



**NATIONAL MINORITIES VIS-À-VIS
POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THEIR
KIN STATES. THE CASE OF FLENSBORG
AVIS NEWSPAPER.**

**A paper presented at the ASN Conference in Graz (4-
6 July 2018)**

Sergiusz Bober

ECMI WORKING PAPER #114

December 2018



The European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) is a non-partisan institution founded in 1996 by the Governments of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the German State of Schleswig-Holstein. ECMI was established in Flensburg, at the heart of the Danish-German border region, in order to draw from the encouraging example of peaceful coexistence between minorities and majorities achieved here. ECMI's aim is to promote interdisciplinary research on issues related to minorities and majorities in a European perspective and to contribute to the improvement of interethnic relations in those parts of Western and Eastern Europe where ethno-political tension and conflict prevail.

ECMI Working Papers are written either by the staff of ECMI or by outside authors commissioned by the Centre. As ECMI does not propagate opinions of its own, the views expressed in any of its publications are the sole responsibility of the author concerned.

ECMI Working Paper # 114

European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)

Director: Prof. Dr. Tove H. Malloy

© ECMI 2018

ISSN 1435-9812; ISSN-Internet 2196-4890



NATIONAL MINORITIES VIS-À-VIS POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THEIR KIN STATES. THE CASE OF FLENSBORG AVIS NEWSPAPER.

Numerous national minorities residing in Europe produce their own printed or on-line media. In most of the cases, the content such minority media offers, includes also information regarding developments (political, economic, social) taking place in kin states. This Working Paper, through the analysis of content published in Flensburg Avis (the newspaper of the Danish minority residing in the bundesland of Schleswig-Holstein), aims to examine how such information is presented. In other words, does minority media rather passively convey content concerning aforementioned developments or actively participate in debates taking place in their kin state? Another related question is also addressed: does minority media feel obliged to follow the political line currently dominant in a kin state? The conducted analysis shows that Flensburg Avis is an example of a minority media actively engaged in debates concerning issues important for Denmark and presenting views not infrequently on a collision course with narratives dominating there.

Sergiusz Bober

December 2018

ECMI Working Paper # 114

1. Introduction

Since the most recent parliamentary election (June 2015), Denmark has been governed first by a minority government of the conservative liberal party Venstre (literally 'Left' in Danish) and, from late November 2016, by a minority coalition government composed of Venstre, Liberal Alliance (a neoliberal and libertarian political party) and the Conservative People's Party (Det Konservative Folkeparti; a conservative

political party). Both minority governments were/are additionally (and crucially) supported by the second biggest party in the Danish parliament (*Folketinget*), i.e. the Danish People's Party (Dansk Folkeparti; a national-conservative political party). Due to the latter's ideological profile (it could be described also as a nativist, anti-immigrant and euro-skeptical political party) and clout, it can be argued that - in spite of some grey-zones and intra-governmental differences -



one of the distinctive features of the Danish governments post-June 2015 is a rather strict approach, in terms of rhetoric and actions, to persons of foreign origin living in Denmark or willing to (immigrants)/forced to (refugees) relocate to Denmark. Furthermore, that approach is densely correlated with ongoing debates concerning Danish identity and core Danish values, as well as critical approaches to multiculturalism and Islam.

As a result, the research aim of the present Working Paper is to investigate the perception of the above indicated nativist tendency observable in Denmark (kin state) by the *Flensborg Avis* newspaper, i.e. the most important and influential media-outlet of the Danish minority residing in the German land of Schleswig-Holstein.¹ To a significant degree, also another question is guiding the present text: to what extent does the newspaper of the Danish minority residing in Schleswig-Holstein feel obliged to follow the political line set by the government and political parties of its kin-state?

2. Method

In order to answer the central research question of the present Working paper (i.e. how the above-mentioned tendency is perceived?), the content of the *Flensborg Avis* newspaper will be examined (covering the period from just before June 2015 election until mid-2018), with the focus set primarily on the columns expressing the views of the editorial board (in *Flensborg Avis* such pieces are usually authored by the newspaper's editor-in-chief) on four subjects: (a) border controls to be

introduced/introduced by Denmark on its border with Germany; (b) the so-called *smykke lov* ('jewellery law');² (c) the law banning garments that cover the face in Denmark;³ (d) the Danish government's initiatives concerning the so-called *ghetoområder* ('ghetto areas')⁴. The aforementioned topics were chosen due to their densest correlation with political developments mentioned in the introduction. With regard to the first subject and because of the publication of numerous texts discussing border controls in *Flensborg Avis*, one column for each three months of the covered period has been chosen (it is the first one in a given period, containing the densest references to a given topic). For the three remaining subjects, all columns discussing them within the indicated period have been examined, since those subjects had been addressed by the editor-in-chief much less frequently. Within each section, the texts are analyzed in a chronological order (i.e. from the oldest to the newest). The selected topics are also presented accordingly to the time of their first appearance in the editor-in-chief's column (as a consequence, the issue of border controls is discussed first, and initiatives concerning the so-called ghetto areas last). A qualitative analysis of the printed media discourse conducted in the present Working Paper should provide answers to the aforementioned research questions, with additional conclusions identifying tension(s) and/or similarity(-ies) between the understanding of a given problem by the newspaper of the Danish minority in Germany and government/politicians in the kin-state on the one hand, and between both



sides' approaches to the Danish identity on the other.

3. What is *Flensburg Avis*?

The *Flensburg Avis* newspaper is published in Flensburg (Schleswig-Holstein) by a joint-stock company registered in Germany and it contains texts published in Danish (c. 75% of the content) and German (the remaining 25%). Its daily print run in 2017 approached 5,000 copies. The above-mentioned newspaper's significance for the Danish minority in Schleswig-Holstein is confirmed by its close cooperation with the South Schleswig Association (SSF - *Sydslesvigsk Forening*; the main cultural organization of the Danish minority) and the Danish School Association for South Schleswig (*Dansk Skoleforening for Sydslesvig*; it runs Danish schools and kindergartens in Schleswig-Holstein). For example, each Thursday *Flensburg Avis* distributes a bulletin of SSF among all its members. It is important to add, also in the context of present considerations, that the newspaper is to a significant degree supported by the Danish state, which covers c. 60% of its budget (Resultataftale).

Since *Flensburg Avis* is undoubtedly one of the most important publications produced by the Danish minority in Germany (also historically, as the newspaper was founded in 1869), it can be assumed that at least to a certain degree it represents the views shared by a substantial part of the analyzed minority group. At the same time, however, the newspaper's position on different issues cannot be conflated with the Danish minority's opinion of such issues in general. The aforementioned overlap certainly exists,

but the determination of its degree requires further research. As a result, this Working Paper should be understood as discussing primarily the opinions of the *Flensburg Avis* newspaper.

4. *Flensburg Avis* and the question of border controls on the Danish-German border.⁵

4.1 The Second Quarter of 2015

The first of the analysed texts from the above indicated period was published on the 8th of May 2015 (Møllekær, J. 2015, May 8). Already the title suggests that both the *Flensburg Avis* newspaper and its editor-in-chief Jørgen Møllekær critically assess the way potential introduction of border controls on the border crossings between Denmark in Germany had been discussed in the former country during the election campaign of 2015. The discussed opinion piece is titled '*Valgkamps-grænsekage*'. It could be literally translated as 'Electoral campaign border cake', which seems to suggest that in the author's view, we deal here with something very attractive for at least a part of the electorate ('cake'), that apparently can resolve a complex problem (porous borders in the contemporary Europe and wider world). At the same time, the title seems to suggest that it is perceived by him as a cheap political trick (i.e. an apparently easy and straightforward solution of a dilemma, which in truth requires far more complex actions in order to be properly addressed).

