²⁰³.

The prominence of the value solidarity in political discourse is a corollary of the attachment to *folkhem* in domestic politics. It is an essential part of the welfare state to be solidary towards each other. In his New Year's address in 2000, Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen underlines the importance of solidarity by stating:

*We should not accept failure in our treatment of those who are weak and exposed. We must not accept that the elderly (...) are treated with lack of dignity. This is (...) part of our shared responsibility.*²⁰⁴

The Danish welfare state offers every individual the same right and chances: education, health care and pensions. Everyone benefits and everyone is dependent. This way, all will feel obliged to do their share in the society²⁰⁵. Moreover, the welfare state creates a sense of security among the population that contributes to a strong community feeling. People believe that they can fall back on each other and the government, which leads to a firm belief in the system and its superiority. The Danish take pride in their system and in the fact that it works so well in their country. Large parts of the Danish population truly believe that their democratic and welfare model is better than that of other European states²⁰⁶. Therefore, it is Denmark's domestic priority to protect the welfare state against global market pressures or European interference. The future of the welfare state is, in the eyes of the Danish population, closely connected to the Danish sovereignty. If Denmark should lose the latter, it will lose the first²⁰⁷. This is the reason that a large part of the Danish population is sceptical of European integration: they believe they have something to lose in a deeply integrated European Union²⁰⁸. However, the Danish also see that the world is changing and because they want to protect their welfare state they have to be part of these changes. The only way to be in control is to participate²⁰⁹.

3.2.2 Foreign policy

The values of solidarity and security have not only become socially embedded because of domestic legislations, but also due to the regional and foreign policies of the government. Denmark (as well as the other Scandinavian states) has a reputation for a consistent progressivism beyond a cooperative, rule governed international behaviour. Internationalism is very much a rational response to Denmark's own relative weakness, it is also driven by its distinctive domestic values, such as solidarity and security²¹⁰. In short: the values form the domestic and foreign policies, but at the same time the values become accepted because of these policies.

This Nordic progressivism is associated with internal and regional peacefulness, solidarity with the third world, hospitality to refugees and migrants and environmentalism²¹¹. In the case of Denmark, this is only partly true, for the hospitality to refugees and migrants is not widely accepted among the

²⁰³ Østergård, 'The Danish Path to Modernity', 36

²⁰⁴ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *New Year's Speech*. (Statsministeriet 2000)

²⁰⁵ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 572

²⁰⁶ Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox', 93

²⁰⁷ Christiansen, 'The Danish 'No' to Maastricht', 97-101

²⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, 97-101

²⁰⁹ Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU', 14-30

²¹⁰ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 565-595

²¹¹ *Ibidem*, 570

Danish population. Migrants are actually seen as a threat to the homogeneous democracy²¹². However, Denmark does really well on the other three aspects. These qualities can repeatedly be noticed while analysing Danish foreign policies and Danish activity in international organisation.

Primarily, Denmark is very focussed on Nordic cooperation, which is extensive. Norway, Sweden and Denmark work together on various programmes, for instance to preserve the regional culture, to create a common labour and social security market and to develop a stringent regional environmental policy²¹³. Even in the area of defence, in which Denmark does not wish to participate on European level, it does strive to establish close ties with Sweden and, especially, Norway²¹⁴. These security policies are primarily rationalist policies, but they are legitimised domestically by a language of idealist internationalism²¹⁵. One can argue that the close bonds of the Nordic countries are a result of a form of nostalgic nationalism. It is true that the Nordic countries are much alike. They largely share the same values, history, folklore, and, to a certain extent, language²¹⁶. It is also possible that the cooperation between the countries is purely self-interested, due to their proximity and geographical location²¹⁷. Whatever the reason, it is a fact that the Nordic countries have their own identity that is based on being better than Europe²¹⁸. The countries have been independent from Europe since medieval times, only joining forces in a handful of situations. They have prospered for it and they still hold on to their identity of independence and of being different from Europe²¹⁹. Furthermore, this identity is largely based on the Scandinavian model of the ideal state: the welfare state²²⁰. After the Cold War, the Baltic States were seen as natural partners for this Nordic cooperation. They had always been included in the Hanseatic League and largely shared the Nordic identity²²¹. However, there were also economic reasons to including the Baltics, for Prime Minister Poul Schlüter saw the Baltic Sea area as a new economic area, as early as 1991²²².

During the 1990's, Denmark also actively contributed to the founding of the Arctic Council that officially took up responsibilities in 1998. This council is the only major intergovernmental initiative for the Arctic, involving all eight states with sovereignty over territory in that region: Canada, United States of America, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Iceland and Denmark, since it holds sovereignty over Greenland²²³. The Arctic council serves a dual purpose. First of all, the Council promotes environmental protection as a follow up to the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy, an effort of the same Arctic countries that was started in 1991. Secondly, the Council is actively involved in sustainable development programs that focus on the economic activities of the indigenous people

²¹² Stainforth, 'The Danish Paradox', 94-101

²¹³ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 570

²¹⁴ Henrik Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period. Continuity or Change?' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 35, 1 (2000) 37-63

²¹⁵ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 565-595

²¹⁶ Ibidem, 565-595

²¹⁷ Ibidem, 568

²¹⁸ Ole Waever, 'Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War.' *International Affairs*, 68,1 (1992) 77-102

²¹⁹ Noel Parker, 'Differentiating, Collaborating, Outdoing: Nordic Identity and Marginality in the Contemporary World.' *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 9, 3 (2002) 355-381

²²⁰ Waever, 'Nordic Nostalgia', 77-102

²²¹ Mikko Lagerspetz, 'How many Nordic Countries? Possibilities and limits of geopolitical identity construction.' *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 38, 1 (2003) 49-61

²²² Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

²²³ Evan T. Bloom, 'Development of the Arctic Council.' *The American Journal of International Law*, 93, 3 (1999) 712-722

living in the Arctic and their impact on the environment. Indigenous people have been given a prominent role: many indigenous organisations are granted observatory status²²⁴.

The Danish participation in this council mirrors its activity with environmental policies. Moreover, the Danish government is the largest sponsor of an umbrella organisation for Indigenous people, Indigenous People Secretariat that has its headquarters in Copenhagen²²⁵.

Furthermore, Denmark has been an active member of the United Nations (UN), especially if it comes to human rights, peace or security. Denmark has always vehemently promoted human rights and good governance. 'Peace and stability' have been a part of the discourse in the Danish foreign policy. Issues in Africa, in particular democracy and human rights, are key interests for the Danish government. It has been actively supporting the development of several African countries. The extensive Danish aid programme was one of the first to reach the UN aid target and has since managed to stay above it²²⁶. Furthermore, the Danish government has frequently stated that it would support EU member states in their efforts of a joint military action, as long as it would be in the framework of the UN charter²²⁷. The Danish themselves were part of the UN mission in the Balkans in the early 1990s²²⁸. Additionally, in 1999 they participated in the NATO bombing of Serbia²²⁹. NATO was, in the Danish opinion, the primary institution to deal with the territorial defence. Denmark actively sought dialogue with the US and, moreover, advocated a strengthening of EU – American dialogue on EU level. During the 1990's, Denmark became more engaged with NATO than it had ever been, due to NATO's increasing emphasis on out-of-area engagements. In line with the growing concern with challenges to stability emanating from outside the treaty area, the Danish objective was to sustain continuously 1,500 troops deployed internationally, in order to contribute to worldwide peace and security²³⁰.

3.2.3 European policy priorities

When looking closely at the Danish EU policy, it is relatively easy to point out several key areas. First of all, there seems to be a consensus on the notion that the EU has offered peace and prosperity for its member states. Moreover, the EU has a global responsibility to establish peace, human rights and the rule of law, according to Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen. This responsibility should first of all be shown through close cooperation with the neighbouring non-EU states²³¹. This statement points directly to the importance of the Eastern enlargement and cooperation with the other European countries in order to establish peace and stability in Europe. Denmark sees climate and environmental cooperation as another key priority, as stated by P.N. Rasmussen in the same speech²³².

The internal market and free trade remain a priority for Denmark as well. The internal market should continue to grow, for it will create jobs and stimulate the European economy, according to the

²²⁴ Timo Koivurova and David L. VanderZwaag, 'The Arctic Council at 10 years: retrospect and prospects.' *University of British Columbia Law Review*, 40, 1 (2007) 121-194

²²⁵ Bloom, 'Development of the Arctic Council', 712-722

²²⁶ Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 569

²²⁷ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²²⁸ Poul Villaume, 'Confronting the 'Small State Syndrome': Danish Post-Cold War Foreign Policy and the Use of Cold War History.' in Juhana Aunesluoma and Pauli Kettunen (eds), *The Cold War and the Politics of History*. (Edita Helsinki 2008)

²²⁹ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²³⁰ Jens Ringmose and Sten Rynning, 'The impeccable Ally? Denmark, NATO, and the uncertain Future of Top Tier Membership.' *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook* (Copenhagen, 2008) 55-84

²³¹ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, Speech: *Our Common Europe for the Future*, (Statsministeriet 2001)

²³² Ibidem

Danish government. Moreover, trade should be facilitated as much as possible. Strong ties between the member states would mean that Europe could form an important block in the world economy and in world politics²³³. Regional cooperation is an important priority for the Danish policy, as stated by P.N. Rasmussen in 1999, since it will bring countries closer together²³⁴.

3.3 Normative context

After analysing the different priorities of the Danish foreign policies, it directly stands out that Denmark often acts for the greater good. Their focus on peace and stability or on the environment holds no direct gains for the Danish society, but it benefits the world as a whole. Denmark acts as a part of various international cooperation frameworks – Nordic, EU or UN – as much, and maybe more, as it acts as an individual player. Within these frameworks, it holds on to its own sovereignty, without trying to jeopardise further cooperation, for this cooperation has grown increasingly important to Denmark²³⁵.

When looking at the domestic context outlined in this chapter, by focussing on the Danish democracy, nationalism and welfare state, we can conclude that the values solidarity and security are a large motivation for the Danish policy. The values are part of their national identity and surface in many facets of Danish politics. First and foremost, the values show in the continued functioning of the welfare state. Secondly, solidarity returns often in foreign policies, for instance aid to African countries and in the Nordic cooperation. Solidarity towards the CEEC's bid for independence from the Soviet Union led to Danish early recognition of the Baltic States independence. Security strengthens the value of solidarity. The Danish people feel safe and supported, which increases the feeling of inclusion in the Danish society and, at the same time, makes the people feel connected to their fellow countrymen. Additionally, the establishment of peace, democracy and the care for human rights are clear aspects of the Danish context, as can be deduced from the participation in the UN and NATO. So how does this normative context come together to explain the role of Denmark in the Eastern enlargement?

To begin, one can argue that the shared identity and history with the Baltic States has been a large argument for Denmark to involve itself in the enlargement process. It had to be sure that the Baltics were to be included. Would the Baltics not be included in the larger European Union, this could mean that the countries would be rendered to the Russian sphere of influence. The Danish had a duty and solidarity to those that were considered 'one of them'²³⁶. However, this does not explain why Denmark chose to push for negotiations with all potential member states. Again, solidarity can be used to explain their preference to a large enlargement. In Danish society, all have equal opportunities and possibilities. Therefore, it would be prudent to offer the same to all the potential members, as Denmark does to its own population. When every country would be able to open negotiations at the same time, they would all have to adhere to the Copenhagen criteria, which in turn would lead to democratisation and establishment of the rule of law in the CEEC's countries. Moreover, these countries would now be part of the same peaceful community. Nyrup Rasmussen underlines this in his speech at the OSCE Foreign Minister meeting in 1997.

²³³ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, Speech: *Our Common Europe for the Future*, (Statsministeriet 2001).

²³⁴ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *Opening statement to the Conference in Regional Cooperation in an Enlarged Europe* (Statsministeriet, April 19, 1999).

