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Abstract

This essay seeks to discern the motives of the aid allocation of western governments. The aim of the essay is to find differences between three highly similar aid donors: namely Denmark, Norway and Sweden, by doing a comparative case study according to the most similar case method. The research has been conducted by analyzing material from two ministers of each government, the Foreign Ministers and Ministers for International Development, by using a motive-analysis method. Social constructivism and structural realism have been used as a theoretical explanation. These two theories have been helpful in understanding how International Relations work.

The results showed that although the three countries were highly similar, they showed some crucial differences in their motivation for aid allocation, especially in the case of Denmark. Theoretically, this could be explained by social constructivism, i.e. that the states have different priorities and experiences.
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1. Introduction
Today, several countries donate considerable funds to other countries hoping that it will allow them to achieve a higher standard of living. This process started after the Second World War when the western countries perceived other countries in the world to be in a lower stage of development. Consequently, the developed states started to try and aid these countries to catch-up with the western countries by giving them the capital and knowledge needed.\(^1\)

The largest part of the aid funds originate from the state itself and the government draws up the guidelines for how the money is to be used. A great amount of research has been invested in trying to understand how aid is given and if aid works. Interestingly, seemingly little has been done to understand the motives and determinates of the developed country; that is, how they motivate the aid donation. The essay will build on this research and by answering the question: \textit{How do western states such as Denmark, Sweden and Norway motivate their allocation of aid to less developed countries?}

1.1 Aim and Research Questions
The aim of this essay will be to investigate the declared motives for aid donation in three developed states, Denmark, Norway and Sweden.

1. What declared motives can be found in official documents from the government, in this case meaning the Foreign Minister and the Minister for International Development, of Denmark, Norway and Sweden?

2. Is it possible to discern a difference between the states in how they prioritize between security/power, economic and altruistic motives?

3. How do social constructivism and structural realism explain the motives?

1.2 Disposition
To begin with, the previous research will be accounted for. I will discuss the contents and results of these investigations and how they have been useful to this essay. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical aspects as well as operationalizing the contents which will be researched. In addition, two hypotheses are formulated and explained, and the analytical method is elucidated.

Thereafter, Chapter 3 will look at the methodological aspect of the essay where the method used to carry out the investigation and analyze the results will be described.

\(^1\) Odén (2006) p. 43-44
Lastly, the results of the investigation will be presented in Chapter 5, and analyzed in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 will present some concluding remarks.

1.3 Previous Research

The books that have been used discuss various parts of aid donation. Roger C. Riddell’s *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* (2007) and Bertil Odén’s *Biständets idéhistoria: från Marshallhjälp till millenniemål* \(^2\) (2006) have been very useful in explaining how aid donation works and for the historical background. Though this information will not be described in this essay, it gave comprehensive background knowledge. However, most important for this essay was that both authors’ state different motives of aid donation.

Moreover, a few articles and essays written by researchers who have conducted research in this field previously have been used in this study. Two such examples are Alesina and Dollar’s *Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?* (2000) and also Schraeder’s, Hook’s and Taylor’s *Clarifying the Foreign Aid Puzzle: A Comparison of American, Japanese, French, and Swedish Aid Flows* (1998), which gave good insight into the subject of motives for aid donation. In 1998, Schraeder, Hook and Taylor stated that: “*Unfortunately, the ongoing debate over the foreign aid regime remains trapped in something of an intellectual vacuum given the lack of scholarly understanding of the determinants of foreign aid programs.*” \(^3\)

The scholars point to the lack of research into this field, but offered valuable insight for the research. The article discusses the different factors that determine the aid flows of four states. They look for example at their highly different historical background as an important factor. Highly relevant to this essay was that they discovered that Sweden, to a high degree, promotes its economic interests aside from humanitarian objectives, contradicting their prior understanding. \(^4\)

The other important study was made by Dollar and Alesina in 2000. They carried out a quantitative research of the determinants of aid donation by looking at the different aid donors of the world. They compare the aid donors according to several variables in trying to find an answer to their question, which is also the title: *Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?* Their findings point to that most states donate aid because of security interests and that old colonial ties between the DCs and LDCs is a very important motive for aid. Interestingly, the

\(^2\) The title roughly translates into *The History of Ideas of Aid Development: from the Marshal Plan to the Millennium Development Goal* (2006)


states chosen for this study (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) are lumped together in a group because of their similarity.¹

2. Theory and Hypothesis
In this chapter a theoretical discussion of the essay is given. There will be a brief outline of two theories (structural realism and social constructivism) that will be used in the essay. The theories were chosen as they are used in International Relations (IR) discipline and give incongruous viewpoints, on how states work.