The contents of Møllekær's text are centred around two quotations from the interview with the then Danish People's Party's justice



spokesperson Peter Skaarup, which was published in *Jyllands-Posten* newspaper. In the first of them, Skaarup refers to the temporary border controls introduced by Germany due to the G7 summit held in that country, which in his view allows Denmark to introduce border controls of its own (without any special circumstances similar to the aforementioned summit). In the following one, he makes an electoral promise by stating that after upcoming general elections, an average Dane should be able to see at the border crossings customs officers deciding whether there is a reason to control any of the cars crossing the border.⁶ According to Skaarup, the reason why border checkpoints are necessary stems from the fact that a certain number of people crossing the border into Denmark, come to the country to commit burglaries (it needs to be remarked that in the light of the above, Skaarup's understanding of border controls includes the check-ups of travellers and vehicles entering as well as leaving the Danish territory). In his reply to Skaarup's reasoning, Møllekær does not hesitate to call it populist. He remarks for example, that – obviously - in the German case the introduction of border controls had been justified by exceptional conditions. Their temporary nature makes border controls themselves also temporary. Additionally, he scathingly adds that most of the crimes are in fact committed in Denmark by the country's inhabitants, so the impact of border controls will be very limited. In addition to that, he is concerned about the economic impact of border controls. In his opinion, border controls can badly affect the tourism sector, since potential visitors from Germany may no longer feel welcome and

thus will be less interested in spending their holidays in popular Danish summer cottages. The long queues at the checkpoints also will not help. What is more, the message of closed Denmark can make it harder to attract foreign investors to the country.

From the very first of the analysed periods, the *Flensborg Avis*' position vis-à-vis the question of border controls on the Danish-German border is unequivocally negative. In the currently examined period, the argumentation against their introduction is built around two main elements: lack of efficiency of border controls (it cannot stop crime) and potential harm to Denmark's international reputation and economic interests. In addition to that, certain politicians supporting the introduction of border controls are described as populist.

4.2 The Third Quarter of 2015

During the third quarter of 2015, the topic of border controls was not densely addressed in the commentaries written by the editor-in-chief of the *Flensborg Avis*. At the same time, it does not mean that the subject has not been discussed at all in the newspaper during that period. For example, on the 16th of July an extensive summary of the debate on the potential introduction of border controls by Denmark, which took place the day before in the Landtag in Kiel, was published (Krueger, R. 2015, July 16). In the article, critical opinions about the idea expressed by such politicians as Ekkehard Klug (FDP; he warned against re-nationalization of Europe), Astrid Damerow (CDU; she stressed that she does not want to meddle in Danish politics, but at the same time it is important to inform



Danish politicians that border controls would send a very wrong signal to the outside world), Birthe Pauls (SPD; in her opinion it was shocking how populist political parties across Europe used the topic of refugees in their electoral campaigns), Jette Waldinger-Thiering and Anke Spoorendonk (both SSW⁷; they emphasized and praised Venstre's lack of support for DF's idea of border controls) were quoted.

In the currently analysed period, the editor-in-chief of *Flensborg Avis* did not give any opinions on border controls. At the same time, however, the newspaper did not lose that subject from sight, as it printed the article summarizing the debate concerning these issues, which took place in the Schleswig-Holstein's Landtag. The politicians quoted in the text very critically assessed the idea of border controls, which seems to be in line with the newspaper's position on that issue.

4.3 The Fourth Quarter of 2015

On the 13th of November, the editor-in-chief Møllekær published another opinion piece focused upon border controls (2015, November 13). This time the context had significantly changed, since not long before Sweden, Denmark's north-eastern neighbour, introduced border controls while clearly expressing their purpose: the willingness to redirect the inflows of refugees towards Germany and Denmark, due to Sweden's limited capacity to welcome more of them (Kingsley, P., Weaver, M., Kassam, A. 2015, November 12). In the opening paragraph Møllekær states that probably these are the latest days of unhindered border movement between Denmark and Germany,

as shortly after the Swedish decision a broad consensus had been reached in *Folketinget* (the Danish parliament), including the biggest opposition party Social Democrats, regarding the introduction of border controls on all of Denmark's borders. In spite of his noticeable - and sustained - objection to border controls, the tone of his text is somewhat resigned. The author of the opinion piece is worried about the consequences of border controls for the daily life in the Danish-German border region, as well as notices their potential symbolic and psychological consequences. At the same time, he doubts if it is a tool capable of significantly reducing the number of asylum seekers in Denmark (as – according to him – Danish People's Party claimed). He also acknowledges that the political pressure exerted on a relatively weak Venstre government had been so intense, that the introduction of border controls – the result of a 'domino effect' initiated by Sweden - was the question of 'when', and not the question of 'if'. What in his view makes it even more probable is the fact that the public opinion in Denmark will not be such to be willing to welcome more refugees in a foreseeable future.

In the currently examined period, the most important elements regarding the argumentation against the introduction of border controls are: efficiency (they may not reduce the number of asylum seekers reaching Denmark) and their influence on the Danish-German border region and its daily life (the repercussions of queues at the checkpoints and of the necessity of using passports again). Importantly, *Flensborg*



Avis is not ignorant of the international context of the Danish government's actions, nevertheless its position on border controls does not change.

4.4 The First Quarter of 2016

The text published in the currently analysed period once again comments on the border controls introduced by Sweden, this time because of their tightening, which took place at the beginning of 2016 (Crouch, D. 2016, January 4). In his opinion piece Møllekær openly regrets (although not condemns, since again his position could be described as that of a resigned realist; in his text he refers to the danger posed by the growing popularity of the right-wing populist Swedish Democrats/Sverigedemokraterna political party too) the decision made by Swedish authorities (2016, January 4). He also mentions its practical (in his view it is basically the end of the free movement of people in the Øresund Region, connecting Copenhagen and Malmö areas; it also suspends the functioning of the Nordic Passport Union) and symbolic consequences (he mentions the rebuilding of walls in Europe, which is a reference to the new organization of the access to the trains running from Kastrup Lufthavn Station towards Sweden). Additionally, he is very concerned about the technical and logistic aspects of potential border controls between Denmark and Germany, their efficiency (it is a land boundary requiring far more substantial presence of border guards), and Denmark's international reputation (even though he perceived as to a certain degree legitimate Lars Løkke Rasmussen's doubts with regard to the application of Geneva

Convention during the refugee crisis, at the same time he was dissuading Denmark from unilaterally 'ignoring' the country's international obligations).

In the currently examined period, border controls are critically assessed by *Flensborg Avis* through the usage of the following arguments: efficiency (recurrent topic with various aspects stressed over time; here: it is hard to protect a relatively long land boundary between Denmark and Germany); practical consequences (the end of a free movement between Nordic countries); technical and logistic obstacles (human resources available); symbolic aspects (rebuilding of walls in Europe) and Denmark's international reputation (recurrent topic).