²³⁵ Kelstrup, 'Denmark's relation to the EU', 14-30

²³⁶ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

*The security, prosperity and welfare of a state and its people cannot be built in isolation. Only when all states and peoples enjoy the same prospects and opportunities can we reach this goal. (...) The key word is **solidarity**²³⁷.*

However, these normative arguments on their own do not explain the reason behind the Danish role in the Eastern Enlargement process. There is no denying the importance of the normative context, since norms and values form the actors as well as their stage. Nevertheless, it is important to look further than these notions. These notions are only deductions and interpretations based on documents and speeches. They are subjective and it is not possible to prove them either right or wrong. Moreover, the conclusion that Denmark's policies are not directly aimed at national gains, does not mean that Denmark is not a rational (self-interested) party. The Danish prosperity and future is tangled up with the various international institutions that the country is involved in. Therefore, it is crucial to analyse other reasons that Denmark might have had to promote Eastern enlargement with all potential members: economic interests, security reasons or perhaps influence from other countries.

²³⁷ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *Speech at the OSCE Foreign Minister meeting*, (Statsministeriet December 18, 1997) (emphasis in original)

Chapter 4: Rationalist interests

As argued in the previous chapter, norms and values are part of the context in which decisions are made, priorities are set and interest are pursued. Constructivists have often argued that this normative context explains the reasoning and decision making of governments, since the rational explanations fail to explain all reasons or arguments for the choices countries make. Moravcsik calls this approach the 'Copenhagen School', because this normative discourse seems to radiate from the Danish capital²³⁸. He refers to the Danish/ Nordic scholars, who all seem to promote the constructivists analysis of European integration. However, the scope of constructivism should be seen as much wider based on the conclusions of the previous chapter, as not only scholars but also the Danish government seems to use the constructivist discourse to set their priorities. The question remains if the Danish officials use this discourse as a tool to achieve their goals and further their interests in the European Union. In order to answer this question, one should analyse the Danish interests and potentials gains of enlargement.

4.1 National interests or the greater good?

Various constructivist scholars have argued that Denmark is not a self-interested country, since their policies are aimed at the greater good. This basically refers to the Danish policy on environment protection, the Danish stance on peace and security and its considerations about the stability and security of the European Union²³⁹. National conceptions of foreign policy interests are increasingly Europeanised. According to Larsen the interaction between the national and the EU level implies that no national interest formation can be identified because the possibilities and constraints at the EU level are always part of the member state's construction of interests²⁴⁰. In short, the European interest is an important part of the national interest. Denmark has been a member of the EU since 1973 and it has prospered because of that membership. The economic benefits of being part of the EU have been large for the Danes and the EU is still serving its purpose of enabling and increasing trade across the continent. The Danish government has a keen interest in remaining part of the EU and has therefore become increasingly more involved²⁴¹. To simplify matters, I will therefore assume the European interests Denmark promotes are in line with their national interests. To put it differently: The greater good (in this case the EU) serves the Danish interests. A reaction to this assumption immediately springs to mind: Denmark does not take part in the common currency. This common currency is very much an interest of the EU and according to this assumption it should be Danish interest too. Even so, this is not the case. I should therefore be more specific: when I speak of Denmark in this context, I refer to the Danish government. In the case of the Euro, the government very much wanted Denmark to adopt it and officials have declared this on several occasions²⁴². The Danish people, however, blocked accession to the EMU. In the case of enlargement, the government is not obliged to hold a referendum, as enlargement will not influence or change the Danish constitution²⁴³. For this reason, I argue that the assumption that the European interests that the Danish government promotes are in fact in line with national interests.

²³⁸ Andrew Moravcsik, 'Is something rotten in Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6, 4, (1999) 669-681.

²³⁹ See *i.e.* Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162 or Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁴⁰ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁴¹ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 451-483

²⁴² See *speeches Poul Schlüter on Maastricht 1991 or P.N. Rasmussen in his New Year's address in 2000.*

²⁴³ Setälä, 'Referendums in Western Europe', 327-340

4.2 Security considerations

The Danish promotion of peace, stability and minority rights is more than just normative. In the years after the fall of the Soviet Union, the CEECs underwent many changes during their transition into market-oriented democracies. Such a transition is by no means a peaceful and stable process. The chance existed that the transition process would spark lingering conflicts and lead to destabilization of the whole region, as happened after the break-up of Yugoslavia²⁴⁴. Central and East Europe was still in the grip of old animosities, which could resurface unless the EU offered its stabilizing influence. A real possibility existed that the new states would lapse back into the old system and the nationalist ideologies that came with it²⁴⁵.

Would this destabilization come to pass, there would be a constant threat that it would spill over to the neighbouring countries and this spill over was understood to pose a security threat to Europe²⁴⁶. Engagement with Eastern Europe would therefore promote stability. The prospect of EU-membership and the adherence to the Copenhagen criteria were seen as the best way to stabilize the post-communist states and additionally, the whole region. Peace through integration was a popular Danish discourse in the 1990's. According to Denmark, the EU had served its purpose with the EU15 member states: they cooperated peacefully and there were no internal threats²⁴⁷. The only way to make Eastern Europe part of this stability was to fully integrate them in the Union.

Skålnes assumes that geopolitical arguments would be most important for states that share a border with East European states. Since they experience the threat more closely, these countries should be willing to make more concessions to ensure stability and security²⁴⁸. Denmark does not directly fit the picture, but it did act as a leading promotor of enlargement. Danish security is closely related to the security in its neighbouring region²⁴⁹. This region includes Germany, Sweden and Norway, but also the Baltics and Poland. Denmark saw a potential danger in a new divide in Europe. If not all CEECs would be invited to the enlargement negotiations, this would be a source of renewed instability²⁵⁰. The regional security argument was one of the reasons of the Danish government for emphasizing the necessity to integrate all three Baltic States into the European Union. Would these states be left out, this posed sincere security risks to their own region²⁵¹. Moreover, the Baltic States themselves voiced concerns about being left as a grey zone, when they would not become part of the EU (or NATO). They feared being left to the pressures of Moscow and renewed imperialist tendencies²⁵². Moscow still saw all ex-communist states as part of the Russian sphere of influence. For this reason, there was a concern that Eastern enlargement would provoke Russia. This was certainly a risk and Denmark worked to include Russia in various regional cooperation initiatives in order to remain on good footing²⁵³. Denmark did not see enlargement as a potential security risk, but as a way to strengthen regional cooperation, not only in the area of security, but also concerning

²⁴⁴ Lars. S. Skålnes, '10. Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*. (Routledge, 2005) 340-368

²⁴⁵ Merje Kluus, 'Europe's Eastern expansion and the reinscription of otherness in East-Central Europe.' *Progress in Human Geography*, 28, 4. (2004) 472-489

²⁴⁶ Skålnes, 'Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', 340-368

²⁴⁷ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁴⁸ Skålnes, 'Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', 340-368.

²⁴⁹ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

²⁵⁰ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 1-15

²⁵¹ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

²⁵² Ronald D. Asmus and Robert C. Nurick, 'NATO enlargement and the Baltic States.' *Survival*, 38, 2, (1996) 121-142

²⁵³ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

more unconventional issues like the environment and international crime. A larger European union would invite more countries to work together to solve those issues²⁵⁴.

4.3 Pressures from United States

It could be argued that the geopolitical considerations were not aimed at territorial expansion and military power, but instead to a closer cooperation in the political sense. The use of EU membership to encourage the CEECs to become functioning market-orientated democracies, that would be less prone to civil violence and conflict, was a part of the United States' post-Cold War strategy as well as a wish of the EU-15 and the CEECs themselves²⁵⁵. Expanding democracy was one of the core aims of the Clinton administration in the US and the administration therefore encouraged the enlargement of the European Union with the CEECs²⁵⁶. The enlargement of NATO would take the security issue off the table, since the EU was deemed too weak to lead the enlargement process in the military sense. The EU was left with the task of ensuring the transition of the candidate countries to a democracy²⁵⁷. This was part of the larger goals to reposition the US and Europe in the world to address new global challenges²⁵⁸. A large, functioning EU would be able to share global leadership and responsibility with the US as well as create an economic centre in Europe that could hold its own, but that had the US at heart²⁵⁹. In short, traditional geopolitics had to some extent be replaced by geo-economics²⁶⁰.

Denmark had special interests in aligning itself with the US. The Danish government had actively promoted the strengthening of the EU-US dialogue during the 1990s, because of the Danish interests in strengthening the NATO framework. The Danes were interested in doing this, for they were vehemently against the EU developing its own common defence policy. A strengthening of the NATO and the support of the US would assure that a defence policy, a supranational policy, would not yet be a priority on European level²⁶¹.

4.4 Economic interests

Thus, the world had turned into a geo-economical game, instead of the geopolitical game it once was. To be able to play on global level, the EU had to develop a large economic base to compete with the US and Asia²⁶². Enlargement would have a number of economic implications and advantages. First of all, the internal market would almost double in size. The CEECs' economies were not large during the 1990s, so many argued they were "too small to matter" but they each had a large labour force²⁶³. It would count for almost one third of the overall EU work force and the labour would be cheap. The opening of the market meant that the EU15 would be able to acquire Eastern European goods relatively cheap, while the export towards the CEECs was expected to grow as well²⁶⁴. The enlargement would add a new 100 million customers from fast developing economies to the internal

²⁵⁴ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁵⁵ Ola Tunander, 'Post-Cold War Europe: Synthesis of Bipolar Friend-Foe Structure and a Hierarchic Cosmos-Chaos structure?' in Ola Tunander, Pavel K. Baev and Victoria Ingrid Einagel (eds), *Geopolitics in Post-Cold War Europe*. (International Peace Research Institute 1997) 17-44

²⁵⁶ Douglas Brinkley, 'Democratic Enlargement: The Clinton Doctrine.' *Foreign Policy*, 106 (1997) 110-127

²⁵⁷ Ronald D. Asmus, 'Europe's Eastern Promise. Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement.' *Foreign Affairs*, January/February issue (2008) 95-106

²⁵⁸ Asmus, 'Europe's Eastern Promise', 95-106

²⁵⁹ Brinkley, 'Democratic Enlargement', 110-127

²⁶⁰ Tunander, 'Post-Cold War Europe', 17-44.

²⁶¹ Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁶² Tunander, 'Post-Cold War Europe', 17-44.

²⁶³ Tito Boeri and Herbert Brücker, 'Eastern Enlargement and EU Labour Markets: Perceptions, Challenges and Opportunities.' *IZA discussion paper series*, 256 (2001) 1-28, p.2

²⁶⁴ Boeri and Brücker, 'Eastern Enlargement and EU Labour Markets' 6

market²⁶⁵. In economic terms, Eastern Enlargement of the European Union would lead to trade creation, which entails that foreign competitions lowers the prices of goods, which benefits the overall welfare.²⁶⁶

For Denmark, the most important economic gain would be the inclusion of the Baltic States in the single market. As discussed previously, Denmark had a history in trading with the Baltic States and the government saw large possibilities in creating a Baltic Sea economic centre²⁶⁷. The Baltics states had been one of the most important trading partners outside of the EU during the 1990s and EU membership for these states would facilitate the trade between Denmark and these countries and would increase its efficiency²⁶⁸. The Danish geographical position as the sea gate to the Baltics, would enable it to profit from increased trade with this area. Moreover, the Danish focus on Nordic cooperation included the Baltics and possible membership as well as closer cooperation with the Baltic region would strengthen the interdependence and would create increased commerce that would contribute to economic growth and lead to new jobs²⁶⁹.

The economic enlargement aims were long term aims, coupled by the Danish government to other issues. For instance: economic growth in the CEECs would dampen potential nationalist conflict and would make illegal immigration more manageable²⁷⁰ and thus create a stable environment. Stability would, in turn, encourage Foreign Direct Investment in the CEECs that would contribute to the economic growth of the countries. This in turn was believed to lead to less emigration, job creation and, in the end, to benefit the EU as a whole²⁷¹.

4.5 Widening vs. deepening

Another argument for Denmark to promote the Eastern enlargement is to prevent a deepening of the Union. As mentioned earlier, the Danes has always been sceptical of supranational policies. They strongly believe in intergovernmental decision making, as it does not affect their sovereignty. For this reason, they consider the NATO the only framework in which to deal with defence The Nordic cooperation is set up in the same way²⁷². On EU level, various member states and the Commission voiced the opinion that the Union had to deepen prior to enlargement. The Economic and Monetary Union is an example of this, as is the strategy of France to create a political union²⁷³.

