

---

## 17. The Nordic countries and EU security policy: convergent or divergent agendas?

---

*Pernille Rieker\**

### I. Introduction

While the Nordic countries are similar in many respects, they have had different positions on and approaches to the European Security and Defence Policy and the European Union's security policy in general. These differences have partially been a result of their different formal relations with the EU: two are full members—Finland and Sweden; one is a member with an 'opt-out' in security matters—Denmark; and one is an 'associated' member—Norway.<sup>1</sup> Also, and perhaps more importantly, these differences are a result of different national security policy traditions: there are two neutral or non-aligned states—Finland and Sweden; and two are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Denmark and Norway.

During the cold war period, the security policies of the Nordic countries were often understood as creating a 'Nordic balance': a combination of policies that aimed at preserving a balance between the two superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> While the end of the cold war paved the way for a different and more complex security approach, it took some time before the Nordic countries responded to this new security context. Despite their differences and owing to their geographical location, they all continued to maintain a rather traditional security policy, emphasizing either territorial defence or the military aspects of security for longer than most of their European counterparts.<sup>3</sup> Today, important changes seem to have taken place in all of the Nordic countries in the direction

<sup>1</sup> Iceland, which, like Norway, is 'associated' with the EU through the European Economic Area and is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is not considered in this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> This concept was developed by Arne Olav Brundtland as describing the Nordic countries' security policies during the cold war period. For further detail see Brundtland, A. O., 'Nordisk balanse før og nå' [The Nordic balance past and present], *Internasjonal Politikk*, no. 5 (1966), pp. 491–541; and Brundtland, A. O., *The Nordic Balance and its Possible Relevance for Europe* (Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt: Oslo, 1981). Finland's close relationship with the Soviet Union and Norway's strong Atlantic orientation was of particular importance here. See also the Introduction to this volume.

<sup>3</sup> While Denmark initiated a transformation of its military forces in the early 1990s, the 'dominant security discourse' (as expressed by the Danish Ministry of Defence) still continues to be focused on the military aspects of security.

\* This chapter was written with financial assistance from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence. The author would like to thank Kristin Marie Haugevik for her assistance.

of a more comprehensive security approach. These changes seem to have been initiated or accelerated in response to the European integration process.<sup>4</sup>

The argument of this chapter is twofold. First, the Nordic countries' security approaches, which have traditionally diverged, are increasingly converging and that this process started with the end of the cold war. Second, this convergence must be seen in relation to the European integration process and the development of EU security policy. It is this process of 'Europeanization' that is the focus of the chapter.

Section II starts with a clarification of what is meant by 'EU security policy'. While some look only at the ESDP process, a broader approach is advocated here that also includes the Common Foreign and Security Policy, the EU's counter-terrorism efforts and the European Commission's activities in the area of conflict prevention. Section III reviews developments in the Nordic countries' security approaches since the early 1990s and discusses whether and to what extent it is possible to argue that they have been Europeanized. In particular, it examines the impact of three important changes in the EU: the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht and the establishment of the CFSP;<sup>5</sup> the 1998 Anglo-French St Malo summit as a milestone in the creation of the ESDP; and the adoption of the European Security Strategy (ESS), a constitution for the EU and the concretization of what is here called 'a comprehensive European security policy' in 2003–2004. Section IV makes some overall comparisons on the basis of these findings and draws some conclusions.

## II. EU security policy: more than the European Security and Defence Policy

It is no longer sufficient to look only at the ESDP when discussing the EU's security policy. In fact, the ESDP is, at least as it is most often defined, only one part of the EU's security policy. It is difficult or perhaps impossible to isolate the ESDP not only from the rest of the EU's foreign and security policy, but also from the EU's activities with regard to external relations and the fight against terrorism. The ESS, adopted in December 2003,<sup>6</sup> provides a much better indication than any previous EU document of what the Union's security policy is all about: a comprehensive approach to security.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Rieker, P., 'Europeanisation of Nordic security: the EU and the changing security identities of the Nordic states', Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo, Department of Political Science, 2004; and Rieker, P., 'Europeanisation of Nordic security? The EU and the changing security identities of the Nordic states', *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 39, no. 4 (2004), pp. 369–92.

<sup>5</sup> The Treaty on European Union (Treaty of Maastricht) was signed on 29 July 1992 and entered into force on 1 Nov. 1993. The consolidated text of the treaty as amended is available at URL <<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/index.htm>>.