4.5 The Second Quarter of 2016

In the case of the second quarter of 2016, the tone of Møllekær's opinion piece changes somewhat, although his position vis-à-vis border controls introduced by Denmark is not modified (2016, April 9). The aforementioned change is expressed by his acknowledgement that due to the changes introduced by the Balkan countries (i.e. the closing of the so-called 'Balkan Route'), the intensity of migratory pressure felt by western and northern European countries has diminished, including Denmark (in order to prove that point, statistical data presented by the then German minister of the interior Thomas de Maizière is quoted in the text⁸). As a consequence, his view can be interpreted as a general acceptance that at times tougher measures such as border controls are necessary, but only when they are introduced



as an answer to real challenges, and not as an empty gesture addressing imaginary threats. Because of the steps taken by the Balkan countries, the German government had scaled down the presence of police on the border with Austria. For Møllekær it is logical that the Danish authorities should soon follow in their German counterparts' footsteps, since the Danish border with Germany is no longer in need of additional protection. It is also interesting how at the beginning of his column he scoffs at those in Denmark who believe that even tougher border controls are necessary: he simply wants to confront them with 'facts', and thus he juxtaposes their irrational belief in the continuous necessity of border controls, with changing European reality expressed in hard data, which proves that at least on the Danish-German border checkpoints are no longer needed.⁹

In the currently examined period, the argumentation against border controls is narrowed to a one significant aspect: the necessity for a focus on facts and actual threats/challenges. In the *Flensborg Avis*' view, Danish politicians supporting border controls seem to disregard both facts and wider international context. As a result, their views on border controls are somewhat detached from reality, while the above mentioned and desired re-focus, should result in the abolishing of border controls.

4.6 The Third Quarter of 2016

A completely different aspect of border controls introduced by Denmark attracts Møllekær's attention in the following of the analysed periods (2016, August 9). This time

he neither gives an account of the debates regarding border controls in the kin-state nor wonders about their efficiency. Instead (one can ask: with resignation?), he focuses upon something which can be described as a technical aspect of border controls introduced on the Danish-German border, namely waiting queues caused by much slower traffic on the border crossing in Ellund (near the town of Padborg), on the motorway A7/E45 connecting Germany and Denmark. In the text Møllekær first describes two traffic accidents, in which drivers unaware of the conditions on the road ahead, crashed into queuing trucks. What follows, is a rather detailed scrutiny of the precautionary measures introduced by the German police, in order to limit the risk of similar accidents in the future. In the concluding part, first, he wryly remarks that border controls are to stay until the end of the year, and that waiting queues are becoming a frequent occurrence. Next he asks a bitter question: 'How many more will get hurt or even die on the A7 in Ellund until that time?'.¹⁰ For a reader it is quite easy to notice in Møllekær's column a certain level of fatigue with the topic of border controls (a complex question of border controls is reduced to a hazardous technical issue) and indeed resignation (in spite of numerous protests from the Danish-German borderland, also his own, the Danish government still wanted to prolong them for further months). At the same time, the question asked by him at the end seems to suggest that resistance is still there: border controls are undesirable not only because they complicate life in the border region, but also because from time to time they put human life and health at risk.



In the currently analysed period, the most important aspect of the negative perception of border controls by the *Flensborg Avis* are technical issues. Wider technical aspects of border controls are not mentioned for the first time in the examined set of texts, however previously such factors as health risks or traffic safety had not been addressed within this context. In the editor-in-chief's view, border controls are not only detrimental to Denmark's international soft power or everyday life in the Danish-German borderlands. In certain circumstances, they can also pose a significant threat to human life or health.

4.7 The Fourth Quarter of 2016

In the column chosen for the period of October – November 2016, Møllekær discusses Danish debate regarding border controls after roughly one year after their introduction (2016, November 3). First, he sums up the mood among the politicians/political parties by mentioning the views of the Minister for Foreigners and Integration (Danish: *Udlændinge- og integrationsminister*) Inger Støjberg, who, according to him, repeats the argument about the necessity of border controls because of porous external borders of the European Union, so often that it has become banal.¹¹ The Danish People's Party's view indicating that border controls are efficient and should be permanent is described as 'persistent'. He also reminds his readers that in this particular space opposite views have been repeatedly formulated.¹² Although he can politically understand why the government – with the support of the so-called *Blå Blok*¹³ and the Socialdemocrats - introduced border controls

(after the 'chaotic refugee autumn of 2015' a majority of Danish citizens felt the need for at least symbolic confirmation that their country's borders are secure), he notices that recently the tone of the debate regarding that issue has changed. The cause of that change is connected to the problem of limited police resources: due to the presence of numerous policemen on the border, a significantly smaller number of them are able to perform the regular police work in the Danish interior (this view is supported by statistics quoted by Møllekær). In other words, the price for at least symbolic security of the border demanded by Danish citizens, has been paid by themselves, since they were feeling less secure in their neighbourhoods/town/cities etc. What is more, according to the opinion polls mentioned by him, the majority of the inhabitants of the four borderland local councils (Haderslev, Sønderborg, Tønder, Aabenraa) no longer supported border controls. The final straw in his border controls-sceptic column refers to the article published by one of the major Danish newspapers *Berlingske*, according to which, the introduction of permanent border controls (supported by Danish People's Party) would limit the access of Danish police and tax authorities to a crime mapping database shared by Schengen countries. As he remarks in the final sentence of his opinion piece, all the facts discussed by him ('reality') should soon reach the authorities in Copenhagen. Although Møllekær is not stating this *expressis verbis*, it is rather obvious that for him the consequence of such a confrontation of the authorities with hard reality should lead to the abolishment of border controls.



In the currently analysed period, the argumentation against border controls is built around the following main points: the lack of informed debate on that issue in Denmark (politicians frequently use banal or shallow arguments in support of border controls); inefficient use of police's human resources (focus on border security instead of inland criminality); the changing mood of public opinion with regard to that issue, especially in the areas of Denmark close to the border with Germany (i.e. where border controls have the most significant influence on everyday life).

4.8 The First Quarter of 2017

Møllekær's column published on the 4th of January 2017 for obvious reason discusses the first anniversary of border controls introduced by Denmark (2017, January 4). Its very title is noteworthy, since it describes border controls as 'postfactual'. In that way the author suggests that the introduction of them was based on emotions/false assumptions instead of facts. In the first part of his text he critically assesses the data on the effectivity of border controls provided by minister Inger Støjberg (it is worth to add that her surname is misspelled again). According to her, three million controls (as Møllekær remarks, it means 'real' controls of people waved to the side of the road) carried on the Danish-German border crossings led to three thousand cases of persons not allowed to cross into Denmark. Both Møllekær and the editorial team of *Flensborg Avis* tried in vain to obtain a clarification with regard to who those persons were, being at the same time convinced that in most of the cases they were not illegal migrants or unlawful asylum

seekers, but rather average citizens resident in the region, who simply forgot their passport before making the trip to Denmark (a story of that kind is described by him in the column). Although he acknowledges that for a certain period of time border controls were necessary due to exceptional circumstances, he also agrees with the statement of the mayor (*borgmester*) of Aabenraa local council (*kommune*) pointing out that it is relatively easy to cross Danish-German border illegally and unseen by anyone. In the two final paragraphs of his column Møllekær quite bluntly attacks the Danish political establishment for their stance on border controls. He begins with Støjberg and her rhetoric justifying the continuation of border controls. According to him, the minister's constant praise for the efficiency of border controls do not make such statements closer to the truth, since a clearly lower number of asylum seekers in Denmark is a result not of border controls, but rather of generally less intense migratory pressure on Europe.¹⁴ He does not want to downplay the risk of terrorist attacks in Denmark mentioned by Støjberg, but at the same time he is convinced that the Danish People's Party's simplistic answer to that challenge is not the right one (a totally and permanently closed border). Finally, Møllekær makes a reference to the prime minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen's traditional New Year's speech, in which he warned the Danes against the willingness to build a wall between themselves and the world, because in such a way none of the important problems of the contemporary world can be solved.¹⁵ He praises the prime minister's words, but at the same time he emphasises their inconsistency with 'pseudo border controls'