Enlargement with the 10 CEEC candidates would make this supranational deepening a lesser priority. The enlargement would entail many reforms that should be dealt with before a potential political union could be discussed again. For example, the 10 new states should have a place in the European institutions. For this to take place, a large institutional reform had to take place: the more members, the less chance of unanimity. The new countries would have their own veto power and they would be highly diverse²⁷⁴. Therefore, institutional reform was needed to prevent the Union from becoming

²⁶⁵ Moravcsik and Vachudova, 'National interests, state power and EU enlargement' 21-31

²⁶⁶ Richard Baldwin, Joseph Francois and Richard Portes, 'The costs and benefits of Eastern Enlargement: the impact on the EU and Central Europe.' *Economic Policy*, April (1997) 125-176

²⁶⁷ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

²⁶⁸ Anders Due Madsen and Morten Lobedanz Sørensen, 'Economic consequences for Denmark of EU enlargement.' *International Conference on Policy Modelling* (Brussels 2002)

²⁶⁹ Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 126-162

²⁷⁰ Moravcsik and Vachudova, 'National interests, state power and EU enlargement' 21-31

²⁷¹ Baldwin, Francois and Portes, 'The costs and benefits of Eastern Enlargement', 125-176

²⁷² Larsen, 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period', 37-63

²⁷³ Skålnes, 'Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', 340-368

²⁷⁴ Moravcsik and Vachudova, 'Preferences, power and equilibrium', 314-339

unmanageable. Additionally, the Common Agricultural Policy would need reform in the light of the accession of new member states that, for a large part, relied on agriculture²⁷⁵.

Most importantly, after the accession of the new members to the Union, it would be increasingly difficult for the promoters of political union to find common ground for a political union. Not only would there be more members to block the development of a political union, the new countries would all differ from one another and they might not even take interest in a political union. The widening of the European Union would therefore make the deepening more difficult, even in the long term²⁷⁶.

4.6 Rationalist vs normative?

Analysing this last chapter, it becomes clear that Denmark did indeed have something to gain with the Eastern Enlargement, especially from the accession of the Baltic States. There had been a history of trade with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as a part of a common history. This common history and the fact that Denmark felt that these countries were part of the Nordic region, led to strong advocacy on their inclusion in the Enlargement process. Furthermore, there was the strong conviction that EU membership for all Eastern European states would result in peace and stability in the region. This stability would have positive effects on the European economy as well as on the security of the continent. A stable market- orientated democracy was less prone to civil unrest. The violence in the Balkans had shown that nationalism could easily spark in the post- Soviet states and Denmark saw the promise of membership, and membership itself, as a way to prevent Central and Eastern Europe from destabilizing like the Balkan region did.

It becomes clear that rationalist considerations and normative values are not as black and white as sometimes argued. The case of Denmark underlines this. On the one hand, the Danes share a history with the Baltic countries and believe that these countries are part of their Nordic region. The Nordic region is often explained as bonded by a common identity and common values. On the other hand, would enlargement include the Baltics, this would result in economic and security benefits for Denmark in the form of regional cooperation. Moreover, the values of democracy and human rights are important in the Danish discourse, but the adoption of these values, the creation of a democracy in the CEECs, would lead to a stable region that would definitely have economic advantages for the EU overall, let alone the decreased security risk that it would entail. To conclude, it is hard to see normative context and rationalist consideration as two separate concepts, for they are deeply intertwined. Neither the normative context nor the rationalist dimension is able to explain the reasoning behind the Danish decision making sufficiently, so the two concepts have to be put together.

²⁷⁵ Lorena Ruano, 'Institutions, Policy communities and EU enlargement. British, Spanish and Central European accession negotiation in the agricultural sector' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*. (Routledge 2005) 404-435

²⁷⁶ Skålnes, 'Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', 340-368

Part III

Chapter 5: Arguments for Eastern Enlargement

As elaborated upon in the first two chapters, the constructivist – rationalist divide is not as black and white as the bulk of the literature would have us believe. The two types of reasoning are interlaced with each other and separately they can therefore not explain the Danish reasons behind their role as a promotor for Eastern enlargement. If we look away from the rational, economic interests that might be driving Denmark, but focus on the general interests Denmark pursued, it becomes clear that normative arguments do play a role. Sketched in the previous chapter is a large array of reasons why Denmark could choose to promote EU enlargement with all the CEECs (and Cyprus). Nevertheless, the Danish priorities are difficult to point out without investigation of the empirical evidence. The evidence comes in various forms: firstly, it comes in the form of the debates and statements on the *Folketing* level, then there are the speeches and press releases that outline the Danish position and finally one should look at the Danish actions in international context.

5.1 A duty to unite Europe

European integration and European enlargement are much debated topics in the Danish *Folketing* sessions. However, from the early 1990's the Danish parties readily supported the same belief: it was the duty of the EU and, therefore Denmark's duty as well, to ensure "security and stability in all of Europe"²⁷⁷. Security and stability would provide the continent with the opportunity to create stronger ties and would be the foundation for lasting economic benefits. Additionally, it was seen as the "historic duty for European cooperation now to take the next big step, which is to give new opportunities to the Central and East European countries"²⁷⁸. The Danish position was clearly stated by Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen in 1995: "Our ambition in the coming years, our duty in Europe, is to make a very concrete contribution to the stabilization of the democracies, securing of peace and new... prosperity in Europe"²⁷⁹.

The security dimension of EU enlargement was broadly supported. Even the Eurosceptical Socialist People's Party (SF) made clear that they supported the Danish position on enlargement. The party especially supported enlargement to "have a security – political perspective"²⁸⁰. From the *Folketing* debates during the 1990's it becomes clear that Denmark saw destabilization of the Post-Soviet countries as a new and important threat to the EU and to Denmark itself. Foreign Minister Niels Helveg Petersen made this very clear to both parties in 1996: "Security – for all of us – is at stake"²⁸¹.

The Danes believed that the way to provide the stability that could eliminate the threat would be the integration of the CEECs in the European Union. The transition to democracies where the rule of law and minority rights would be respected and the adoption of the EU *acquis* would turn the CEECs into fully functioning member states. The past had shown that EU member states could cooperate peacefully with each other and that the stable EU environment benefited the member states. "The theory of 'peace through integration' has proved its validity in practice"²⁸², according to Foreign Minister Petersen in 1993.

²⁷⁷ Anders Fogg Rasmussen, *Opening debate in the Folketing* (October 7, 1993). Quoted in Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 152

²⁷⁸ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign- political situation* (May 26, 1996)

²⁷⁹ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *Debate on the international development and especially the development in Europe* (February 21, 1995)

²⁸⁰ Holger K. Nielsen (SF) *Opening debate in Folketing* (October 10, 1997)

²⁸¹ Niels Helveg Petersen, *Speech at Conference on Security Cooperation and Integration in the Baltic Sea Area*, (Riga August 25, 1996)

²⁸² Niels Helveg Peterson, *Speech at Chatham House* (November 3, 1993. Quoted in Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 467

Denmark's dedication to securing peace and stability became still more clear when the Danish government was confronted with the economic dimension of enlargement. It was clear for Danish officials that short term economic gain would be limited, but nevertheless they considered themselves ready for it. "The effort of peace has its price, which the rich countries of Western Europe must be willing to pay²⁸³", Prime Minister Rasmussen stated in 1995. Moreover, "(the government is) prepared to pay our part of the costs of enlargement, even if this for a period will imply additional payments for Denmark²⁸⁴." These statement did not mean that economic arguments in favour or against enlargement were not presented. For example, the Minister of Development Aid, Helle Degn, declared in 1993 that "the Eastern countries and in particular the Baltic Sea Area will in a long term perspective be of great importance to Denmark's economy²⁸⁵." Economic arguments for enlargement mostly entailed long term goals, like increased trade and economic growth for the entire EU. For the Danish Folketing, the main argument was creating peace and stability in Europe.

Denmark believed, as is stated above, that the task to secure peace and stability on the European continent was not only a Danish duty, but also a European one. According to Foreign Affairs Minister Peterson, "the enlargement of the EU is the most comprehensive response to the security challenges and risks Europe is facing²⁸⁶." The EU might be determined not to risk the advances made in integrating Western Europe and creating an area that is stable, but a refusal to enlarge might put the future of the EU itself at risk by sentencing the CEEC's to disorder and chaos that could be destabilising to the EU itself. Enlargement of the EU should not create a 'new divide line' on the continent²⁸⁷, a vision that was shared by Danish Prime Minister P.N. Rasmussen in December 1997: "There is no place for the second division in the New Europe²⁸⁸."

In this light, the Danish- Swedish non-paper was presented in November 1997. Denmark and Sweden issued their non-paper as a reaction to the Commission's proposal to Eastern enlargement. In this non-paper, the two governments argue that a need existed for "inclusiveness, non-discrimination and credibility²⁸⁹", meaning that the enlargement process should include all candidate countries irrespective of their present stage of preparations. All candidate countries should be measured by the same criteria and on equal basis. Moreover, the enlargement model should make it clear for all countries that they are a part of the enlargement process and that they would thus become members of the EU once they would have fulfilled the membership requirements²⁹⁰. Denmark and Sweden argue that the best way meet the need for inclusiveness would be to start negotiations with all candidate countries and the two countries therefore advise that the European Council in Luxembourg should take one single decision encompassing all candidate countries²⁹¹. The countries specifically state that the (bilateral) negotiations should start "in January 1999 with the 5+1 countries recommended by the Commission in its July 1997 communication *and with any other candidate country that might be judged to be ready*²⁹²." The countries conclude by stating that the financial

²⁸³ Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, *Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign-political situation* (February 21, 1995)

²⁸⁴ Niels Helveg Peterson, *Erhvervsbladet* (February 22, 1999) Translated by Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 151

²⁸⁵ Helle Degn, *Debate in the Folketing on the Danish East support* (November 25, 1993)

²⁸⁶ Niels Helveg Petersen, *Morgenposten Fyens Stiftstidende* (March 11, 1995). Translation by Riddervold and Sjørnsen, 'The importance of solidarity', 132

²⁸⁷ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 1-15

²⁸⁸ Rasmussen, *Speech at the OSCE Foreign Minister meeting*

²⁸⁹ Non-paper by Denmark and Sweden, 'The launching of the Enlargement Process' (November 27, 1997)

²⁹⁰ Non-paper, 'The Launching of the Enlargement Process'

²⁹¹ Ibidem.

²⁹² Ibidem, emphasis added.

support to all candidate countries should increase and that the non-discrimination principle should be upheld, while paying particular attention to those countries with the greatest need²⁹³.

Against the backdrop of the Danish efforts to promote peace and stability in Europe, this non-paper underlines that no country should be excluded from the negotiations, for the threat of destabilizing the new democracies was seen as ever present. A divided Europe would be a vulnerable Europe. Danish government officials had been stating this since the beginning of the 1990's. The Central and East European Countries were seen as members of the European family. The Danish Government "wholeheartedly and actively promoted the integration of these countries into European cooperation- structures... The time has come to create an undivided Europe... The historic task of our generation will be to extend the existing zone of stability to the rest of Europe²⁹⁴." And it was the EU's "joint historical responsibility to form the future of Europe²⁹⁵". According to Elisabeth Arnold of the Social Liberal party "it is the present member states' and thus Denmark's duty that this happens²⁹⁶." Moreover, the then largest opposition-party, Venstre, argued that a reason for including the CEECs in the EU is 'that human rights are secured for the millions of people who for too many years have lived under repression²⁹⁷."

Denmark insisted in making peace and security a priority on the European agenda and this peace and security was tied to Eastern enlargement. During the 1996 IGC, representatives argued that "the forthcoming IGC must help to ensure peace, stability and welfare in the Europe of the future. The IGC must, above all, lay foundations for the enlargement of the EU to include the countries of Central and Eastern Europe²⁹⁸."

Denmark promoted its cause not only by arguing the importance of creating a peaceful and stable European continent. The Danish actions that were the response to the actual destabilisation of the Balkan underlined the Danish discourse. The government decided to participate in UN peace-keeping and peace-making operations in ex-Yugoslavia throughout the 1990s. In 1992, Danish troops helped secure the food supply and humanitarian aid for the population. In 1993, Denmark participated in the international blockade against Serbia and military operations in Croatia. In 1995, Danish troops were sent to Bosnia under NATO command, and Danish troops were also sent to secure the Dayton Peace Agreement²⁹⁹.