<sup>6</sup> Council of the European Union, 'A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy', Brussels, 12 Dec. 2003, URL <[http://ue.eu.int/cms3\\_fo/showPage.ASP?id=266](http://ue.eu.int/cms3_fo/showPage.ASP?id=266)>.

<sup>7</sup> Rieker, Doctoral thesis (note 4).

This indicates that the discussion about EU security policy cannot be separated from a discussion about the concept of security. In fact, whether or not one agrees that the EU has developed a distinct approach to security depends on how one defines 'security'. While there is general agreement that there is a relationship between integration and security, those who defend a more traditional and more militarily focused definition of security still tend to ignore the EU as an important security actor. The EU's persistent lack of any military power that is comparable to that of the USA makes it difficult for these traditionalists to characterize the EU in this way.<sup>8</sup> For those who understand security in a broader sense, however, the situation will look quite different. For them, the EU's potential to coordinate diverse tools of security policy—economic, political and military—makes it one of the most important security actors of the post-cold war period.<sup>9</sup> Not surprisingly, it is also the latter view that is emphasized by the EU itself (represented by both the Commission and the Council of the European Union) through its official documents and speeches.

While existing multilateral security policy frameworks, such as NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), have also adapted to the new security context, the most interesting development has occurred within the EU. This is because the EU is the only multilateral framework without a security policy legacy from the cold war period. While this may be understood as reflecting a certain reluctance by the member states to relinquish national sovereignty in the traditional security area, it is precisely this reluctance that seems to have facilitated the development of a somewhat 'innovative' approach to security—an approach that emphasizes the value of combining different security policy tools.

What, then, is the precise content of this comprehensive EU security policy? Is it more than just wishful thinking and declarations? There are in fact many concrete manifestations of this policy, which are looked at here under the categories of external and internal security policy. The most obvious examples of a comprehensive *external* security policy are the EU's enlargement process, the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts, and the increased focus on civilian and military 'integrated missions' within the ESDP framework, which include the missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Examples

<sup>8</sup> Bull, H., 'Civilian power Europe: a contradiction in terms?', ed. L. Tsoukalis, *The European Community: Past, Present and Future* (Blackwell: London, 1983); Walt, S. M., 'The renaissance of security studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 35 (1999), pp. 211–39; and Hill, C., 'The capability–expectation gap, or conceptualizing Europe's international role', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 31, no. 3 (1993), pp. 305–28.

<sup>9</sup> Wæver, O., 'Identity, integration and security: solving the sovereignty puzzle in EU studies', *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 48, no. 2 (1995), pp. 46–86; Sjørnsen, H., 'New forms of security policy in Europe', ARENA Working Paper 01/4, ARENA–Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Oslo, 2001, URL <<http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/>>; and Manners, I., 'European [security] Union: from existential threat to ontological security', COPRI Working Paper 2002/5, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI), Copenhagen, 2002, URL <<http://www.diis.dk/sw3416.asp>>.

of a comprehensive *internal* security policy are the various efforts made in both the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) and European Community (EC) pillars of the EU to combat terrorism and to provide civilian protection.<sup>10</sup> In addition, there is a growing recognition among EU actors that the internal–external divide is becoming less sharp, making it appropriate to use external tools for internal purposes and vice versa. For example, conflict prevention and international crisis management in third countries are seen *inter alia* as a means to reduce the threat of terrorism and the spread of international crime to EU countries, while instruments taken from JHA and other internal community policies constitute important elements of the civilian parts of EU conflict prevention efforts in third countries.<sup>11</sup> The adoption of the ESS is also a manifestation of this comprehensive approach to security: it shows that the EU, despite the lack of a coherent and clearly defined common foreign and security policy, does have a distinct approach to security that is implemented by both the Commission and the Council, and that includes—in addition to the CFSP—parts of both the EC and JHA.<sup>12</sup>

Some have questioned the EU's capacity to deliver an efficient coordinated approach to security, and it has been argued that bridges between the different policy areas are still lacking.<sup>13</sup> However, both the member states and the EU itself have expressed their wish to strengthen the EU's powers in this area further.<sup>14</sup> The events of 11 September 2001 and the subsequent emphasis on the need to combat terrorism have also further favoured such an approach.<sup>15</sup> Several of the proposals in the draft Constitutional Treaty put forward by the European Convention,<sup>16</sup> such as a common foreign minister, the Solidarity Clause,<sup>17</sup> and structured cooperation in the area of security and defence with the creation of

<sup>10</sup> These efforts include the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, the common arrest warrant, Europol and Eurojust's joint investigation teams, the Solidarity Clause of the Constitutional Treaty and various initiatives to coordinate national civilian protection measures.