(*pseudokontrollerne*; in that way he refers to two things: on the one hand, border controls are not necessary; on the other they are considered by him to be rather lax).

For the first quarter of 2017, the following topics are the most important when it comes to the *Flensborg Avis*' stance regarding border controls: during the debates in Denmark, too frequently facts are not properly considered (recurrent issue in the analysed columns) and emotions take precedence over them; the data regarding border controls provided by the Danish government is not convincing (a very significant remark concerning trust); inefficiency of border controls (it is rather a spectacle and not an efficient security measure). Importantly, the newspaper is capable of noticing differences between politicians and political currents in its kin state.

4.9 The Second Quarter of 2017

On the 3rd of May 2017, the editor-in-chief of *Flensborg Avis* turns his attention to the situation in Sweden, where the minister of internal affairs Anders Ygeman around that time announced that ID checks on buses, trains and ferries travelling between Sweden and Denmark will end (Møllekær, J. 2017, May 3). At the same time, the Swedish authorities announced the introduction of the so-called 'intelligent border controls', consisting of the scanning of registration plates of the vehicles entering Sweden and of mobile police teams patrolling the country's interior. On that occasion Møllekær once again emphasized that the introduction of border controls by Sweden in January 2016

was understandable in the light of events of the second half of 2015. Nevertheless, the context justifying their introduction has significantly changed a long time ago. He is convinced that because of the 'Good news from the Øresund region', Denmark should follow Sweden's example and do away with checkpoints on the border with Germany. In addition, he mentions that border controls on the Danish-German border are not very effective, because the relatively tiny number of people not allowed to enter Denmark on legal grounds, does not offset substantial numbers of law-abiding travellers, who are stopped at the checkpoints or need to spend relatively long time in waiting queues. Besides that, Denmark's reputation is also at stake. In Møllekær's opinion, uniforms on the borders are a sign of the past and Denmark needs to regain its reputation of a country which openly welcomes visitors. Borders - in his words – cannot be neglected, but the right way forward are cost-effective and 'smart' controls, resembling those introduced by Sweden.¹⁶

In the analysed period, the most prominent arguments used against border controls in the *Flensborg Avis* are: inefficiency (this particular aspect is mentioned again); Denmark's international reputation (same as above: recurrent argument; due to the importance of tourism sector, Denmark needs to be perceived as a visitor-friendly country); the necessity of a secure border is acknowledged, however it should be achieved through smart and cost-effective surveillance methods.



4.10 The Third Quarter of 2017

In the column chosen for the third quarter of 2017, Møllekær deals with the controversial topic of the deployment of soldiers on the Danish-German border (2017, August 12). According to the authorities, the intensification of the so-called *Bandekrig* ('Gang war') taking place in the major urban centres of Denmark, which required larger police presence in the affected neighbourhoods, was the reason behind their decision. The very beginning of Møllekær's opinion piece sets the tone for his further considerations. He cannot accept the presence of Danish soldiers on the border with Germany and is convinced that a use of military personnel is justified only when the country is faced with a severe crisis. He also asks a somewhat provocative question about the last time when Danish soldiers were present on that particular border. In his own answer, he makes a reference to the symbolically charged date of 9th of April of 1940, that is the day when the forces of the Nazi Germany begun the invasion of Denmark.¹⁷ Thereafter, he mentions critical voices from the local authorities in Flensburg and from the German police, and the broader problem of potential damage to Denmark's international reputation. In his opinion the task of soldiers is to guarantee peace and not to scrutinize people crossing the border, since the Danish-German borderland is not an occupied territory and Denmark is not a military state. This already rather sharp rhetoric is additionally reinforced by the description of a potential situation, in which Danish soldiers would inspect people crossing into Denmark in order to do their shopping at the local supermarkets.¹⁸ Further

in his text, Møllekær argues that in exceptional circumstance soldiers should be deployed in the areas affected by the rising level of criminality (for example in Copenhagen's district of Nørrebro, mentioned in the column's title), and not on the border with Germany. According to him, this is what usually happens in similar situations in other Western countries. In his words, the Danish prime minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen, under political pressure exerted by the Danish People's Party, instead of deploying soldiers in the aforementioned areas, is creating conflict in the areas of absolute peace. At the end of the column, Møllekær ironically remarks that possibly the presence of soldiers on the border will at last lead to the introduction of serious controls instead of pseudo ones.

In the presently analysed period, two recurrent arguments against border controls are especially noticeable in the *Flensburg Avis*: misuse of resources (in the contemporary Europe, during peacetime, the place of soldiers is not at the border) and Denmark's international reputation (the presence of soldiers on the Danish-German border evokes painful historical memories and sends a wrong message to the wider world, i.e. of Denmark as an isolationist country, cordoning itself off the wider world).

4.11 The Fourth Quarter of 2017

The final of Møllekær's columns selected for 2017 discusses Denmark's budget for the following calendar year, adopted by the parliament – after protracted and bitter negotiations involving the governing



coalition and the Danish People's Party - on the 7th of December (2017, December 12). Among its various aspects, he is discussing also the budget's consequences for border controls on the Danish-German border. As he points out, the Danish People's Party has been handsomely rewarded for its tough negotiating position. Due to that party's pressure on the governing coalition, a certain amount of financial means was earmarked for the tightening of border controls. From 2018 all border crossings had to be surveyed (as opposed to the earlier situation, when only the most intensely used border crossings in Frøslev, Kruså and Padborg had been constantly watched over), though some of them only by mobile police patrols, plus the scanners of cars' registration numbers had to be installed at the checkpoints. As Møllekær remarks wryly, decisions of that kind are a natural consequence of opinions such as those constantly expressed also by his newspaper, indicating that controls limited only to the major border crossings turn the whole endeavour into an unserious fiction. Simultaneously he reminds his readers, that smart and frequent patrolling of Denmark's interior constitutes a lot more effective way of protecting the country's territory against unwelcome guests, than a simple waving in of thousands of commuters and tourists on their way to Denmark.¹⁹ Nevertheless, he concludes that the introduced changes make sense, but only if one believes in the effectiveness of border controls. Møllekær, of course, does not include himself in that group. He is also worried that a newly adopted budget means that border controls will be continued in the foreseeable future, which is not only contrary to the expectations

of the *Flensborg Avis*' editorial board, but also entails a continuous occurrence of queues on the border, especially during the peaks of the tourist season.