Security and international responsibility are important Nordic values³⁰⁰. A Norwegian minister explained the Nordic preoccupation with peace and security by stating that: "We [the Nordics] feel that we have a moral obligation to pursue peace and stability when – and where – we can³⁰¹." Denmark worked hard to project these values to the other EU member states in preparation of the Luxembourg Council meeting in 1997. The Danish representatives continually argued that security

²⁹³ Non-paper, 'The Launching of the Enlargement Process'

²⁹⁴ N.H. Petersen, *Speech at the Institute of European Affairs* (Dublin October 28, 1994)

²⁹⁵ P.N Rasmussen, *Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign political situation* (May 30' 1996)

²⁹⁶ Elisabeth Arnold (RV), *Folketing Debate on ICG* (May 28, 1997)

²⁹⁷ Venstre MP, *Debate on the international development and especially the development in Europe* (February 21, 1995)

²⁹⁸ Base for Negotiations – Open Europe: the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference SN522/95 (REFLEX 23), 1996. Quoted in Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 467

²⁹⁹ Rasmus Brun Pedersen, 'Danish foreign policy activism: Differences in kind or degree?' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47, 3, (2012) 331-349

³⁰⁰ Christopher S. Browning, 'Branding nordicity models, identity and the decline of exceptionalism.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 42, 1 (2007) 27-51

³⁰¹ Jan Petersen, 'Nordic Peace Diplomacy: Looking Back, Moving Forward'. *Speech to the Conference on Nordic Peace Diplomacy* (Copenhagen, February 24, 2005)

was at stake. The only way to create a stable continent was to allow all the applicant states join the negotiations and ultimately to become an EU member state. Stability was seen as the ultimate goal, for integration could only deepen and economies and trade could only flourish in a stable environment. For this reason, the EU should show solidarity to all applicant states. Incorporation of the applicant state in the EU is the soft approach to stabilization and peace on the continent. There would not be need of military power and the adoption of the *acquis* and the transition to democracy would ultimately reform the applicant states in such a way that they would not easily destabilise and threaten the EU member states. In this context, the liberal idea seems to be not only of geopolitical consequence in terms that 'democracies do not wage wars against each other'³⁰². The idea also implies that stability would stimulate trade and would enable economies to grow. Lastly, it is a normative idea. The *acquis* entails the European values and the transition to democracy requires of implementation of various additional values and rights, which will transform the applicant countries into European countries that actually share the same normative dimension. This underlines again how interconnected the normative, geopolitical and economical dimension are.

5.2 Rhetorical action

When preferences are construed as more than materialist and economic gain, norms play an important role both on the member state level and on the level of international decision making. Rhetorical action plays a central role in this process. To underline this statement, I will compare the empirical evidence from the previous section with the theory as it was explained by Schimmelfennig in 2001.

The theory of rhetorical action presupposes weakly socialised actors. The actors show commitment to the community that they belong to and have a general interest to uphold the shared values and norms. However, the community does not shape the concrete preferences of its members. The collective norms and values compete with egoistic and material interests³⁰³.

The communities' 'standard of legitimacy' defines who belongs to the polity as well as the rights and duties of its members. This standard is interpreted as an external institutional resource and constraint³⁰⁴. In other words, the standard can support some preferences, while obstructing others. This influences the way political actors interact as well as the relative power actors have over the outcome. The standard obliges actors to justify their goals and preferences on the grounds of identity, values and norms. Moreover, legitimacy strengthens the actors bargaining position³⁰⁵. The standard of legitimacy, therefore, forces actors to strategically use norms in order to justify their preferences. Moreover, this strategic use of norms will increase the bargaining power of the actor, for its preferences will be seen as legitimate. Actors comply with the standard in order to avoid coercive sanctions what might cost them³⁰⁶.

In the Danish case, there are two levels of justification: on the national level, where voters and opposition have to support the government's approach, and the international level, where other member states have to believe the Danish approach is the legitimate one in order to follow it.

³⁰² As argued by various liberal scholars, see for example Raymond Cohen, 'Pacific unions: a reappraisal of the theory that 'democracies do not go to war with each other', *Review of international Studies*, 20, 3 (1994) 207-223.

³⁰³ Schimmelfennig, 'The Community Trap', 63-64

³⁰⁴ Ibidem, 63

³⁰⁵ Ibidem, 63

³⁰⁶ Ibidem, 64

On the national level, the Danish government used arguments concerning the security risks of leaving countries out of the negotiations and the duty to unite Europe in Folketing debates and in statements in the national press. Economic arguments were overshadowed by the perceived threat of destabilisation of countries in the Danish neighbourhood. The arguments presented are mostly normative and are in line with the values of Danish, Nordic, identity. The themes 'security' and 'international responsibility' are part of the discourse the Danish government adheres to but also to the discourse that influences the opposition and the population. The use of normative arguments may in this case not be strategic, but based on the shared idea that Denmark does have a duty to contribute to peace and security in Europe. The fact that the arguments were broadly supported by the EU-sceptic political parties as well as the parties that favoured the EU, suggests that the arguments presented by the government were seen as legitimate and that not to support a full Eastern Enlargement would in fact be the illegitimate course of action. It seems that on national action rhetorical action was not necessary.

The reasons for this can be found in the Danish society and identity. The rhetorical action theory presupposes weakly socialized actors, as was mentioned earlier. For these actors the norms and values of the community do not form their concrete preferences. The opposite is the case for the Danish society. Norms and values are a large part of the Danish society and surface in their democracy as well as in the welfare system and the foreign policies. In the Danish national discourse solidarity is an important value, as is security and the believe that everyone should have the same opportunities. This suggest that the Danes are not the weakly socialized actor that Schimmelfennig's theory refers to, but are in fact strongly socialized and in such a way that the norms and values are able to form the Danish preferences as well as the Danish discourse.

On the European level, it is an entirely different matter. The other member states do not share the Danish identity, except perhaps Sweden to some extent. This means that a different standard of legitimacy exists in the European context that has to be adhered to. In this context, other member state have mutually different interests. Where on the national level every actor has the same goal, namely to do what is best for Denmark, on the European level it is to be expected that every member state is first and foremost a self-interested actor, just as the theory prescribes.

In order to convince the member states to open negotiations with all CEECs, the Danish government argued that creating stability in whole of Europe should be a priority of the EU member states. Stability on the continent will provide economical and security benefits to all member states, as well as the applicant states and the countries that chose not to apply for EU membership. The way to create this stability was to allow all applicant states to join the membership negotiations and, by allowing this, to help transform the countries into peaceful democracies that would adhere to the rule of law and human rights.

As a part of this approach, Denmark emphasized the need for the reunification of Europe and the duty that the member states had to the CEECs by stressing the possible threat that would to arise if some countries were to be left out. First of all, transitions to democracies are very unstable processes. The wish of the CEECs to join the EU created a common goal for the various parties in the applicant countries. If the EU were to include some countries in the negotiations but close the door to others, there existed a large possibility that the latter would fall in disarray. This process of destabilization would not only threaten to spill over to the neighbouring countries, it would also possibly spill over to EU member states. The troubles on the Balkans illustrated what could happen with all CEECs, but where the EU was helpless in preventing the Balkan conflict, the Union did have the tools and the opportunity to protect the applicant states from suffering the same fate. By inviting the CEECs to the negotiation table and promising actual accession to membership status, the

countries would transform into safe and stable countries. Since all the EU member states are liberal democracies, the values of peace and basic human rights are shared between them. According to Denmark, drawing a new dividing line across the continent would condemn countries to chaos and internal violence. It was the liberal duty of the EU member states to prevent this, since they all adhere to the United Nations Charter and the basic principle of human rights. It would not be seen as *legitimate* to condemn civilians in the CEECs that would not be selected in the first round of enlargement to live in a destabilized area. It was the Western task to provide peace and security, as it had done so often under the UN mandate. Furthermore, the EU member state could not legitimately take away the human right to live in peace away from the civilians of the CEECs.

On European level, Denmark used rhetorical action in an attempt to pressure other member states, but not exactly in the way that Schimmelfennig described. Schimmelfennig argues that the EU accepted the CEECs to become part of the Union because the CEECs and some drivers argued that the requirements for membership had been fulfilled. Moreover, the member states were forced to accept the CEECs as they could not negate on promises that were made, like the fact that every European country could become member of the EU, a statement made in the conclusions of the Council meeting in Copenhagen³⁰⁷. The arguments that Schimmelfennig used to build his theory were based on values and identity: the CEECs were the democracies and the market economies that they were required to be in order to be considered for EU membership. Moreover, they were European and valued the same norms and values as the member states did. For these reasons, they could not legitimately be kept out³⁰⁸.

Denmark does not try to legitimate its arguments by lining them alongside the European norms and values. It explicitly pointed at the liberal values, that were not only important in the EU context, but also formed the foundations of the European democracies themselves. For a large part they overlap with the European values, but by taking them out of the EU context member states become more involved, because it concerns them directly. The second difference between the Danish case and Schimmelfennig's theory is that part of the rhetoric emphasized on the possible threat of destabilization that would arise if countries were left out of the EU. This threat is regarded as the costs of keeping countries out of the negotiation, and – as Schimmelfennig stated and as noticed above - actors comply with the standard in order to avoid coercive sanctions what might cost them. In other words, Denmark believed the member states had to accept the CEECs as members of the EU because if they did not, the states themselves would pay the price, when chaos would destabilize in the EU's backyard with the potential to disrupt the member states' security and economic stability.

5.3 Reactions to the Danish approach

The reactions to the Danish plea to open negotiations with all applicant states were diverse. This was due to the different preferences that the various member states had with regard to enlargement. Denmark's approach was actively supported by Sweden and the United Kingdom. Italy was also a supporter from hour one. Even though the Italians were sceptical of enlargement itself, they argued the security threat alongside the Danish government³⁰⁹. Germany was in favour of the Commissions approach to enlargement, together with Austria and Finland. The Benelux countries were swing states, not sure if they favoured enlargement in the first place and if they were to support it, the countries were indecisive whether to include all applicant states. Ireland and France, supported by the other Mediterranean countries were not in favour of enlargement at all³¹⁰. However different the

³⁰⁷ Schimmelfennig, 'The Community Trap', 68

³⁰⁸ Ibidem, 68

³⁰⁹ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 9

³¹⁰ Ibidem, 15 (endnote 5)

opinions and preferences, Denmark was able to convince all member states of the security dimension of enlargement and the duty to prevent destabilization. This acknowledgement led to the adaption of the Commission's proposal in *Agenda 2000*. This adaption was accepted during the Luxembourg Council meeting, which concluded that negotiations would be opened directly with the 5+1 countries that the Commission suggested, but that, once they would have met the requirements and were deemed 'ready', other CEECs could join the negotiations for membership³¹¹. Nearly every member state had already argued the importance of stability in Eastern Europe one time or another, which made it possible for Denmark to 'entrap' them in at least acknowledging the Danish approach to enlargement.

5.3.1 Sweden and Finland

Sweden had supported Denmark's approach from the moment that the country became part of the European Union. The Swedish government co-wrote the non-paper issued in November 1997 and was an ally in promoting the opening of the negotiations with all member states. The Swedes and Danes shared the Nordic identity and the norms and values connected to it³¹². The Nordic states can be argued to share a consistent internationalist content to their foreign policies in that they have long evinced a substantially stronger commitment to international solidarity as opposed to mere international relations³¹³. Securing peace and stability in other countries could be viewed as a Swedish tradition as well as a Danish one. "Conflict prevention is a priority area in Swedish foreign policy ... this is a natural development of Sweden's traditional policy of promoting peace and solidarity, one expression of which is our commitment to development co-operation³¹⁴." This statement by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs underlines the Swedish commitment to peace. Moreover, Sweden believed that it had the normative obligation to assist the EU in its efforts to create a more stable and peaceful world³¹⁵ and therefore supported the Danish approach to enlargement. The inclusion of the Baltic States was of great importance to Sweden, as the countries shared economic, political and historical ties. Even Norway, despite its inability as a non-member to formally influence the enlargement process, provided support for Baltic membership through both bilateral and multilateral channels³¹⁶. Even so, this preference did not overshadow the need for a united Europe, that Sweden understood to be necessary to provide security on the continent, seeing enlargement as 'one of the single most important elements in the evolution of the European security architecture³¹⁷'.