<sup>11</sup> On conflict prevention and crisis management see chapter 11 in this volume.

<sup>12</sup> For a more detailed presentation of this understanding of the EU as a security actor see Rieker, Doctoral thesis (note 4), chapter 2.

<sup>13</sup> Den Boer, M. and Monar, J., '11 September and the challenge of global terrorism to the EU as a security actor', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 40, supplement 1 (Sep. 2002), pp. 11–28.

<sup>14</sup> EU Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission, 'Improving the coherence and effectiveness of the European Union action in the field of conflict prevention', Report to the Nice European Council on Conflict Prevention, document 14088/00, Brussels, 30 Nov. 2000, URL <<http://register.consilium.eu.int/pdf/en/00/st14/14088en0.pdf>>; and Council of the European Union, 'Draft European Union programme for the prevention of violent conflicts', Prepared for the Göteborg European Council, document 9537/1/01, June 2001, URL <<http://ue.eu.int/>>.

<sup>15</sup> Saryusz-Wolski, J., 'Looking to the future', ed. A. Missiroli, 'Enlargement and European defence after 11 September', Chaillot Paper no. 53, EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, 2002, URL <<http://www.iss-eu.org/>>, pp. 55–69.

<sup>16</sup> Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe, European Convention, Brussels, 18 July 2003, URL <<http://european-convention.eu.int/DraftTreaty.asp>>. The Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe was signed on 19 Oct. 2004 but has not been ratified. The text of the treaty is available at URL <[http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/index_en.htm)> and selected articles are reproduced in the appendix in this volume.

<sup>17</sup> See chapter 15 in this volume.

multinational battle groups, also indicate a clear will to embed a coherent and comprehensive approach to security in the future functioning of the EU.<sup>18</sup>

### III. Nordic countries and their relationship to the EU as a security actor

The policies of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden and their relationship to the EU are examined here with regard to the three major changes since the early 1990s that have been most crucial in making the EU an increasingly independent security actor. These changes were: first, the establishment of a political union and a common foreign and security policy; second, the development of a European security and defence policy and an EU competence in international crisis management; and third, the adoption of the ESS and the emergence of a comprehensive European security policy.<sup>19</sup>

#### **The Common Foreign and Security Policy**

The reluctance towards the European integration process that was felt in Norway and Sweden in the early 1990s was partly owing to security policy considerations. In Norway it was feared that a European political union with a common foreign and security policy would weaken NATO, and hence Norway's position in the European system. In Sweden the EU's security policy ambitions were seen as incompatible with the doctrine of Swedish neutrality. Despite this general scepticism, parts of the political elite in both countries recognized the importance of the integration process and began to work for a closer relationship with the EU.

Once Sweden had submitted its application for membership of the EU, an intense domestic debate concerning neutrality took place, and some change in the understanding of this concept was perceived as necessary in order to permit membership. While the first change in the national security doctrine was made in 1992, the debate concerning the need for more radical change continued after Sweden joined the EU, in 1995. In addition, there was also a greater focus on the need to reorganize Swedish national defence forces.

Norway's security policy approach was perceived in the early 1990s to be compatible with EU membership, but at this time NATO membership and transatlanticism dominated Norwegian security policy. After the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht, however, the Norwegian political elite wished to strengthen their country's relationship with the EU. The dominant security discourse also changed towards a more balanced view of the EU and NATO, emphasizing the EU's role as a soft security actor, with a special emphasis on

<sup>18</sup> The negative results of the referendums in France and the Netherlands in May and June 2005 mean that the entry into force of the Constitutional Treaty has been postponed.

<sup>19</sup> For a more detailed analysis of this process see Rieker, Doctoral thesis (note 4), chapters 4–7.

its role in the Barents Euro-Arctic Council.<sup>20</sup> While the majority of the Norwegian political leadership was largely in favour of Norway's membership of the EU, the negative result of the referendum in November 1994 kept Norway formally outside the integration process. However, in the years leading up to and following the referendum, Norway has managed to achieve a close relationship with the EU, resulting in several agreements and cooperation arrangements—such as the 1992 European Economic Area Agreement, accession to the Schengen Treaty in 1996 and association arrangements with the ESDP—and thus exposing Norway to even further Europeanization.