For the fourth quarter of 2017, especially two border controls-sceptic arguments attract attention: lack of efficiency (simultaneously more effective measures are proposed, i.e. smart and frequent patrolling of Denmark's interior) and economic damage caused by them, since deterring effect of border controls negatively influences tourism. Besides the above, it is worth mentioning that *Flensborg Avis* puts most of the blame for the introduction of border controls and their tightening on the Danish People's Party.

4.12 The First Quarter of 2018

January 2018 offered Møllekær one more opportunity to discuss the efficiency of border controls on the second anniversary of their introduction (2018, February 2). The opinion piece begins with a quotation from Martin Henriksen, in which the Danish People's Party's spokesperson for the matters concerning foreigners and integration (official Danish version: *udlændinge- og integrationsordfører*; in the text he is described as *udlændingeordfører*) claims that border controls are necessary and should be even tighter, because over the period of two years as many as 5,150 persons were denied entry to Denmark. In reaction to Henriksen's claims, Møllekær repeats his earlier expressed view that a protection of Danish borders is necessary, although in his view the methods used in order to achieve internal security in the country deserve to be thoroughly discussed. He also points out that



the numbers provided by Henriksen could have been more convincing, if at the same time it would have been possible to learn on what grounds aforementioned border crossers were denied entry into Denmark. He is in equal measure unimpressed by the numbers regarding border controls provided by the Danish news agency Ritzau (6,4 million of border controls over two years; in Møllekær's back of the envelope calculation it equals 8,500 daily controls – i.e. at least a short conversation with a Danish border guard – and 7 cases per day of entry denial), as again he would like to know in how many cases the entry was denied because of serious suspicions regarding the intentions of the border crosser, and in how many it was a result of triviality concerning local residents (e.g. forgotten passport).²⁰ What is particularly interesting, when mentioning the unknown number of 'those of us' who could cross the border without being controlled (as he says those people were simply waved in into Denmark), he describes that group as having the 'right' registration plates, a washed car or the 'right' hair colour, thus suggesting that racial profiling is taking place at the check points.²¹ At the end of his column, Møllekær returns to the issue of efficiency. In his opinion, frequent police patrols inside Denmark and additional financial resources provided to PET (Danish Security and Intelligence Service, *Politiets Efterretningstjeneste* in Danish) probably would have been a better way of guaranteeing security. He also reminds his readers again of the topographic reality of the Danish-German border: it is highly permeable and generally not much effort is required if one is willing to cross unnoticed into Danish territory. In his

opinion, unless a fence is built along the Danish-German border or the waters of the Flensborg Fjord are mined, professional criminals will be able to find a way to enter Denmark. In concluding sentence, he points out that, in their current shape, border controls can presumably stop a few "small fish", but they do not help much in preventing the entry of those who indeed deserve to be stopped.²²

For the first quarter of 2018 the following main points in the *Flensborg Avis'* assessment of the question of border controls can be identified: dubious data supporting their supposed efficiency; the claim that in most of the cases trivialities contribute to the fact that certain persons are not allowed to cross into Denmark (e.g. a passport forgotten by someone residing in the Danish-German borderland); a hint that racial profiling might be taking place at the check points; the topographic reality of the Danish-German border (it is relatively easy to cross illegally and unnoticed into Denmark); the issue of controls' efficiency is mentioned again.

4.13 The Second Quarter of 2018

In the final of Møllekær's sample columns regarding border controls, the recent condemnation of them by the European Parliament is discussed (2018, May 31). He clearly expresses his agreement with that condemnation and its justification stating that they are in breach of the law and Schengen Area rules. Afterwards, he mentions the reasons why the editorial team of *Flensborg Avis* supports the European Parliament: irritating queues on the border taking place foremostly, although not exclusively, on



Saturdays (it is traditionally the first day of a stay in the Danish summer houses, which are very popular among German tourists); lack of efficiency; the primarily symbolic value of border controls resulting from the previously mentioned argument (are they the right measures to prevent terrorist attacks in Denmark as some politicians think? Cooperation of intelligence services is a better way towards prevention and not wasting of time on the border; Can border controls prevent terrorist attacks committed by individuals?). At the end Møllekær praises European Parliament's willingness to increase expenses on the protection of the EU's outer borders in the forthcoming multiannual financial framework.

In the final of the analysed periods, the following elements of argumentation against border controls are the most prominent in the *Flensborg Avis*: their lack of efficiency; mostly symbolic value (in other words: propaganda value); unforeseen results making everyday life more difficult in the Danish-German borderlands (queues on certain days). At the same time, the way forward is again suggested: close cooperation between European countries and tighter protection of the European Union's outer borders.

5. *Flensborg Avis* and the so-called *smykkelov* ('jewellery law').

The most comprehensive editor-in-chief's view of the so-called 'jewellery law' was presented in the *Flensborg Avis* on the 19th of December 2015, shortly after the plans regarding *smykkelov* had been made public

(Møllekær, J. 2015, December 19). In the first part of Møllekær's column, the proposed law is discussed in the wider context of basic principles organizing the Danish welfare system. To a certain degree, the author agrees that there is connection between them and the 'jewellery law'. At the same time, in the following parts of his column, he is formulating numerous doubts regarding the proposed law. Those can be divided into two broad categories: of ethical and practical nature. With regard to the first group, he is concerned with the fact that belongings were to be confiscated from people coming to Denmark after long and exhausting journey, often fleeing for their lives. For him it is also unclear, how to properly define goods of personal value. The second category of doubts concerns Denmark's international reputation (by the time of his writing comparisons with the reality of the Nazi Germany had already been made by the international media) and the potential revenues for Denmark's state treasury (do refugees/migrants indeed travel with significant amounts of jewellery?). All in all, he seems to be convinced that Denmark does not need that particular instrument and that the symbolic costs of its introduction are too damaging internationally.

A similar perception of *smykkelov* is expressed by Møllekær in his column (2016, January 22) discussing Liberal Alliance's proposal to 'suspend' Denmark's adherence to international conventions regarding refugees. Besides his explicitly stated support for international cooperation as a legitimate way of dealing with international issues, he again mentions the potential damage to



Denmark's standing in the world and compares it with the effects of the adoption of the so-called 'jewellery law'. An almost identical line of argumentation is used by Møllekær seven months later, when he commends Denmark's prime minister for decidedly stating that non-adherence to international conventions is not considered as a realistic option by his political party. He is glad that Denmark will not step out of the international community, while being convinced that international reactions to such a move would have been a lot more intense than those regarding the 'jewellery law'. In Møllekær's columns, a reference to that law is made once more in November 2016. This time - in the context of Danish People's Party's continuous support for border controls - *smykke lov* is described by him as nothing more than an example of symbolic politics.

Regarding the issue of the so-called 'jewellery law', the *Flensborg Avis*' position is manifestly negative. The argumentation is built primarily upon the following elements: ethical grounds (is it right to seize assets from asylum seekers fleeing from wars?); practical grounds (only limited revenues for the state's treasury); international reputation of Denmark (the seizing of assets belonging to people in need is discrediting for the country due to disturbing historical associations).

6. *Flensborg Avis* and the law banning garments that cover face in Denmark.