Finland shared the Nordic values with Denmark and Sweden, but differed fundamentally from these countries due to its relationship with Russia. The Finnish-Russian ties had been strong during the Cold War, but after the fall of the Soviet Union, Finland decided to turn to Europe. Hans Mouritzen referred to the Finnish switch of focus as 'bandwagoning with the winning party'³¹⁸. Finland's security was tied to Russia as well as to the Baltic States and to the military strength of neighbour Sweden and the West. Finland was cautious not to damage relations with Russia and therefore supported the

³¹¹ European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency* (Luxembourg, December 12-13, 1997)

³¹² Lawler, 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union', 567-568

³¹³ Annika Bergman, 'Post-Cold War Shifts in Swedish and Finnish Security Policies: The compatibility of non-alignment and participation in EU led conflict prevention' *ECPR conference, University of Uppsala*. (2004)

³¹⁴ Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 'Preventing Violent Conflict-Swedish Policy for the 21st Century.' *Government Communication 2000/01:2*, (Stockholm 2001)

³¹⁵ Bergman, 'Post-Cold War Shifts in Swedish and Finnish Security Policies'

³¹⁶ Annika Bergman, 'Adjacent Internationalism. The Concept of Solidarity and Post-Cold War Nordic-Baltic Relations.' *Cooperation and Conflict* 41, 1 (2006) 73-97.

³¹⁷ Clive Archer, 'Nordic Swans and Baltic Cygnets.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 34, 1 (1999) 47-71

³¹⁸ Hans Mouritzen, 'Lessons for Alliance Theory', in Hans Mouritzen (ed), *Bordering Russia. Theory and Practice for Europe's Baltic Rim*, (Ashgate 1998) 91-107.

Commissions approach to enlargement, with neighbour Estonia as part of the package³¹⁹. The two countries shared special historical and cultural ties in addition to their geographic closeness and extensive trade relations. Therefore, Finland accepted the proposal of EU enlargement that included Estonia, instead of arguing for inclusion of Latvia and Lithuania as Denmark and Sweden did. On the other hand, Finnish defence policy did acknowledge the importance to achieving security and stability in Europe and argued that EU enlargement was the way to achieve this security³²⁰. While Minister of Foreign Affairs Tarja Halonen stated that she could not support the 'delayed regatta approach' issued by Denmark, she could support the opening of preparatory negotiations with the Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and Slovakia, as proposed during the Luxembourg Summit as middle way between the 5+1 approach and the 'delayed regatta' approach³²¹.

5.3.2 United Kingdom

As the United Kingdom's geographic location is remote and therefore the threat of destabilisation may not be as strong as in other member states, the direct support of the British government to Eastern enlargement is hard to explain in security considerations. The Danish 'entrapment' was neither applicable nor necessary in reference to the United Kingdom (UK), for the UK had fundamentally other motives to enlarge than Denmark had. The UK had always seen the EU as a free market project³²². Scholars argue that the British government seems to have regarded Eastern enlargement in this context: simply as an enlargement of the free market. Additionally, it was argued that the government promoted the enlargement as they saw it as a way to prevent the political deepening of the EU and to weaken the supranational aspects of the Union³²³. On the other hand, the British government issued a White Paper in the period leading up to the 1996 IGC that stated that the UK sees the EU as a community that safeguards stability in Europe and generates economic prosperity. "The European Union is more than a trade area, it is means to consolidate democracy and prosperity across Europe³²⁴." The paper concluded that the EU should focus on "healing the historic divisions and cementing peace³²⁵" on the continent. Prime Minister Tony Blair underlined the British focus on the stability aspect of enlargement in a speech in Warsaw in the year 2000, stating that "without enlargement, Western Europe will always be faced with the threat of instability, conflict and mass migration on its borders³²⁶". This statement implied that the UK was not solely after material benefit, as many scholars argue. On the contrary: it shows that the UK harboured a desire for stability like Denmark did, even though in the case of the UK it is more often referred to as economic stability³²⁷.

5.3.3 Italy and the Mediterranean countries

Italy played an ambiguous role in the enlargement process. The country was not in favour of enlargement, as it would mean the loss of various European funds and increased contributions to the Union³²⁸. On the other hand, Italy would be one of the countries that would gain the most in the

³¹⁹ Archer, 'Nordic Swans and Baltic Cygnets', 47-71

³²⁰ Archer, 'Nordic Swans and Baltic Cygnets', 47-71

³²¹ Eilen, Suomen Ulkopoliittikan Asiakirja- Arkisto ja Kronologia, *Vuosi 1997 Suomen Ulkopoliitikassa*.

<http://www.eilen.fi/fi/chronology/1997/>

³²² Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 451-483

³²³ Skålnes, 'Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', 340-368.

³²⁴ British Government White Paper, *A partnership of Nations* (March 12, 1996)

³²⁵ Ibidem

³²⁶ Tony Blair, Prime Minister's Speech to the Polish Stock Exchange (Warsaw, October 6, 2000) online:

<http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/page2373.asp>

³²⁷ Larsen, 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s' 451-483

³²⁸ Mayhew, *Recreating Europe*, 1-426.

short run, with the accession of Hungary and Slovenia³²⁹. In addition, Friis argued that Italy was one of the countries that directly supported the Danish security frame, even that Italy was one of the 'founders' of this approach³³⁰. Additionally, Schimmelfennig argues that Italy was more concerned with the Mediterranean dimension of the EU than with the CEECs. The Italian focus was especially directed at securing stability in the Balkan and since the Balkan countries were not candidates for membership Italy lost interest in the Eastern enlargement³³¹. Nevertheless, Italy did not lose interest in promoting stability. Additionally, Italy saw the Eastern enlargement as a way to induce the reforms needed for a deeper and closer EU³³².

Spain, Portugal and Greece shared Italy's hesitancy. These countries were relatively new to the EU and therefore felt they had a 'moral obligation' to support the pleas of the CEECs to become a member of the Union³³³. For this reason, the countries supported the regatta approach from its first hour. Nevertheless, the enlargement costs Spain, Portugal and Greece in terms of (CAP) funding. The eastern European countries were largely agricultural and therefore direct competition for CAP-funds. Scholars argue that the Mediterranean governments merely supported the full-on enlargement to delay the actual accession³³⁴. This was the reason that these countries switched their support to the Commission's approach when it was issued. Spanish Prime Minister Gonzales stated he wished for a larger Europe and more Europe similarly, meaning that a larger Europe had to be accompanied by reforms and political deepening³³⁵. Foreign Minister Matutes also emphasized this by saying that the EU is the main factor for peace and stability and that this should be a prospect for the Eastern republics. Nevertheless, he cautions that the enlargement process will be a lengthy one, and that Spain will see to it that the accession of the countries will not endanger the *acquis communautaire* or the EU economy. Based on this, one could conclude that support for enlargement was hesitant and conditional³³⁶.

5.3.4 France and Germany

Without a doubt, Germany has been one of the keenest countries to enlarge and has been the most influential supporter. Enlargement would place Germany at the centre of the European Union, enlarging with countries with which Germany shared a history and good relations³³⁷. On the other hand, France could be seen as one of the most hesitant countries to Eastern enlargement of all the member states. Contrarily to Germany, the Scandinavian countries or even Italy, France felt it had nothing at all to gain with this enlargement. The French government had never had the incentive to create economic and political ties with the CEECs. The country had always prioritized relations with North African countries. For this reason, France was afraid to find itself alone after the

³²⁹ Fritz Breuss, 'Benefits and Dangers of EU Enlargement.' *Empirica*, 29 (2002) 245–274

³³⁰ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 9

³³¹ Frank Schimmelfennig, 'The double puzzle of EU enlargement: Liberal norms, rhetorical action, and the decision to expand to the East.' *Paper presented at the sixth Biennial International Conference* (Pittsburgh June 3-5, 1999)

³³² Philip Daniels, 'Italy in European Union' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33, 35 (1999) 107– 112

³³³ Sonia Piedrafita, 'In spite of the costs? Moral constraints on Spain's enlargement policy' in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 73-101

³³⁴ Friis, 'The End of the Beginning', 15 (endnote 5).

³³⁵ Piedrafita, 'In spite of the costs?', 84

³³⁶ *Ibidem*, 85

³³⁷ Marcin Zaborowski, 'More than simply expanding markets. Germany and EU enlargement' in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 162-186

enlargement would take place³³⁸. Moreover, French European politics seem to be guided mainly by a fear of the revitalisation of German predominance³³⁹.

France heavily insisted that institutional reforms should take place to ready the EU for enlargement. Even though France was opposed to the enlargement process, as is argued by many scholars, the country accepted it during the Copenhagen council and did not veto it. Moreover, the French government presented the idea of a stability pact in 1993, stating that it was “desirable to convene an international conference with the aim of stabilizing the situation and establishing an equilibrium in Europe³⁴⁰”. France saw the importance of stability on the continent, but did not necessarily accept the role for the EU in safeguarding it. Not sharing borders with the CEECs, the threat of instability or spill over had no large influence on the preference formation of France. Many scholars agree that France, in fact, was entrapped: given the fear of a geopolitical shift, the French government could not openly resist the drive for enlargement shown by Germany and Denmark³⁴¹. French support to the widening of Europe was necessary to maintain French influence in the East and to prevent Germany from establishing the dominant position³⁴². The French feared that by not supporting enlargement, they would drive the CEECs into Germany’s arms and leave France outside the playing field instead of in the middle of it, where it belonged, according to the French. Therefore, France decided to support the enlargement to all CEE candidates during the Luxembourg Council³⁴³.

Germany, as noted, was a supporter of the enlargement, but also kept an eye on the EU’s capacity to absorb all the new member states. Therefore, Germany supported the Commission’s 5+1 approach, but not the regatta approach that Denmark fought for. With the 5+1 approach Germany secured the accession of its two neighbours, Poland and the Czech Republic and the country did not feel the need to push for enlargement with all candidates³⁴⁴. The German government supported this so-called ‘Visegrad’ group especially for its historical ties. Germany felt solidarity to those countries that were a large part of German history³⁴⁵. Solidarity was a recurring topic in the German discourse, underscored by a desire to share this solidarity with the other member states. “European solidarity demands that a single or group of member states does not bear all duties, which can only be managed by the Community as a whole, permanently and predominantly alone. A higher degree of solidarity on the part of EU partners is necessary³⁴⁶.” Moreover, Germany saw the importance of stability, arguing to set a normative standard in the applicant countries to prevent that nationalist policies would gain momentum and lead to regional instability³⁴⁷. Enlargement was seen as enhancing Germany’s security. Stabilizing of the East European region would benefit Germany as a border state. Foreign Minister Genscher underlined this by arguing that threats were to Germany’s

³³⁸ Skålnes, ‘Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union’, 344-346

³³⁹ Sylke Nissen, ‘Who Wants Enlargement of the EU? Support for Enlargement among Elites and Citizens in the European Union’ *Sociologický Časopis/Czech Sociological Review* (2003) 757-772

³⁴⁰ Prime Minister Edouard Balladur, quoted in Helene Sjursen and Børge Romsloe, ‘Protecting the idea of Europe. France and Enlargement’ in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 216-249, p.222

³⁴¹ Sjursen and Romsloe, ‘Protecting the idea of Europe’, 216-249

³⁴² Skålnes, ‘Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union’, 344-346

³⁴³ Siegfried Schieder, Rachel Folz and Simon Musekamp ‘The Social Construction of European Solidarity: Germany and France in the EU policy towards the states of Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific (ACP) and Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).’ *Paper prepared for UACES conference "Exchanging ideas on Europe 2008"* (Edinburgh, September 1-3, 2008)

³⁴⁴ Zaborowski, ‘More than simply expanding markets’ 162-186

³⁴⁵ Schieder, Folz and Musekamp, ‘The social construction of European Solidarity’

³⁴⁶ Deutscher Bundestag 1999, BT-Drs. 14/396: 4

³⁴⁷ Zaborowski, ‘More than simply expanding markets’ 162-186

security were no longer of a military nature and therefore not NATO, but the EU should step in to promote and secure stability in Eastern Europe³⁴⁸.