The Finnish political leadership was in general far more favourably inclined to the integration process than its Norwegian and Swedish counterparts. With the end of cold war constraints, EU membership was seen not as a threat to Finland's national sovereignty or freedom of action but as a way for Finland to confirm its long-repressed Western identity. The establishment of a political union made EU membership interesting with reference to security political considerations. Membership of the EU was actually seen as a possible substitute for Finland's traditional policy of neutrality. While the old interpretation of Finnish neutrality was abandoned and the EU was recognized as an actor in security policy, there was no national debate about possible change in the role of the Finnish defence forces at that time. The rationale for Finland's EU membership continued to be based on traditional security policy arguments and was seen as a complement to a national, independent and credible defence.

While tendencies for increased interest in the EU could be identified at the time in the three non-members of the EU—Finland, Norway and Sweden; albeit for different reasons—the opposite seemed to hold for the longer-standing EU member Denmark. In the early 1990s the Danish political leadership actually supported the Treaty of Maastricht and the establishment of a political union. The people's rejection of the treaty in June 1992, however, led to a (self-imposed) opt-out of Denmark from important parts of the integration process, including the security dimension, before the treaty's acceptance in a referendum in May 1993.<sup>21</sup> This meant that there were few references to the EU in the Danish security discourse, and the EU continued to be perceived as primarily an economic project. Despite this weak interest in the EU's security dimension, the Danish security discourse and policy underwent important changes in the early 1990s. The reorganization of the national defence forces was initiated earlier in Denmark than in most other European states; but this should be seen as an early response to the end of the cold war rather than as an effect of the Treaty of Maastricht. Indirectly, however, the initial rejection of the Treaty of Maastricht may have contributed to this change. The opt-out made it even more important for Denmark to be a 'good pupil' in the new NATO (in which international crisis management now was becoming the major task), as this was the sole

<sup>20</sup> See tables I.1–I.4 in the introduction to this volume.

<sup>21</sup> See chapter 1 in this volume.

arena within which Denmark could participate in terms of an integrated approach to European security.<sup>22</sup>

This shows that the Treaty of Maastricht and the establishment of a political union had an impact on the changes in the Nordic countries' approach to security in 1992–95. The degree and the character of Europeanization have varied, however, and historical and geopolitical differences have arguably contributed to these differences. During this period there was a recognition in all four countries of the EU's security dimension, but this was interpreted differently in each country. As argued above, the impact was most evident in Finland and Sweden, where it led to changes in these countries' national security policy doctrines and a move away from the formulation and content of their traditional neutral orientation.

### **The European Security and Defence Policy**

The framework for the establishment of a European security and defence policy was set out in the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam.<sup>23</sup> For Sweden a future security and defence dimension of the EU was particularly problematic; and, once inside the EU, Sweden strove to use its influence to prevent this process from developing into a collective defence arrangement. With support from Finland, Sweden managed to have the Petersberg Tasks included in the Treaty of Amsterdam in a way that effectively limited the collective European ambition in crisis management.<sup>24</sup> While this was perceived as a successful policy action in both countries, the fact that the Petersberg definition covers tasks that might go beyond traditional peacekeeping with regard to the use of military force also indicates an important change in the security identity of the two countries. This change was most important for Sweden, which was more attached to a policy of neutrality than was Finland.<sup>25</sup>

However, the inclusion of the Petersberg tasks in the Treaty of Amsterdam also made it easier for Denmark to accept and support the EU's security dimension. This is evident in the Danish security discourse at that time. Even so, there was no sign of Denmark's defence opt-out being abandoned. The Danish Defence Commission's report of 1998 emphasized that the country's relationship to the EU continued to be based on arguments linked to economic

<sup>22</sup> Frantzen, H. A., 'NATO and peace support operations 1991–1999: policies and doctrines, a study of NATO and Britain, Canada, and Denmark', Doctoral thesis, University of London, King's College, 2003.

<sup>23</sup> The Treaty of Amsterdam amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties Establishing the European Communities and Certain Related Acts was signed on 2 Oct. 1997 and entered into force on 1 May 1999. The text of the treaty is available at URL <[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/treaties\\_other.htm](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/treaties_other.htm)>.

<sup>24</sup> The Petersberg Tasks were agreed in 1992 to strengthen the operational role of the Western European Union. They include humanitarian intervention and evacuation operations, peacekeeping and crisis management, including peace making. See chapter 6 in this volume.