2.1 Definition of Terms
The organization OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) has established a committee called DAC (Development Assistance Committee) to monitor and improve the development cooperation from the OECD countries. Odén describes them as normative regarding the definition of terms in development context.⁶ They use the term ODA (Official Development Aid) to describe aid; ODA will be used to in this essay as well. They define ODA as:

“those flows to countries and territories…and to multilateral organization which are:

i) provided by official agencies, including state and local government, or by their executive agencies, and

ii) each transaction of which: is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective;”⁷

i) Motive – “A person’s motive is their aim or purpose which influences the way they behave.”⁸ In this essay, the aim is to find the motives of a particular governments, by looking at key ministers (see 1.2)

ii) Altruism – “is concern for the happiness and welfare of other people rather than for you own.”⁹ In this essay altruism, would mean one state showing concern for the welfare of another state.

---

¹ Alesina, Dollar (2000) p. 33-34 & 42
² Odén (2006) p. 20
³ Internet 1: www.oecd.org/dac/stats.
iii) **Solidarity** – “if a group of people show *solidarity*, they show complete unity and agreement with each other, especially in supporting the same aims or actions.”\(^{10}\) In this essay solidarity, would mean that states share a common goal of the development and welfare of all states, i.e. that they support each other in their development.

iv) **Power** – “If someone has *power*, they have control over other people of events or activities.”\(^{11}\) In this essay, power means the capability of one state to influence another.

v) **Security** – in this essay meaning the threat of a state from other states, or various form of threats or attacks against the population of the state. Different policies or strategies influence the level of *security* of the state and the aim is to achieve a high level of security.\(^{12}\)

vi) **Economic benefit** – in this case meaning *economic benefit* in *relative gains*, i.e. the state seeks to generate more economic value that its competitors in any ways possible. In this case, relating to development work an increase in (for the state) beneficial trade, access to raw material or gain for businesses.\(^{13}\)

vii) **Developed Country** (DC) – a country in Western Europe, North America and Japan (often describes as pertaining to the North) with the wealth and power control the international management of global economy.\(^{14}\) The states Denmark, Norway and Sweden belong to this group.

viii) **Less Developed Country** (LDC) – countries usually describes as the South in relation to the DC North. The countries not belonging to the DC’s and the ones whom receive ODA.\(^{15}\)

\(^{10}\) Definition taken from: Collins COBUILD English language dictionary., Collins, London, 1987

\(^{11}\) Definition taken from: Collins COBUILD English language dictionary., Collins, London, 1987

\(^{12}\) Kolodziej (2005) p. 22-24

\(^{13}\) Cohn (2008). P. 52-53

\(^{14}\) Cohn (2008) p 5

\(^{15}\) Cohn (2008) p. 5
2.2 Structural Realism

Structural realism belongs to a group of theories labeled realism.\textsuperscript{16} Realism is one of the most influential theoretical approaches within International Relations and has been so for quite a long time. Structural realism as theory was formulated mainly by the researcher Kenneth Waltz in the end of the 1970s. His intent was to establish a theory in realism that was not bound strictly by normative concerns but instead could give a scientific explanation of international politics.\textsuperscript{17} For this reason structural realism will be used for this essay, as it seeks to explain the interests, motives and actions of the state, it will help answer the research question.

For structural realists as other realists, states are the primary actors and the most important unit to study and understand in IR. States are the highest authority within the international system. The implication of this is that there is no higher authority to govern the states themselves, the international system is anarchic and conflict ridden. This has a profound effect on realist theory and structural realism. This means that, because, there is a perpetual conflict between states there is a constant struggle for its survival and for more power for the state.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, structural realists believe that this struggle for survival, security and power creates zero-sum game; where states regard themselves relative to other states in terms of power, security and wealth and always seek to maximize their own gains.\textsuperscript{19}

Structural realism is as the name suggest mainly focused on international structures. Waltz explains that the anarchy of the international system is a decentralized structure where states are the units that make up the structure. He continues by saying that all states are similar in that they perform the same basic task, such as maintain the infrastructure and national defense. However, they differ in regards to their capabilities to perform these tasks; with greater capability comes more influence and with lesser capability comes lesser influence. Consequently, changes in the international system occur when the capabilities of the states changes, or the rise and fall of great powers.