5.3.5 The Netherlands

The Netherlands were divided regarding the approach towards Eastern enlargement. The majority of the parties supported the Commissions approach of 5+1. Still, these parties did acknowledge that this approach would be potential dangerous for the countries that would not directly be included in the negotiations. Member of the European Parliament on behalf of the Netherlands' Christian party, Arie Oostlander, vehemently argued that countries like Bulgaria and Romania were on a very good track, considering the reforms they were going through. The EU should not "shoot these countries in the head"³⁴⁹, by taking away the thing these countries had been working towards. It would send them back into chaos³⁵⁰. The recognition of this security risk to partial enlargement led the Netherlands to focus on the way to prevent the negative fallout of these countries. The government argued that pre-accession negotiations should be opened with the countries that are not selected for the accession negotiations to help and support them prepare for the membership negotiations. These membership negotiations would be a possibility once the countries had sufficiently lived up to the requirements³⁵¹. Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hans van Mierlo, stressed this view in a letter to parliament, in which he explained that it was necessary to emphasize the inclusivity of the enlargement process³⁵².

5.4 Rhetorical action?

Based on this chapter, it can be concluded that Denmark felt a duty towards the CEECs to promote stability and peace. This was not solely a moral conviction, as stability in the Eastern European region would benefit Denmark's security as well as the security of the EU as a whole. Instability was seen as catching, an argument that was underlined by the violent collapse of the Balkan region into violence. Moreover, stability would enable the European economy to flourish, for it would stimulate foreign direct investment and a growth of the internal market. These long term economic gains that would not only benefit Denmark but the EU as well were connected to the security inspired need for stability and peace. The Danish government argued that the way to achieve this stability and peace was to open negotiations with all applicant countries. Creating a new divide in Europe would send the countries that were not selected for negotiations back over the edge, probably into chaos and disarray. It was the European duty to prevent this, since it is the duty of the liberal countries in the West to promote peace and democracy.

Denmark issued this frame in response to the Commission's 5+1 approach in the period prior to the Luxembourg Council meeting in 1997. The referral to liberal values and to the duty to secure peace can be seen as an attempt to entrap the other member states to support the Danish approach to enlargement. Many countries indeed saw the threat of instability, but the threat was not seen as so critical that the countries decided to support the regatta approach to enlargement. Moreover, the statements made by the Heads of government serve various political purposes. One can never objectively formulate the true agenda of the governments, since its context is unknown. Therefore, the conclusions drawn in the paragraph are based on speculations about true meanings, which often

³⁴⁸ Ibidem, 174

³⁴⁹ Correspondent, 'Het zijn geen rechtstaten, ze horen er niet bij!' *Trouw* (Brussels October 31, 1997). (Own translation)

³⁵⁰ Correspondent, 'Het zijn geen rechtstaten'

³⁵¹ Eerste Kamer der Staten Generaal, *Europadebat – State Secretary Michiel Patijn* (November 11, 1997)

³⁵² Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hans van Mierlo, *Verslag Algemene Raad van 8 december jl.* (December 9, 1997)

clash with the actual statements made by governments. These findings emphasize the argument that normative arguments can be strategically used by governments to gain a level of support for their policies. Even so, the Danish concern that a new divide of Europe would increase the instability in the countries that were not selected for membership found its mark with many member states and allied 'drivers' and 'brakemen' of enlargement on the note that the Commission's approach had a gaping hole in it and that the security dimension of enlargement should be taken into account. Even though the true regatta approach was not accepted during the Luxembourg Council meeting, the Danish government was able to set the agenda by the launch of their competing frame. This ultimately led to opening negotiations with the 5+1 applicants and the opening of pre-accession negotiations with the remaining applicant countries. So in a way, the Danish rhetorical action did work, only the threat they advocated as being imminent was not perceived as such by many of the other member states. After the Kosovo crisis in 1999, the validity of the Danish arguments was underlined and it became apparent that stability indeed was at stake by not including all applicant states to the negotiation table. This was set right during the Helsinki Council meeting in 1999, when the EU chose to open negotiations with the remaining applicants in the year 2000³⁵³.

Analysing this chapter, it can be concluded that the Danish government used its arguments for enlargement in two ways. In the first place to legitimize the government's opinion on enlargement in the Folketing and with the Danish people. By calling upon the intrinsically Danish values of solidarity and security, the government was able to secure a broad domestic support for their role as promoter of the Eastern enlargement, with even the euro-sceptic parties acknowledging the threat and supported the government's solution. This could be done, because the Danish population adheres to the same norms and values as the Danish government and is influenced by the same discourse that influences the government. Therefore, not supporting the government's views on promoting stability, security and solidarity would be seen as illegitimate and in discordance with the Danish identity.

This case could be seen as an example of entrapment of the Danish opposition and population, even though they are not the weakly socialized actors that the theory presupposes. However, the extent to which the opposition was actually entrapped leaves room for interpretation: due to the shared discourse and normative context of the Danish population, including the government and the opposition, the government did not need to use normative arguments strategically in order to secure the support it needed. Both sides were equally convinced of the Danish duty to Europe.

Secondly, on European level the Danish government uses their arguments to appeal to the liberal values that were core of the nature of the other member states as well as to emphasize the perceived threat of destabilization. The Danish government was not able to entrap other member states with their arguments, even though the countries did acknowledge the security dimension to enlargement. On the European level one can speak of a 'battle of rhetorical action', for not only Denmark attempted to entrap the member states, the Commission did the same, by adapting their 5+1 proposal in such a way that is answered to all the issues raised in the period leading up to the Luxembourg council meeting. By doing this, the Commission ensured that the member state could not decline the new proposal, without losing credibility in front of their colleagues. Additionally, Germany (supported by the Netherlands) had identified another sort of threat and aimed rhetorical action to securing its acknowledgement. Germany was concerned that the regatta approach would be more than the EU structures could absorb and the shocks that would be part of such a large enlargement would jeopardise the functioning of the Union. Thus Germany also argued that the

³⁵³ Mayhew, *Recreating Europe*, 1-426.

stability of the EU was at stake, but from a completely other viewpoint than Denmark. The Mediterranean countries argued yet another case, namely that deepening of the EU should proceed widening to create a sufficient framework to absorb the same shocks that Germany and the Netherlands feared. However, these countries aimed to hold off enlargement for a while. This 'battle of rhetorical action' is a new concept and requires further research.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This thesis aimed to look into several European integration theories by analysing the case of Denmark as promotor for Eastern enlargement, especially in the run up to the Luxembourg council meeting. Each of the main questions of the research help zoom in on a specific theory or theoretical assumption. The answers to questions ‘Why did Denmark not support the Commission’s approach and launch a competing approach?’ and ‘Why was Denmark such a strong supporter for enlargement with all CEECs?’ draw attention to the constructivist – rationalist debate that is popular in the current literature. The answers to the questions ‘What reasons did Denmark give for doing so?’ and ‘what made other countries support this approach during the Luxemburg Council meeting?’ focus on the rhetorical aspect of the Danish role, based on Frank Schimmelfennig’s theory on rhetorical action.

The literature on the constructivist- rationalist divide seems to be very black and white: scholars either argue that international decision making is based on geopolitical and economic gains, implying that a decision is always based on a cost-benefit analysis, or they argue that norms, values and identity are the most important reasons behind international decision making. As Jachtenfuchs argued in his 2002 paper: the division is less clear as the current debate would have us believe.

Based on the Danish case, I argue that the constructivist and rationalist arguments do not counter, but complement each other. Norms and values constitute to the normative context that underlies every decision that is made by a government (or an individual, for that matter). Norms and values are part of the discourse that influences governments and their preference formation. In other words, this normative context enables governments to determine their priorities, interests and therefore their actions. In the Danish case, the government pursued the inclusion of all Central and Eastern European states in the accession negotiations with the European Union. They desired this for economic reasons, for the inclusion of the new states would increase trade. In the Danish case, this trade would be specifically directed at the Baltic states, since the country shared historical ties with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and therefore felt connected to the countries. This is a clear example of how the normative context is a foundation for the economic interests. Moreover, Denmark had geopolitical reasons to promote enlargement. This is no longer geopolitics in the sense of the acquirement of power and land. The geopolitical reasoning was twofold: with the CEECs as new member states the EU would be a stronger political actor in the world. However, this reason is overshadowed by the desire to prevent conflict from spreading through the newly formed democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. Were applicant states to be left out of the negotiations, the countries would possibly collapse into violent unrest and civil conflicts that could spill over to neighbouring states and the EU itself. The Danish security was closely tied to the security in the region, that included the Baltic States and Poland. Denmark argued that Eastern enlargement would create peace and stability in the applicant state, as these states were to adopt the *acquis communautaire* and transform into a democracies that respected human rights. These are normative ideas – democracy, stability, peace and human rights – but they all lead to the economic and geopolitical goals envisioned by the Danish government. The Danish case thus underscores the statement that the normative and rationalist dimension cannot be seen as two separate dimensions.

These findings support the theory that was introduced by Larsen in 1997, that changes in the discourse of a country lead to changed international behaviour. The Danish discourse changed during the 1980’s as the government came to find that interstate cooperation was no longer a way to achieve the Danish goals. The EU became an essential partner in various aspects and therefore Denmark became more involved. I believe that this theory is an important starting point when researching reasons behind a country’s foreign policies and priorities, as discourse is an important determinant of the actions of governments. It is therefore essential to look into the domestic context

of the country in order to determine what is the dominant discourse and with that determine the normative background of the decision. Only after analysing this context can one sufficiently explain the priorities of a country. In the Danish case, the emphasis on security and solidarity has its roots in the normative context, for both values are an important part of the Danish identity and discourse, that are both linked to the welfare state and a Danish nationalism that is connected with it. I would like to argue that, instead of arguing either the rationalist or the constructivist approach to explain a country preference formation, one should look first at the domestic and normative context, including the dominant discourse, and with that explain the rationalist and self-interested preferences that a country pursues.

Many scholars actually acknowledge that both approached on its own cannot explain the reasoning behind the (Danish) decision to enlarge. Marianne Riddervold and Helene Sjørnsen for instance do argue that the economic and geopolitical reasoning cannot be overlooked when explaining the Danish role in the enlargement process. However, they focus mainly at countering the arguments with constructivist ones, instead of strengthening the rational arguments with their constructive approach. Jachtenfuchs argued that one should not limit oneself by trying to prove a theory, but instead one should let the empirical evidence lead the research and this thesis supports that statement, by not focussing on the details before the larger foundations are analysed. It is important to take the bigger picture into account as well as the details.

In this bigger picture in which rationalist and constructivist arguments are two sides of the same coin, one will also find that rhetorical action plays a central role in the process of decision making, as norms and values act as determinants for economic and geopolitical preferences on national as well as international level. The Danish case shows that the Danish government legitimized its approach by emphasizing solidarity and security in Folketing debates and press releases about Eastern enlargement. This could be seen as a national dimension of rhetorical action: the government based its arguments on core value of the Danish identity and because of this, opposing the government's opinion would not put strain on the actor's credibility. It would be seen as 'illegitimate' to deny the Danish identity and therefore the domestic support for an inclusive Eastern enlargement was very strong. This national dimension to rhetorical action is a refinement of Schimmelfennig's theory, but on the other hand are the actors on national level not the weakly socialized actors that Schimmelfennig presupposes. The Danish population is strongly socialized and feels that it has a strong identity. For this reason, it was possible for the government to create the large support base, but can it be questioned whether the population was indeed entrapped, as the evidence does not suggest reluctance of some parties. Moreover, it can be concluded that the government does not use the normative arguments strategically, as it adhered to the same discourse and normative context as the population did and with that it seems that the government genuinely believed in its duty to bring peace and security to Europe.