<sup>25</sup> This change has recently been confirmed with the creation of a Nordic battle group (with the participation of Norway) as the Swedish and Finnish contributions to an EU rapid-reaction force.

cooperation and free market structures.<sup>26</sup> While Denmark held on to its opt-out strategy, this development in the EU led to the opposite strategy in Norway. After the Anglo-French St Malo summit of December 1998, the Norwegian Government really started to fear marginalization in European security, and several attempts were made to achieve some form of association with European security policy. This is why the Norwegian Government proposed a significant contribution to the EU's 1999 Helsinki Headline Goal—a policy that has been referred to as a 'troops for influence' strategy.<sup>27</sup>

As argued above, Finland, Norway and Sweden have been slow to transform their national defence forces. While the changes in the Danish defence forces were a (rather immediate) reaction to the end of the cold war, this was not the case in the three other countries. These countries focused on possible negative developments to the east, and this was used to legitimize the continued emphasis on significant territorial defence capacity. Not until the late 1990s, after the ESDP was launched, were concrete proposals for transforming the national defence forces presented in Finland, Norway and Sweden. Although the ESDP process is not the only explanation, it seems to have at least accelerated the transformation processes in all three countries. In Norway and Sweden the important changes that have been introduced into the defence structures in recent years have been followed by a change in the dominant domestic security discourses. In Finland, however, a more traditional security discourse has been retained and any alterations were legitimized by reference to their importance for bolstering the Finnish national defence capacity. As argued above, Denmark undertook such a transformation of its defence forces at an earlier stage; yet the launch of the ESDP also had some impact here. In fact, the establishment of the ESDP led to a discussion about the value of the Danish defence opt-out, focusing especially on the risk that Denmark could become marginalized within the European security system.

This shows that the development towards a European security and defence policy has influenced the national security discourse in all the Nordic countries, but that differences in each nation's relationship with the EU and its security policy traditions have generated differences between national responses. In Norway and Sweden the emergence of the ESDP accelerated the move towards modernization of the defence forces, also involving some changes in the conception of security. In Finland it led to greater emphasis on the international dimension, but combined with a continued traditional view of security. In

<sup>26</sup> Danish Defence Commission of 1997, *Fremtidens forsvar* [Defence for the future] (Forsvarsministeriet: Copenhagen, 1998), URL <<http://forsvaret.dk/FMN/Publikationer/>>.

<sup>27</sup> Græger, N., 'Norway and the EU's defence dimension: a "troops for influence" strategy', eds N. Græger, H. Larsen and H. Ojanen, *The ESDP and the Nordic Countries: Four Variations on a Theme* (Ulkopoliittinen Instituutti: Helsinki, 2002), pp. 33–89. While most Norwegian politicians have accepted this strategy, Norway's participation in the EU's new Headline Goal 2010, which includes multinational battle groups operating on the demand of the UN or the OSCE, is seen as more problematic. Some argue that such participation contravenes Norway's constitution, while others argue that Norway's non-participation in the EU's decision-making bodies makes participation in such an integrated force difficult to defend; see chapter 19 in this volume.



Denmark, which had already undergone such internal changes, it led to a debate on the value of its defence opt-out.

### **The development of a comprehensive approach to security**

The adoption of the European Security Strategy in December 2003 clarified the EU's security policy and made it possible for the first time to speak of that policy as having a comprehensive approach. The ESS must be understood as a response to the new US security policy, formalized in the USA's National Security Strategy of 2002:<sup>28</sup> the European strategy emphasizes the same threats as the US strategy—terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organized crime—but focuses on different security policy tools for countering them; that is, a comprehensive approach to security based on effective multilateralism. It also defines four concrete policy conditions for success: the EU has to be more active, more coherent, more capable and better at working with others. Recent decisions such as the establishment of the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator in the Council framework, the European Defence Agency, and a new Headline Goal aiming to create several multinational battle groups, as well as the institutional changes proposed by the Constitutional Treaty—such as the Solidarity Clause and an EU foreign minister representing both the Council and the Commission—are crucial steps towards these goals. It is possible to argue that all this represents an institutionalization of a comprehensive European security strategy, which has been the aim ever since the programme for comprehensive conflict prevention and the development towards 'an area of security, freedom and justice' were launched in the late 1990s and early 2000.

The impact of the EU's comprehensive security approach is evident to some extent in all the Nordic countries. There are, nevertheless, some important differences, both between the four countries and in relation to the external and internal dimensions of this approach.