In the analysed period, only one of *Flensborg Avis*' columns is dedicated to that issue, and its author (Møllekær) focuses primarily on

burqas and niqabs also covered by that law (2017, October 7). What is crucial, is that he is clearly in favour of the proposed ban. In his opinion, a covered face simply does not fit into 'western culture'.²³ At the same time, he is convinced that such a ban will not limit anyone's religious freedom. According to him, the law-maker's intention is not to target a certain sector of society, i.e. women covering their faces when in public space, but rather to help them understand and internalize the cultural norms, which are dominant in the society of their new country. In his opinion, a broad support of the discussed law proposal in the Danish parliament (as he remarks, the Danish People's Party initiated that debate) is reflected by an equally broad support for it within the Danish society, since among its core values ('unbreakable' values) there is also gender equality. As a result, even if a requirement to cover woman's face can be justified on the ground of a given religion, it contradicts Danish social norms. In the final paragraph, Møllekær acknowledges that it is a significant challenge to find a balance between newcomers' individual rights and the expectations of the receiving population. Nevertheless, in his opinion, social and other practices, which may hinder one's integration with a surrounding society, should not be allowed.

Regarding the issue discussed in the present section, *Flensborg Avis*' position is supportive of the Danish government's actions. The positive assessment of them is constructed around the following topics: the concept of 'western culture' (covered face does not belong to it); a certain perception of



the Danish identity (with, for example, gender equality as one of its cornerstones); integration of immigrants (certain behaviours or traditions can make it significantly more difficult); justified expectations of the receiving population (respect for social norms binding in Denmark).

7. *Flensborg Avis* and the Danish government's initiatives concerning the so-called *ghettoområder* ('ghetto areas').

The question of the government's plans concerning the so-called ghetto areas is addressed in the opinion pieces presenting *Flensborg Avis*' official stance twice. In the first of them, Møllekær analyses prime minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen's New Year's speech, in which those plans were mentioned for the first time (2018, January 3). His reaction can be described as mixed. On the one hand, he understands that the government is under pressure from the Danish People's Party, therefore the subject of the 'new Danes' and their integration needs to be addressed. On the other, he wonders whether that question deserved to be so prominent in the prime minister's speech, since in statistical and social terms it is probably not the most important of Denmark's current challenges. Instead of discussing one particular issue, Møllekær would prefer a more comprehensive vision of the country's future. On the other hand, he notices interesting nuances in the prime minister's speech, since an encouraging message towards foreigners willing to settle, work and integrate in Denmark was offered by him too. This, according to the editor in

chief of *Flensborg Avis*, is a good signal in a country which is in need of a stronger welcoming culture concerning migrants.

In the second of his columns concerning the issue discussed here, Møllekær (2018, March 2) examines the detailed plan for the so-called ghetto areas presented by the prime minister Rasmussen on the 1st of March 2018 at the Mjølnerparken housing estate in the Copenhagen's district of Nørrebro (one of the areas to be affected by the plan). In his words, it is a plan to combat the phenomenon of the parallel society in Denmark, and the lack of integration of certain communities with immigrant backgrounds. According to Møllekær, when perceived as a whole, the prime minister's detailed proposal constitutes a carrot and stick (*pisk og gulerod*) approach, and some of them are somewhat controversial. At the same time however, in his opinion it is important that core values of the Danish society are binding for all (freedom, equality, democracy) and that all members of the society educate themselves and by working contribute to the welfare system. Therefore, some of the presented proposals can win a substantial support among Danes. For example, the one requiring children in the so-called ghetto areas to attend nursery from the age of one (parents unwilling to cooperate would suffer financially with their child benefits cut). In the future such children will be both fluent in Danish (it is crucial in order to make them perform well at various stages of their education) and understand the Danish society better. At the end, it should allow them to be better positioned on the job market and thus avoid, for example, criminality. He also



praises the government's plans aiming to limit the parents' possibility to arrange marriages, and to demolish and/or to significantly redevelop current ghetto-areas.

Regarding the currently discussed topic, the *Flensborg Avis* in general supports the actions of the Danish government with arguments referring to the following topics/concepts: core Danish values (e.g. freedom, equality, democracy; the phenomenon of parallel society makes it harder to internalize them for certain sectors of Denmark's population); welfare state (all members of the Danish society should contribute to the country's welfare system); the future shape of the Danish society (the earlier the integration efforts begin, the more successful they are).

8. Content Analysis

On the basis of the above-conducted analysis of the opinion pieces published in *Flensborg Avis*, the following findings can be formulated:

The newspaper is unequivocally critical of two out of the four policies proposed in its kin-state that are analysed in the present Working Paper, i.e. those regarding border controls on the Danish-German border, and the so-called 'jewellery law'. When it comes to the two others (i.e. regarding 'ghetto areas' and face-covering garments), the newspaper of the Danish minority in Germany agrees with governmental policy-proposals.

Regarding the content discussing border controls, a consistency of argumentation is easily observable throughout the analysed period. Among the most recurrent points in

the newspaper's critical stance, the following ones can be mentioned: inefficiency of border controls; their adverse effect on Denmark's international reputation; economic damage; inefficient use of economic and human resources; difficulties caused by border controls to the everyday life in the Danish-German border area. Among the arguments of secondary significance one can mention for example: fluctuations of public opinion, topography of the Danish-German border-area or unreliable governmental data regarding the efficiency of border controls. In addition, Danish political debate regarding border controls is frequently described as uninformed, based on emotions and dominated by populist approaches to the issue. It is important to add that *Flensborg Avis* formulates also positive proposals regarding border controls: border issues should be addressed from a wider, European and internationally-coordinated perspective.

When the focus is turned to the so called 'jewellery law' a similar pattern emerges, although the number of analysed texts is significantly smaller. The newspaper critically examines governmental proposals from ethical and practical perspectives. The damage to Denmark's international reputation is also mentioned.

Conversely, the issues of the face-covering garments and the so-called 'ghetto areas' are assessed positively by *Flensborg Avis*. In both cases similar supportive arguments are used, for example: the expectation that the immigrants are going to integrate; the necessity to accept core Danish values by persons with immigrant background; welfare state and access to its services (all people



residing in Denmark are expected to contribute to it). It is crucial to add that, frequently, and with regard to all discussed thematic areas, the aforementioned arguments are closely intertwined and thus the analytical distinction between them is not in every case straightforward.

It is important to mention that the opinions of *Flensborg Avis* are expressed in a considerate language, however at times slightly harsher rhetorical means are used too (irony, humorous unmasking of absurdities etc.). On the other hand, such language is not free of directly and indirectly expressed political sympathies either. For example, such politicians as Inger Støjberg (Venstre) or Martin Henriksen (Danish People's Party) are openly criticized, while prime minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen (Venstre) seems to be frequently treated rather lightly.

In a way it is stating the obvious to say that *Flensborg Avis* perceives political ideas originating in Denmark through the geographic and historical context in which it functions (i.e. that of Danish-German border area and not, for example, of Copenhagen). That means, it strongly opposes any initiatives which may negatively influence everyday life in the Danish-German border area or cross-border cooperation. Within that context it should be also mentioned that Denmark's international standing is highly praised by the newspaper of the Danish minority in Germany. A strong willingness to preserve it is mentioned on numerous occasions too. Both positions put it frequently on a collision course with politicians in Denmark. Perhaps it could be argued that through this approach, *Flensborg*

Avis conveys a message stressing the importance of stable international relations for the protection of minority rights and Denmark's soft power as a tool enabling the country to 'export' its achievements form that particular field.