On European level, rhetorical action played a central role as well, which supports Schimmelfennig's theory. In this case, the actors in the decision making process were weakly socialized and all had their own agenda. The Danish approach to gain support for the regatta approach was twofold. First of all they emphasized the security threat that would arise if the EU did not allow all applicant states to join the negotiations. Secondly, Denmark attempted to convince the other member states to prevent this threat by aiming normative arguments at the liberal core of the member states. The arguments were based on the liberal idea of peace and democracy and the liberal duty to promote it. However, the arguments were only as strong as the threat was perceived imminent.

In reaction to the Danish action, most member states acknowledged that there was a hole in the Commission's approach to enlargement and that there indeed could arise a security threat if the

problem was not addressed. Yet, most member states did not view the threat as imminent or saw a different threat that they prioritized. Germany prioritized the threat that an inclusive enlargement would be too much to absorb for the current EU framework and therefore argued the 5+1 approach, since the threat of destabilization of the EU framework would be less severe if less countries joined. The Mediterranean countries supported the deepening of the EU before enlargement could take place at all. Various blocs within the EU attempted to rhetorically entrap the other member states, which could be called a 'battle of rhetorical actions' as referred to in the last chapter. This new concept should be a focus point of new research as it could be an addition to Schimmelfennig's theory of rhetorical action. It seems to me that these various rhetorical actions are the result of regional integration within the EU. As the EU grows, new alliances or blocs form within the framework of the union: the Nordic countries, the Mediterranean countries and Germany-orientated countries (Germany, the Benelux countries and Austria) all seem to have different preferences and all have their own set of arguments to legitimize those. Attention should be also paid to the position of France, whose sole aim is to contain Germany and hold on to the French *supériorité*. This aim prevents the country from becoming fully part in one of the blocs. It appears to me that each bloc has its own discourse of what Europe should be and its own normative context in which the preferences are formed. However, this is just my shallow analysis of the subject. It would be interesting to research a possible connection between regional integration and a battle of rhetorical actions.

The current literature on enlargement is extensive in describing the effects of it on EU level, member state level and applicant state level. The effects of conditionality and whether this tool achieved the set goal is also a well- represented subject in the overall debate, as is research on the changes the EU had to make to absorb the new member states. It seems like the main focus is on the period after the Eastern enlargement to determine the results of it. Less is written on the reasons to enlarge in the first place. Most of the literature on this topic focusses on either the EU's overall reasons and the applicant states reasons for wanting to join the union. I find that the reasoning of member states to support the decision for enlargement is a largely unexplored dimension of the Eastern Enlargement process. Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier acknowledge this in their 2001 article. Research on the reasoning of the member states would be an addition to the current literature as it would enable a comparative research between various member states, perhaps in connection to regional integration. It would be interesting to compare the reasons of the Nordic countries with each other, to determine whether their shared identity is indeed as strong as the literature suggests or to sufficiently explain why Finland supported a different approach to enlargement. I believe that comparative research on reasons for Eastern enlargement could be a good case study to illuminate the concept of alliance formation within the Union.

Another subject that this thesis briefly touched upon is pressures from non- EU countries, like in this case the United States. The influence of other countries on the enlargement process is largely unexplored. Several accounts exist of Norway's efforts to promote the acceptance of the Baltic States into the EU. It could be assumed that the US had a strong opinion on Eastern enlargement as well and some literature does exist on the US aim to democratize the CEECs, yet hardly anything is written about potentially active support of EU enlargement to achieve this. The same goes for Russia, as it would have a reason to try to prevent enlargement. It would be interesting to look into how the Russians attempted to prevent enlargement from happening.

When looking at the large array of literature that forms the constructivist- rationalist debate, one has to conclude that nothing is 'rotten in Copenhagen' in the way that Moravcsik described. It is to be acknowledged that the 'Copenhagen School' is subject to the Nordic discourse and therefore

primarily constructivist, but the school has produced some very interesting theories and focus points. Based on this research I have to conclude that Denmark succeeded in setting the agenda in the period prior to Luxembourg, like Friis argued in her article in 1998. This can be seen as an outcome of the rhetorical action process that is described in this thesis. Moreover, this research also supports the main points that were made by Piedrafita and Torreblanca, who state that countries do not just follow the logic of consequence or appropriateness, there is also a logic of justification. In the context of this logic, countries support the arguments that they believed to be justified. Helene Sjørnsen concludes the same in her 2002 article and these findings strengthen the concept of rhetorical action, for they describe the importance of the 'standard of legitimacy' that Schimmelfennig refers to. In my opinion, these scholars focus too strongly on the normative side of the story, when an action can also be justified for economic and geopolitical reasons as well as normative ones. I have to agree with Jachtenfuchs' argument that holes in an explanation should not be just filled up with normative arguments that cannot be proven. As I have argued before, future research should let go of the constructivist- rationalist divide and focus on the information that the empirical evidence illuminates and look at the way the two approaches interact with and complement each other. It should be kept in mind that there might not be just one theory that explains all decision making, because the context of every decision is different. Therefore it is important to first determine the context and then analyse the decision. The Danish case underlines this view: the importance that the Danish government placed on the potential threat was not seen as imminent by most other member states and therefore it was not prioritized by them in 1997. Two years later, the Kosovo conflict showed that the Danish approach was indeed justified: the threat of destabilization proved to be very much present. This changed the context of the 1997 decision completely, with the result that during the 1999 Helsinki council the EU member states decided to open up the negotiation process to all CEECs. This example shows that, when analysing the (international) decision making process, the context cannot be forgotten.

Bibliography

- Archer, C., 'Nordic Swans and Baltic Cygnets.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 34, 1 (1999) 47-71
- Arnold, E. (RV), *Folketing Debate on ICG*, (May 28, 1997)
- Asmus R. D. and Robert C. Nurick, 'NATO enlargement and the Baltic States.' *Survival*, 38, 2 (1996) 121-142
- Asmus, R. D., 'Europe's Eastern Promise. Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement.' *Foreign Affairs*, January/ Februari issue (2008) 95-106
- Baldwin, R., Joseph Francois and Richard Portes, 'The costs and benefits of Eastern Enlargement: the impact on the EU and Central Europe.' *Economic Policy*, April issue (1997) 125-176
- Baun, M., 'Eastern Enlargement', in Laura Cram, Desmond Dinan, and Neill Nugent (eds), *Developments in the European Union* (Macmillan Press Ltd 1999)
- Bengtsson, R., Ole Elgström and Jonas Tallberg, 'Silencer or Amplifier? The European Union Presidency and the Nordic Countries', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 27, 3 (2004) 311-334
- Bergman, A., 'Adjacent Internationalism. The Concept of Solidarity and Post-Cold War Nordic-Baltic Relations.' *Cooperation and Conflict* 41, 1 (2006) 73-97.
- Bergman, A., 'Post-Cold War Shifts in Swedish and Finnish Security Policies: The compatibility of non-alignment and participation in EU led conflict prevention' *ECPR conference, University of Uppsala* (2004)
- Blair, T., *Prime Minister's Speech to the Polish Stock Exchange in Warsaw*. (October 6, 2000) online: <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/page2373.asp>
- Bloom, E. T., 'Development of the Arctic Council.' *The American Journal of International Law*, 93, 3, (1999) 712-722
- Boeri T. and Herbert Brücker, 'Eastern Enlargement and EU Labour Markets: Perceptions, Challenges and Opportunities.' *IZA discussion paper series*, 256 (2001)
- Breuss, F., 'Benefits and Dangers of EU Enlargement.' *Empirica*, 29, (2002) 245-274
- Brinkley, D., 'Democratic Enlargement: The Clinton Doctrine.' *Foreign Policy*, 106, (1997) 110-127
- British Government White Paper, 1996, *A partnership of Nations*, March 12th
- Browning, C. S., 'Branding nordicity models, identity and the decline of exceptionalism.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 42, 1, (2007) 27-51
- Caporaso, J., 'Regional integration theory: understanding our past and anticipating our future', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 1 (1998) 1-16
- Christiansen, N. F., 'The Danish 'No' to Maastricht.' *New Left Review* (1992) 97-101
- Christiansen, T., Gerda Falkner & Knud Erik Jørgensen, 'Theorizing EU Treaty Reform: beyond diplomacy and bargaining', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 1 (2002) 12-32
- Cohen, R., 'Pacific unions: a reappraisal of the theory that 'democracies do not go to war with each other'', *Review of international Studies*, 20, 3 (1994) 207-223

Correspondent in Brussel, 'Het zijn geen rechtstaten, ze horen er niet bij!' *Trouw* (October 31, 1997)

Daniels, P., 'Italy in European Union' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33, 35 (1999) 107-112

Degn, H., *Debate in the Folketing on the Danish East support* (November 25, 1993)

Deutscher Bundestag 1999, BT-Drs. 14/396: 4

Due Madsen, A. and Morten Lobedanz Sørensen, 'Economic consequences for Denmark of EU enlargement.' *International Conference on Policy Modelling* (Brussels 2002)

Eerste Kamer der Staten Generaal, *Europadebat – State Secretary Michiel Patijn* (November 11, 1997)

Eilen, Suomen Ulkopoliittikan Asiakirja- Arkisto ja Kronologia, *Vuosi 1997 Suomen Ulkopoliitikassa*.
<http://www.eilen.fi/fi/chronology/1997/>

Euronews press release, *Irony as organised crime prosecutor arrested for corruption in Romania*, (November 21, 2014)

European Commission, *Agenda 2000. For a stronger and wider Europe* (2007)

European Council press release, Lithuania to adopt the Euro on 1 January 2015 (July 27, 2014)

European Council, 'Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union', *Official Journal of the European Union* (2008)

European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency* (Copenhagen, June 21-22, 1993)

European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency* (Luxembourg, December 12-13, 1997)

European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency* (Strasbourg, December 8-9, 1989)

Fierke, K. M. and Antje Wiener, 'Constructing institutional interests: EU and NATO enlargement.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6, 5, (1999). 721-742

Foucault, M., *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. (Routledge 1989) – first published in 1972

Franklin, M. N., Cees Van der Eijk, and Michael Marsh, 'Referendum outcomes and trust in government: Public support for Europe in the wake of Maastricht.' *West European Politics* 18, 3 (1995) 101-117

Friis, L., 'Approaching the 'third half' of EU grand bargaining-the post-negotiation phase of the 'Europe Agreement game'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 2, (1998a) 322-338.

Friis, L., 'The Danish Presidency: 'Wonderful Copenhagen'', *Journal of Common Market Studies* (2003) 49-51

Friis, L., 'The End of the Beginning' of Eastern Enlargement-Luxembourg Summit and Agenda-setting.' *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 2, 7 (1998b) 1-15

Gaudissart M. A. and Adinda Sinnaeve, 'The Role of the White Paper in the Preparation of the Eastern enlargement', in Marc Maresceau (ed), *Enlarging the European Union. Relations between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe* (Longman 1997)

Gstöhl, S., 'Scandinavia and Switzerland: small, successful and stubborn towards the EU.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 529-549

- Haahr, J. H., 'European Integration and the Left in Britain and Denmark', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 30, 1 (1992) 77-100
- Haar, J. H., "Our Danish Democracy": Community, People and Democracy in the Danish Debate on the Common Currency.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38, 1 (2003) 27-43
- Haas, E. B., 'The Challenge of Regionalism', *International Organization*, 12, (1958) 440-458
- Haas, E. B., *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950-1957* (Stanford University press, 1958)
- Hall, P. A. and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, 'Political Science and the three New Institutionalisms', *MPIFG Discussion Paper*, 96, 6 (1996)
- Harris, J. et al, 'If this was the rejection election, where do mainstream politics go', *The Guardian* (May 28, 2014)
- Hoffman, S., 'Correspondence – Back to the Future, Part II: International Relations Theory and Post-Cold War Europe', *International Security*, 15, 2 (1990) 191-192
- Hoffmann, S., 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the case of Western Europe', *Daedalus*, 95, 3 (1966) 862-915
- Jachtenfuchs, M., 'Deepening and widening integration theory' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4 (2002) 650-657
- Jonathan Holslag, *De kracht van het Paradijs: Hoe Europa kan overleven in de Aziatische Eeuw* (Bezige Bij Antwerpen 2014)
- Kallianiotis, I. N., 'The Generative Motive of European Union and its Latest Struggle for Survival' *International Journal of Business & Commerce*, 1, 6 (2012)
- Katznelson, I. and Barry R. Weingast (eds), *Preferences and Situations. Points of intersection between Rational Choice and Historical Institutionalism* (Russel Sage Foundation New York 2005)
- Kelstrup, M., 'Denmark's relation to the EU. A history of dualism and pragmatism' in Lee Miles (ed), *Denmark and the European Union* (Routledge 2014) 14-30
- Kluus, M., 'Europe's Eastern expansion and the reinscription of otherness in East- Central Europe.' *Progress in Human Geography*, 28, 4 (2004) 472-489
- Koivurova T. and David L. VanderZwaag, 'The Arctic Council at 10 years: retrospect and prospects.' *University of British Columbia Law Review*, 40, 1, (2007) 121-194
- Lagerspetz, M., 'How many Nordic Countries? Possibilities and limits of geopolitical identity construction.' *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 38, 1 (2003) 49-61
- Larsen, H., 'British and Danish European Policies in the 1990s: a discourse approach', *European Journal*
- Larsen, H., 'Danish CFSP policy in the Post-Cold War Period. Continuity or Change?' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 35, 1 (2000) 37-63
- Launey, G. de, 'Croatia and the EU- what difference has a year made', *BBC News* (September 25 2014)