#### *External security*

All four Nordic countries have long experience of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention, especially through the United Nations, but these tasks have been viewed largely as separate from those that define *national* security policy. This explains why such aspects have received scant attention in documents and speeches designed to present each country's national security approach and have been promoted mostly by foreign affairs ministries. As international crisis management has become an increasingly important function of the defence forces in all four countries, they have begun to show greater interest in civil–military cooperation and in integrating military and non-military cap-

<sup>28</sup> The White House, 'The National Security Strategy of the United States of America', Washington, DC, Sep. 2002, URL <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/>>.

abilities; yet here, too, there are important differences with respect to how well these aspects are integrated into the dominant national discourse on security issues.

Among the Nordic countries, it is Sweden that has been the most committed to a comprehensive approach to security, yet it is only recently that this has become an important part of the security orientation espoused by the Swedish Ministry of Defence. This is why it is possible to talk about a Europeanization of the Swedish security orientation in this respect as well. In fact, it could be argued that there has been ‘feedback’ from the agenda of the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in the EU—such as the Swedish initiative for a comprehensive programme for conflict prevention—into the Swedish Ministry of Defence, which has resulted in a heightened focus on comprehensive security there also. This has led to a greater interest in civil–military cooperation but also, more generally, to a clear ambition to base national policy on a broader concept of security. The establishment in Sweden of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, an international academy for the training of both civilian and military crisis management personnel, is an important example.<sup>29</sup> While this institution has been placed under the authority of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, one of its aims is enhanced cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces International Centre. Another example is the creation of a new central crisis response authority, the Swedish Emergency Management Agency, with a multifunctional research capacity to assess internal threats.

Sweden has shown a positive attitude towards the ESS, which (in its final form) is perceived by the government as a concretization and strengthening of the EU’s comprehensive approach to security, especially in relation to external security. The EU is increasingly seen as strengthening multilateralism and the UN and as implementing initiatives for conflict prevention.<sup>30</sup> The Swedish input is also becoming increasingly prominent within EU defence policy, and a Swedish diplomat, Ulf Hammarström, is one of the directors of the newly established European Defence Agency. While some would argue that Sweden has become more willing to participate in international defence cooperation across the board,<sup>31</sup> it is also possible to argue that it is precisely the comprehensive character of the EU’s security approach that makes increased Swedish participation possible. An April 2004 article by the ministers of defence and development on the issue of conflict prevention also indicates that it is the comprehensive approach to security that has become the main element of the Swedish approach to national security.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For more information see the Folke Bernadotte Academy’s website, URL <<http://www.folkebernadotteacademy.se/>>.

<sup>30</sup> Björklund, L., Swedish Minister of Defence, Speech, Folk och Försvars rikskonferens [National conference on people and defence], Sälen, 20 Jan. 2004.

<sup>31</sup> On cooperation in defence equipment procurement see chapter 9 in this volume.

<sup>32</sup> Björklund, L. and Jämtin, C., ‘Säkerhetsarbete kan räknas som bistånd’ [Security work can count as aid], *Göteborgs-Posten*, 16 Apr. 2004, URL <<http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/2938/a/17160>>.

Similarly, the need for a more comprehensive approach to external security has recently also been introduced into the discourse in the Finnish Ministry of Defence. Explicit references in the ministry's documents to developments within the EU indicate that this is a direct result of a process of Europeanization. While the notion of comprehensive external security also builds on Finland's traditional activism in the UN, the integration of such a comprehensive dimension into the Ministry of Defence's work is quite new. The changes are, admittedly, carefully judged in relation to whether or not they strengthen Finland's traditional defence capability, and territorial defence is still given primacy.<sup>33</sup> The fact that non-military aspects already seem so well integrated into Finnish security and defence policy seems to have been facilitated by the strong Finnish tradition of inter-ministerial coordination in security issues.

Finland has also taken a positive attitude in general towards the ESS, which it perceives as compatible with the Finnish policy of military non-alignment. The ESS's comprehensive character and the fact that it does not define a collective defence ambition for the EU make this possible.<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, the Finnish Government focuses less on the comprehensive character of the ESS than the Swedish Government does and continues to devote more attention to the need to develop more efficient military capabilities. While Finland supports comprehensive security in the EU, this seems to be perceived as a necessary adaptation rather than a profound change in the Finnish approach to security policy. Finland's reluctance to sign the 1997 Anti-Personnel Mines Convention is one symptom of this traditional territorial concept of security.<sup>35</sup> Despite the continued application of such traditional arguments, however, Finland's recent joining with Sweden to create a battle group as a contribution to the EU's new Headline Goal indicates willingness to contribute to an active and comprehensive EU external security policy.