Finally, *Flensborg Avis*' approach to the Danish identity deserves to be briefly considered. The analysed texts suggest the approach to it, which can be described as combining both elements of strictness and flexibility. On the one hand, a certain set of unnegotiable core elements of that identity are mentioned (freedom, democracy, gender equality). On the other, it seems that beyond that core, a space is created within which different types of 'Danish-ness' can coexist. Certainly, the issue of the Danish identity conceptualizations/interpretations in *Flensborg Avis* deserve to be further explored.

9. Conclusions

Returning to the research question(s) formulated in the introduction, the key-findings of the present Working Paper are:

(1) *Flensborg Avis*' perception of the nativist tendencies mentioned in the introduction is moderately critical, as two out of the four examined topics were negatively assessed on its pages (border controls and 'jewellery law'). At the same time, it is important to add that one of these subjects (border controls) had been critically assessed on numerous occasions and over a prolonged period of time. On the other hand, the two other topics were assessed positively albeit not without certain reservations.



(2) It is evident that *Flensburg Avis* does not feel obliged to follow the political line set in its kin-state (even though it is to a substantial degree financed by it), since certain political ideas originating in Denmark are assessed very critically on its pages. As a result, it can be argued that one of the features of the relationship between the Danish minority in Schleswig-Holstein and its kin-state is an open discussion involving equal partners and plurality of opinion.

(3) *Flensburg Avis* considers itself an equal player within the field of debates concerning political development taking place in Denmark. In other words, it is not limiting its function to a passive conveying of news from a kin state: it comments on them and takes a stand on them.

(4) Further research should be focused on the above-mentioned issue of *Flensburg Avis*' approaches to identity, and its position regarding the topics similar to the ones discussed in the present Working Paper, which in the future will be discussed in Denmark.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Dr. Elise Carlson-Rainer (University of Washington's the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies) for many helpful suggestions and comments on the earlier version of this Working Paper.



Notes

¹ According to estimates c. 50,000 people belong to the Danish national minority in Germany (in most of the cases, members of that group are German citizens). It is foremostly concentrated in the districts (*kreis*) of Schleswig-Flensburg, Nordfriesland and Rendsburg-Eckernförde (i.e. the northern part of the *bundesland*, either bordering Denmark or not far from the Danish-German border) and characterized by a rich cultural and political life. For more information: <https://www.minderheitensekretariat.de/en/who-we-represent/danish-minority/>.

² In English-language media it is usually referred to as a ‘jewellery law’, see for example: <https://www.ft.com/content/6e31579a-c675-11e5-808f-8231cd71622e>. It allows the Danish authorities to confiscate from asylum seekers the assets exceeding the value of 10,000 Danish Krone (with the exception of those having an emotional value) in order to cover, at least in part, the expenses related to their staying in Denmark. See paragraph 1, point 73 of the amendment to Udlændingeloven (The Law on Foreigners): Lov om ændring af udlændingeloven <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=177348>.

³ This general regulation covers also, and perhaps most significantly, burkas and niqabs. Violation of that ban is financially penalized. See the amendment to Straffeloven (The Penal Code): Lov om ændring af straffeloven (Tildækningsforbud) <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=201839>.

⁴ The controversial term ‘ghetto’ is in official use in Denmark: for example, the government publishes an annually updated list of ghetto-areas in the country <https://www.regeringen.dk/nyheder/ghettoudspil/definition-ghetto-og-udsatte-boligomraader/>. In addition, that term is also very frequently used by the politicians or in the media, when matters concerning issues related to integration of immigrants or challenges faced by such areas are discussed. The set of Danish government’s policies discussed here aspires to eliminate ghetto areas from Denmark’s social map, through such measures as demolition of disadvantaged neighbourhoods or compulsory day-care facilitating integration. See for example: <https://www.thelocal.dk/20181123/danish-parliament-passes-contentious-ghetto-plan> and <https://www.thelocal.dk/20181214/denmark-makes-daycare-compulsory-in-disadvantaged-areas>.

⁵ Border controls had been introduced by Denmark in January 2016 and continue until the present day.

⁶ To quote after Møllekær: ”Vi mener, at man efter valget skal regne med, at når man kommer til grænsen, så står der en flink tolder, som vurderer, om der er basis for at tjekke ens bil. Hos langt de fleste er der ikke noget, der skal tjekkes. Men der er folk, som spekulerer i at komme til Danmark for at begå indbrud efter tyvekoster.”

⁷ SSW (Sydslesvigsk Vælgerforening in Danish and Südschleswigscher Wählerverband in German) is a regional political party in Schleswig-Holstein, representing Danish and Frisian minority groups.

⁸ ”Den tyske indenrigsminister Thomas De Maiziere (CDU) fremlagde fredag udviklingen i flygtningetilstrømningen til Tyskland i de seneste tre måneder. I januar kom 90.000, i februar 60.000, mens tallet i marts var faldet til 20.000.”

⁹ To quote Møllekær: ”Vi kan måske se begyndelsen på enden for den grænsekontrol, vi har levet med siden den 4. januar mellem Danmark og Tyskland. Mens nogle vil fastholde behovet for ikke bare den nuværende, men en endnu strengere grænsekontrol, så lad os lige se på fakta (...).”

¹⁰ ”Køerne ved grænsen er hyppigt gentagne og grænsekontrollen varer i hvert fald året ud. Hvor mange flere skal komme til skade eller endda dø på A7 ved Ellund inden da?”

¹¹ It is interesting that the minister’s surname is misspelled in Møllekær’s column. It is written as Støjbjerg instead of Støbjerg (see the first paragraph, line four).

¹² In order to name that space Møllekær is using the term ‘lederplads’, which, according to Den Danske Ordbog, means a regular space in the newspaper where its official views are expressed: <https://ordnet.dk/ddo/ordbog?query=lederplads>.

¹³ An informal group of the right-of-centre political parties in the Danish parliament.

¹⁴ To quote Møllekær: ”Så når Inger Støjbjerg (sic! – S.B.) for Gud ved hvilken gang nu gentager, at grænsekontrollen har virket og, at behovet for den fortsat er til stede, så er det et synspunkt, hun har al mulig ret til at forfægte. Men det bliver det ikke mere faktisk korrekt af. For sandheden er jo, at flygtningepresset stoppede allerede i foråret, blot få måneder efter at kontrollen blev indført.”

¹⁵ ”Og vi kan ikke trylle flygtningestrømme eller terrortruslen væk ved at melde os ud af det europæiske og internationale samarbejde, som skal løse problemerne. Vi kan ikke bygge mure mod verden. For så ender vi med at lukke os selv inde. Vi skal gå forlæns ind i fremtiden. Tage den i vores egne hænder. Forme den. Sætte os mål for, hvad vi vil.”. Source: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/politik/overblik-se-og-laes-statsministerens-nytaarstale-her>.