- Lawler, P., 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and European Union.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 35, 4 (1997) 565-595
- Lindberg, L. N., *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration* (Stanford University Press 1963)
- Ludlow, P., *The Making of the New Europe. The European Councils in Brussels and Copenhagen 2002.* (EuroComment 2004)
- Maresceau, M., 'Pre-accession' in Marise Cremona (ed.), *Enlargement of the European Union* (Oxford University Press 2003) 9-42
- Mearsheimer, J. J., 'Back to the Future: instability in Europe after the Cold War', *International Security*, 15, 1 (1990) 5-56
- Mayhew, A., *Recreating Europe. The European Union's Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe.* (Cambridge University Press 1998)
- Milgrom P. and John Roberts, 'Bargaining Costs, Influence Costs and the Organization of Economic Activity' in James Alt and Kenneth Shepsle (eds.), *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy* (Cambridge University Press 1990). 57-89.
- Mitrany, D., *A Working Peace System* (Quadrangle Books 1966)
- Moravcsik, A. 'Liberalism and International Relations Theory', *Harvard University Center for European Studies*, Paper, no. 52 (1993b) 1-54
- Moravcsik, A., 'Did Power Politics Cause European Integration? Realist Theory Meets Qualitative Methods', *Security Studies*, 22, 4, (2013) 773-790
- Moravcsik, A., 'Is something rotten in Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6, 4, (1999) 669-681
- Moravcsik, A., 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, 4, (1993a) 473-524
- Moravcsik, A. and Milada Anna Vachudova, 'Preferences, power and equilibrium. The causes and consequences of EU enlargement' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches.* (Routledge, 2005) 314-339
- Moravcsik, A. and Milada Anna Vachudova, 'National interests, state power and EU enlargement', *Perspectives* (2002) pp. 21- 31
- Mouritzen, H., 'Lessons for Alliance Theory', in Hans Mouritzen (ed), *Bordering Russia. Theory and Practice for Europe's Baltic Rim* (Ashgate 1998) 91-107
- Nelson, B. F., and Alexander Stubb, *The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration* (Palgrave Macmillan 2003)
- Netherlands' Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hans van Mierlo, *Verslag Algemene Raad van 8 december jl.* (December 9, 1997)
- Nielsen, H.K (SF), *Opening debate in Folketing* (October 10 1997)
- Nissen, S., 'Who Wants Enlargement of the EU? Support for Enlargement among Elites and Citizens in the European Union' *Sociologický Časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, (2003) 757-772

Non-paper by Denmark and Sweden, *The launching of the Enlargement Process* (November 27, 1997)

Nugent N., 'Introduction' in Neill Nugent (ed.), *European Union Enlargement*. (Palgrave 2004)

O'Brennan, J., *The Eastern Enlargement of the European Union* (Routledge 2006)

OECD press release, *Economic Survey of Poland* (March 10, 2014)

Østergård, U., 'The Danish Path to Modernity.' *Thesis Eleven*, 77, 1 (2004) 25-43

Parker, N., 'Differentiating, Collaborating, Outdoing: Nordic Identity and Marginality in the Contemporary World.' *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 9, 3 (2002) 355-381

Pedersen, R. B., 'Danish foreign policy activism: Differences in kind or degree?' *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47, 3 (2012) 331-349

Petersen N. and Christian Thune (eds), *Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Arbog 1993*, (DJOF Publishing Copenhagen 1994)

Petersen, J., 'Nordic Peace Diplomacy: Looking Back, Moving Forward'. *Speech to the Conference on Nordic Peace Diplomacy* (Copenhagen February 24, 2005)

Petersen, N. H., *Speech at Conference on Security Cooperation and Integration in the Baltic Sea Area*, (Riga August 25, 1996)

Petersen, N. H., *Speech at the Institute of European Affairs* (Dublin October 28, 1994)

Phinnemore, D., 'Beyond 25—the changing face of EU enlargement: commitment, conditionality and the Constitutional Treaty.' *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 8, 1 (2006) 7-26

Piedrafita S. and José I. Torreblanca, 'The three logics of EU enlargement: Interest, Identities and Arguments.' *politique européenne*, 15 (2005) 29-59

Piedrafita, S., 'In spite of the costs? Moral constraints on Spain's enlargement policy' in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 73-101

Pierson, P., 'The path to European Integration: a Historical Institutional analysis, *Comparative Political Studies*, 29, 2 (1996) 123-163

Pop, V., 'Italy seen as corrupt as Greece, Romania and Bulgaria', *EU Observer* (December 3, 2014)

Rasmussen, A. F., *Opening debate in the Folketing*, October 7, 1993

Rasmussen, P. 'Denmark approaches a change of government' *Executive Intelligence Review*, 19, 18, (1992) 40-42

Rasmussen, P. N., *Debate on the international development and especially the development in Europe* (February 21, 1995)

Rasmussen, P. N., Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign- political situation (May 26, 1996)

Rasmussen, P. N., Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign political situation (May 30, 1996)

Rasmussen, P. N., *Folketing debate on the domestic and foreign-political situation* (February 21, 1995)

Rasmussen, P. N., *New Year's Speech*. (Statsministeriet, 2000)

- Rasmussen, P. N., *Opening statement to the Conference in Regional Cooperation in an Enlarged Europe* (Statsministeriet April 19, 1999)
- Rasmussen, P. N., *Speech at the OSCE Foreign Minister meeting*. (Statsministeriet December 18, 1997)
- Rasmussen, P. N., *Speech: Our Common Europe for the Future* (Statsministeriet 2001)
- Reuters press release, *France against Romania, Bulgaria joining Schengen Zone* (September 30, 2013)
- Riddervold M. and Helene Sjursen, 'Between Security and Human Rights: Denmark and the Enlargement of the EU', *Enlargement in Perspective* (Arena, Oslo , 2004)
- Riddervold M. and Helene Sjursen, 'The importance of solidarity. Denmark as promotor of enlargement' in Helene Sjursen, *Questioning EU Enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 126-162
- Ringmose, J. and Sten Rynning, 'The impeccable Ally? Denmark, NATO, and the uncertain Future of Top Tier Membership.' *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook* (2008) 55-84
- Risse- Kappen, T., 'Approaches to the study of European Politics – introduction', *ECSA Review*, 7, 2, (1999) 2-9
- Risse- Kappen, T., 'Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34, 1 (1996) 53-80
- Rosamond, B., *Theories of European Integration* (St. Martens Press 2000)
- Rosato, S., 'Europe's Troubles. Power Politics and the State of the European Project', *International Security*, 35, 4 (2011) 5-86
- Ruano, L., 'Institutions, Policy communities and EU enlargement. British, Spanish and Central European accession negotiation in the agricultural sector' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*. (Routledge 2005) 404 - 435
- Sandholtz W. and Alec Stone Sweet (eds.), *European Integration and Supranational Governance* (Oxford University press 1998)
- Sandholtz, W. and John Zysman, '1992: recasting the European bargain', *World Politics*, 41, 1, (1989) 95-128
- Scharpf, F. W., *Games Real Actors Play* (Boulder CO: Westview Press 1997)
- Schieder, S., Rachel Folz and Simon Musekamp, 'The Social Construction of European Solidarity: Germany and France in the EU policy towards the states of Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific (ACP) and Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).' *Paper prepared for UACES conference 'Exchanging ideas on Europe 2008'* (Edinburgh, 1-3 September 2008)
- Schimmelfennig, F. and Ulrich Sedelmeier, 'Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9, 4, (2002) 500-528
- Schimmelfennig, F., 'The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', *International Organization*, 55, 1 (2001) 47-80

- Schimmelfennig, F., 'The double puzzle of EU enlargement: Liberal norms, rhetorical action, and the decision to expand to the East.' *Paper presented at the sixth Biennial International Conference Pittsburgh*, (June 3-5, 1999)
- Schmidt, V. A., 'Approaches to the study of European Politics – introduction', *ECSA Review*, 7, 2 (1999) 2-9
- Schmitter, P. C., 'Neo-Neofunctionalism' in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford University Press 2004) 45-72
- Schneider, C., *Conflict, Negotiation and European Union Enlargement*. (Cambridge University Press 2009)
- Setälä, M., 'Referendums in Western Europe – a Wave of Direct Democracy?' *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 22, 4 (1999) 327-340
- Shepsle, K. A. and Barry R. Weingast, 'The Institutional Foundations of Committee Power', *The American Political Science Review*, 81, 1, (1987) 85-104
- Shepsle, K. A., 'Studying Institutions: Some Lessons from the Rational Choice Approach', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1, 2, (1989) 131-147
- Sjursen H. and Børge Romsloe, 'Protecting the idea of Europe. France and Enlargement' in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 216-249
- Sjursen, H., 'Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU Enlargement Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 3 (2002) 491- 513
- Skålnes, L. S., '10. Geopolitics and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union' in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.), *The politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*. (Routledge 2005) 340-368
- Sofia News Agency, *Belgium: Bulgaria, Romania EU entry was a Mistake, Lesson* (March 3, 2010)
- Stainforth, T., "'The Danish Paradox' Intolerance in the Land of Perpetual Compromise.' *Review of European and Russian Affairs*, 5, 1 (2009) 83-106
- Summaries of EU Legislation:
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/enlargement/2004_and_2007_enlargement/l60001_en.htm
- Sutherland, J., 'Bulgaria made wait for Schengen access', *Euroviews* (April 22, 2014)
- Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 'Preventing Violent Conflict-Swedish Policy for the 21st Century.' *Government Communication 2000/01*, 2 (Stockholm 2001)
- Transparency International, *Corruption perception index* (December 3, 2014)
- Tsebilis, G. and Geoffrey Garret, 'The Institutional Foundations of Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism in the European Union', *International Organization*, 55, 2, (2001). 357-390
- Tunander, O., 'Post-Cold War Europe: Synthesis of Bipolar Friend- Foe Structure and a Hierarchic Cosmos- Chaos structure?' in Ola Tunander, Pavel K. Baev and Victoria Ingrid Einagel (eds), *Geopolitics in Post-Cold War Europe*. (International Peace Research Institute 1997) 17-44

- Venstre MP, *Debate on the international development and especially the development in Europe*, (February 21, 1995)
- Villaume, P., 'Confronting the 'Small State Syndrome': Danish Post-Cold War Foreign Policy and the Use of Cold War History.' in Juhana Aunesluoma and Pauli Kettunen (eds), *The Cold War and the Politics of History*. (Edita Helsinki 2008) 37-61
- Waever, O., 'Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War.' *International Affairs*, 68,1 (1992) 77-102
- Walt, S. M., 'Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power', *International Security*, 9, 4 (1985) 3-43
- Waltz, K. N., 'The stability of a bipolar world.' *Daedalus* (1964) 881-909
- Zaborowski, M., 'More than simply expanding markets. Germany and EU enlargement' in Helene Sjursen (ed), *Questioning EU enlargement* (Routledge 2006) 162-186