In Denmark and Norway the defence ministries have placed less emphasis on such a comprehensive approach to external security. As a result, civilian and military aspects of international crisis management have remained separated in different ministries. Some emphasis on the need for greater comprehensiveness can be identified in parts of the security discourse within, especially, the foreign affairs ministries and, in Norway, in the Ministry of Justice and the Police, but not yet to the same extent within the defence ministries. This is interesting since Denmark and Norway have been perceived as front-runners when it comes to civilian crisis management. Denmark has been particularly active in the EU's

<sup>33</sup> Kääriäinen, S., Finnish Minister of Defence, 'Strategic defence', *Public Service Review: Nordic States*, summer 2004, URL <[http://www.publicservice.co.uk/pub\\_contents.asp?ID=127](http://www.publicservice.co.uk/pub_contents.asp?ID=127)>, pp. 100–101.

<sup>34</sup> Finnish Prime Minister's Office, *Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004*, Government Report no. 6/2004 (Prime Minister's Office: Helsinki, 2004), URL <<http://www.vnk.fi/vn/liston/vnk.lsp?r=88862&k=en>>.

<sup>35</sup> The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction was opened for signature in Dec. 1997 and came into effect on 1 Mar. 1999; the text is available at URL <<http://www.un.org/millennium/law/xxvi-22.htm>>. Finland has now declared that it will accede to the convention in 2012 and destroy its landmines by 2016. Finnish Prime Minister's Office (note 34), p. 87.

civilian crisis management forces and even supports the comprehensive security approach at the EU level. While this can be interpreted as Denmark compensating for its non-participation in EU military cooperation, the implementation of a comprehensive security approach at the EU level will limit Denmark's participation in the civilian dimension as long as the defence opt-out prevails. On the whole, however, civil–military coordination has been more limited, and the dominant security discourse in both Denmark and Norway has been more militarily focused than, for instance, the discourse in Sweden.

Denmark has found itself in a paradoxical position in its relationship to the EU security policy because of its self-imposed European defence opt-out. Denmark may, therefore, not participate in the international operations that are led by the EU. The resulting problems are especially obvious now that the EU is taking over most of the NATO operations in the Balkans, to which Denmark has been an important contributor.<sup>36</sup> In principle, the Danish Government supports the EU's comprehensive security approach and in its report on the fight against terrorism made many references to the work of the EU.<sup>37</sup> However, as long as the Danish opt-out prevails, Danish participation in the EU's comprehensive security approach will remain limited.

In Norway the government has begun to realize that the development of an EU security policy is going to become increasingly important and that non-participation is reducing Norwegian influence on European security. However, there is still little indication that the Norwegian Government sees the ESS as amounting to the institutionalization of a comprehensive approach to security. Rather than a comprehensive security project, it has been seen as a step towards an independent EU military capacity and thus as a competitor to NATO. The creation of battle groups has received special attention in this context. While the Minister of Defence, Kristin Krohn Devold, successfully argued in favour of Norwegian participation in the EU's planned battle groups as necessary to avoid a marginalization of Norway, this was questioned by both those who favour and those who oppose Norwegian membership of the EU.<sup>38</sup> It is interesting to note that in Norwegian discussions on EU security policy the comprehensive dimension is often ignored while the main emphasis remains on military aspects.

<sup>36</sup> Gade, S., 'Dansk forsvar som sikkerhetspolitisk instrument' [Danish defence as a security policy instrument], Speech, Foreign Policy Society, Copenhagen, 2004; and Gade, S., 'EU tager ansvar: Danmark tager forbehold' [The EU takes on responsibility: Denmark takes an opt-out], *Folk og Forsvar*, June 2004, URL <<http://www.folkogforsvar.dk/>>, p. 1.

<sup>37</sup> Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *En verden i forandring: nye trusler, nye svar* [A changing world: new threats, new responses], Government report on the response to terrorism (Udenrigsministeriet: Copenhagen, June 2004), URL <<http://www.um.dk/>>.

<sup>38</sup> Norway will participate in the Swedish-led battle group along with Finland. Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 'Utdrag fra EUs forsvarsministersmøte 22. november [Extract from EU defence ministers meeting, 22 November]: Declaration by Sweden and Finland and Norway on the establishment of a joint EU battle group', Brussels, 22 Nov. 2004, URL <<http://odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/aktuelt/nyheter/010051-990085>>. See also chapter 19 in this volume.