¹⁶ ”Danmark har allerede nummerplade-scannere. Brug dem og gå tilbage til de gode gamle baglandspatroljer. Men gerne hyppigere end før for at afskrække de uønskede. Det vil både være billigere og smartere. Ikke mindst ville



Danmark dermed igen fremstå som et land, der åbent byder indrejsende velkommen. Uniformer døgnet rundt ved grænsen hører fortiden til.¹⁷

¹⁷ To quote Møllekær: ”Danske soldater tager imod de tusinder, der dagligt kører ind i Danmark. Hvornår har vi sidst set noget tilsvarende. Vel ikke siden den 9. april 1940? Sammenligningen er unfair. Men undskyld os. Soldater langs en landegrænse sender et stærkt uheldigt signal om, at vi har at gøre med en national krise af de store. Soldater, bevæbnet må man formode, bruger man kun i aktion på egen grund, når landet står i våde.”

¹⁸ ”Soldater har vi for at sikre freden. Hos os selv eller ude i verden. At militæret nu skal granske Fru Petersen fra Flensborg på vej til Superbrugsen i Padborg er helt uhørt. Som om man fra Palæstina skal ind i Jerusalem. Grænselandet er da ikke et besat område. Og Danmark er heller ingen militærstat.”

¹⁹ To quote Møllekær: ”Det er en for så vidt naturlig konsekvens af, at blandt andet denne avis gentagne gange har peget på den kendsgerning, at kontrol alene på de tre overgange ved Kruså, Padborg og Frøslev, som vi har kendt den i snart to år, er til grin. For de øvrige otte stort set ubevogtede overgange har gjort det relativt nemt for hærdede kriminelle med en smule omtanke at undgå at støde ind i lovens lange arm. Set herfra ville det fortsat give bedre mening med en intelligent og intensiv baglandspatrulje fremfor bevidst at vinke i titusindvis af lovlige pendlere og turister igennem på vej ind til Danmark.”

²⁰ In the column, the particular case is described of when a person living in Flensburg intended to drive a van to Kollund on the Danish side of the border, in order to pick up furniture bought there. A forgotten passport ended in denied entry to Denmark. It is highly probable that the unknown person described by Møllekær is Flensburg’s mayor Simone Lange, who at least once in her public pronouncements referred to similar circumstances in which she was not allowed to cross into Denmark.

²¹ ”Ritzaus Bureau oplyser, at politiet i alt har kontrolleret 6,4 millioner mennesker i de to år, grænsekontrollen nu har været genindført. Læg dertil det meget større og ukendt tal af alle os, der blot vinkes igennem igen og igen, fordi vi kører i de rigtige nummerplader, bilen er vasket, eller også har bilisten den rigtige hårfarve og vinkes derfor ikke ind til siden.”

²² To quote Møllekær: ”Medmindre man bygger et hegn a la Ungarn eller lægger miner ud i Flensborg Fjord, vil professionelle kriminelle og terrorister kunne skaffe sig adgang til Danmark. Det vil heller ikke flere bilnummerpladescannere ændre på. Jo, de små fi sk vil gå i fælden. Men dem, vi alle er enige om at ville stoppe ved grænsen, fanger man ikke med den måde, man nu har arbejdet på i to ineffektive år.”

²³ ”Er man gennemsyret af vestlig kultur, kan langt de fleste af os blive enige om, at det at føle behov for at tilsløre sit ansigt med en burka eller en niqab, virker ekstremt frastødende.”



References

Bjerregaard, M. (2017, January 1). Overblik. Se og læs statsministerens nytårstale her. *Danmarks Radio*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/politik/overblik-se-og-laes-statsministerens-nytaarstale-her> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Crouch, D. (2016, January 4). Swedish border controls hit Øresund bridge commuters as well as refugees. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/04/swedish-border-controls-oresund-bridge-commuters-refugees> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Danish Parliament Passes Contentious 'Ghetto plan' (2018, November 23). *The Local*. Retrieved from: <https://www.thelocal.dk/20181123/danish-parliament-passes-contentious-ghetto-plan> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Definition af Udsatte Områder og Ghettoområder. Retrieved from: <https://www.regeringen.dk/nyheder/ghettoudspil/definition-ghetto-og-udsatte-boligomraader/> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Den Danske Ordbog. Moderne Dansk Sprog (entry: lederplads). Retrieved from: <https://ordnet.dk/ddo/ordbog?query=lederplads> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Denmark makes daycare compulsory in disadvantaged areas (2018, December 14). *The Local*. Retrieved from: <https://www.thelocal.dk/20181214/denmark-makes-daycare-compulsory-in-disadvantaged-areas> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Kingsley, P., Weaver, M., Kassam, A. (2015, November 12). Sweden introduces border checks as refugee crisis grows. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/12/refugee-crisis-sweden-introduces-border-checks> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Krueger, R. (2015, July 16). Landdagen håber på samarbejde uden skærpet grænsekontrol. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 9.

Lidegaard, B. (2016, January 29). There is Something Rotten in the State of Denmark. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/6e31579a-c675-11e5-808f-8231cd71622e> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Lov om Ændring af Straffeloven (Tildækningsforbud). Retrieved from: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=201839> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Lov om Ændring af Udlændingeloven. Retrieved from: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=177348> (accessed 26 December 2018).

Minderheitensekretariat. Who we represent. The Danish Minority. Retrieved from: <https://www.minderheitensekretariat.de/en/who-we-represent/danish-minority/> (accessed 26 December 2018).



Møllekær, J. (2015, December 19). Danmark og flygtnings værdigenstande. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2015, May 8). Valgkamps-grænsekage. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2015, November 13). Den sidste frie grænsepassage? *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2016, April 9). Håb forude for grænsekontrollens endeligt. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2016, August 9). Det er ikke godt nok. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2016, January 22). Jorden kalder Liberal Alliance, *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2016, January 4). En trist start på det nye år. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2016, November 3). Nøgternheden ved at indfinde sig. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2017, August 12). Send tropperne til Nørrebro. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2017, December 12). Valg eller ikke valg. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2017, January 4). Den postfaktuelle grænsekontrol. *Flensborg Avis*, 4 January 2017, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2017, May 3). God nyt fra Øresund. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2017, October 7). Ret og pligt og burka, *Flensborg Avis*, p. 20.

Møllekær, J. (2018, February 2). Mikroskopisk kontrol. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2018, January 3). Dansk-tyske nytårstaler. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2018, March 2). Ingen ghettoer i 2030, *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Møllekær, J. (2018, May 31). EU-Parlamentet fordømmer grænsekontrol. *Flensborg Avis*, p. 19.

Resultataftale 2018 mellem Flensborg Avis AG og Sydslesvigudvalget. Retrieved from: https://kum.dk/fileadmin/KUM/Documents/Kulturpolitik/Kultursamarbejde/Internationalt/Sydslesvigudvalget/Tilskud/Resultataftaler_2018/Flensborg_Avis_-_Resultataftale_2018_.pdf (accessed 26 November 2018).



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sergiusz Bober

ECMI Senior Research Associate, Head of Politics and Civil Society Cluster

*Contact: bober@ecmi.de

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION SEE

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES (ECMI)

Schiffbruecke 12 (Kompagnietor) D-24939 Flensburg

☎ +49-(0)461-14 14 9-0 * fax +49-(0)461-14 14 9-19

* E-Mail: info@ecmi.de * Internet: <http://www.ecmi.de>