*Internal security*

For a long time Nordic national defence was exclusively concerned with defending national territories against military threats. As described above, the first change came during the 1990s with an increased focus on the external dimension (i.e., international crisis management), while national defence, although toned down, was still characterized by territorial defence. Today the need for a more comprehensive approach also in the internal or domestic area has become increasingly evident. The EU has for some time focused on what could be called ‘comprehensive internal security’, for instance, with its moves towards the creation of ‘an area of security, freedom and justice’ and several initiatives to enhance cooperation in the area of civil protection.<sup>39</sup> The 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the USA highlighted the importance of such a development. While these attacks put the need for a more coordinated approach to internal security firmly on everyone’s agenda, the EU had a particular impact on the consequent developments in national security discourses—a development that started prior to September 2001.

Norway was the first to put these issues on the agenda, with its decision in September 1999 to establish a commission to investigate the vulnerability of Norwegian society.<sup>40</sup> Some references to EU developments can be identified in the ensuing debate.<sup>41</sup> At the time, however, the report was not treated as part of the dominant national discourse on security, but as a separate exercise, reflected in the fact that it was carried out by the Ministry of Justice. The report did make reference to the EU and especially to Norwegian participation in the Schengen arrangements: references to terrorism were added later, when these challenges came to be considered an integral part of the national security approach. Recently, there has been some emphasis on the need to improve inter-ministerial coordination, and a high-level civil–military cooperation group and a new directorate have been established for that purpose. The traditional concept of total defence has been somewhat redefined, with more emphasis on civilian preparedness.<sup>42</sup> Close cooperation has also been developed with the EU in these areas.

In Finland and Sweden a similar process started somewhat later than in Norway. In contrast to the Norwegian process, the Finnish and Swedish processes have been viewed from the very outset as integral parts of the national discourses on security. This has been facilitated by the greater salience of the concept of total defence in these countries, including the placing of both civil-

<sup>39</sup> On the EU approach to homeland security see chapter 16 in this volume.

<sup>40</sup> Norwegian State Administration Service, *Et sårbart samfunn* [A vulnerable society], Norges Offentlige Utredninger 2000:24 (Statens forvaltningstjeneste: Oslo, 2000), URL <[http://odin.dep.no/jd/norsk/dok/andre\\_dok/nou/012001-020005/](http://odin.dep.no/jd/norsk/dok/andre_dok/nou/012001-020005/)>.

<sup>41</sup> Vollebæk, K., Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, ‘Statement on the government’s European policy, with emphasis on relations with the EU’, Storting, Oslo, 19 Jan. 1999, URL <<http://odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/ud/1999/taler/>>.

<sup>42</sup> Norwegian Ministry of Defence, ‘Relevant force: strategic concept for the Norwegian armed forces’, Oslo, Oct. 2004, URL <<http://www.dep.no/fd/english/doc/handbooks/010051-120204/>>.

ian and military defence under the authority of the defence ministries. In both countries it was the defence ministry that actually initiated the debate. Interest in these questions has been especially strong in Sweden; and while there are few specific references to the European integration process in Swedish government documents on this subject, it is possible to hypothesize a more indirect influence. In Finland the corresponding changes are explicitly linked to the EU processes, but—as would be expected—they are legitimized by traditional arguments about national security.

In Denmark the political leadership showed little or no interest in these comprehensive internal security issues prior to the attacks of 11 September 2001. Only after these tragic events did such questions begin to appear in the Danish security discourse. As in Norway, this discourse has taken place outside the ambit of the Ministry of Defence and makes few references to the EU.

#### IV. Conclusions: from divergence to convergence

Nordic security policies are changing and many of the changes seem to be closely related to developments in the EU. While there are still differences between the national security policies of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, the differences seem much less pronounced than in the past. Instead of creating a 'Nordic balance' or a special security community based on the differences between them, and between them and the rest of Europe, the Nordic countries now seem to have become an integrated part of a larger European security project in which the EU plays an increasingly important role in comprehensive security.

This convergence actually represents a great opportunity for Nordic cooperation in an area—defence and security—where cooperation has traditionally been impossible. The most important problem is no longer the content of security policy, but rather the different institutional relationships of the different countries. Insofar as these differences are likely to become less important, Nordic cooperation may gain a renewed importance and could even affect the region's prospects of becoming an important player in shaping the EU's comprehensive approach to security. The joint Nordic battle group is perhaps a step in that direction. Of ultimately more importance, however, are the potential for creating stronger Nordic cooperation in conflict prevention; a closer coordination of civilian and military crisis management capacities; and, last but not least, closer Nordic cooperation and coordination in the area of internal security, with a focus on 'societal defence' and the protection of vulnerable modern societies.