This structure is crucial to the understanding of the international system and the action and decision of the state for structural realists. The reason for this is that according to structural realism, the international structure determines state foreign policy. For foreign policy makers

\textsuperscript{16} Jackson, Sörensen (2007) p. 59
\textsuperscript{17} Jackson, Sörensen (2007) p. 74-75
\textsuperscript{18} Jackson, Sörensen (2007) p. 60-61
\textsuperscript{19} Cohn (2008) p. 52
there is little room for maneuverability as the structures constrain and even dictates what the state ought to do.  

However, states are still sovereign entities that are considered as with the same degree of independence for structural realists, regardless of being great powers or not. This leads structural realism back to the essence of realism, which are state security and power. These concerns are at the center of what is the national interest. This in turn, is what leads state leaders in their foreign political decisions. Thus, state actions are a consequence of national interest and the international structures.

2.3 Social Constructivism
A fairly recent development in IR theory was made by political scientists in America; one of them is Alexander Wendt who takes a social constructivist view on international relations. In contrast to structural realism, constructivists do not focus solely on materialist issues such as military power or economic wealth. Instead they focus on the nonmaterial aspect of IR and claim it is not possible to study it objectively as structural realists assert. Constructivists therefore center their research on ideas and the social interactions between states.

Alexander Wendt begins by challenging structural realists by questioning their views on the effect of anarchy. As was discussed in chapter 2.2, structural realists see the international anarchy as a source of conflict between states. Wendt on the other hand, opposes this, saying that: “anarchy is what states make of it”. What he means by this is that the international system is not predetermined and unchangeable, but rather, actions by states and interactions between states constantly reshape the system. This means that the anarchic international system does not necessarily have to mean the struggle by states for power and survival but rather cooperation and peace if they want it to be so.

Continuing, the actions of states can, according to constructivists, lead to different forms of the international system. Instead of the world being predetermined, the constructivists take different possibilities into consideration. Wendt discusses three different cultural types: the Hobbesian, the Lockian and the Kantian. The first one is the realist state of perpetual war

---

20 Walz in Keohane (edn) (1986)81-96
21 Jackson, Sørensen (2007) p. 74-79
22 Jackson, Sørensen (2007) p. 162
24 Jackson, Sørensen (2007) p. 162
25 Jackson, Sørensen (2007) p 168
discussed above. The second one, means a continued rivalry between states but a mutual recognition of the others right to exist. The third one is the most recent world order were states regard each other as friends and cooperate against security threats.  

The degree of internalization is a way to describe how internalized each cultural type is in the behavior of the state. The first degree means that the shared commitment to the degree of cooperation is weak because agents are coerced into commitment. The second degree, actors are more committed to a shared norm because they believe it is in their own self-interest, i.e. it is favorable to them. In the third and last degree, the norm and the ideas inherent to it have become internalized in the actor’s behavior. For example, the interests of a state deeply internalized in the Hobbesian degree of cooperation, would be to use force to achieve its interests. While on the other hand, the interests of a state in the Kantian norm would be to cooperate with other states in order to reach set goals.

Hence, the shared ideas and norms of the international system are crucial to understand, in order to understand the behavior of the state. National interest is not only played down to states seeking more power and increasing the security. For constructivists, identities and ideas formed by social interactions can lead to national interests seeking something else other than power. Therefore, differences between states in terms of power and capability are not something that will lead to conflict.

Furthermore, the constructivist researcher Martha Finnemore argues that international organizations and institutions can establish norms that affect the behavior of the state. She investigates for instance how an organization such as the International Committee of the Red Cross sets up norms for how to conduct warfare appropriately, which the state then adopts into its policy. This is an example of how a certain behavior can become internalized into the behavior of states.

26 Jackson, Sörensen (2007) p. 164-169
27 Copeland, in Guzzini, Leander (2006) p. 6-7
29 Jackson, Sörensen (2007) p. 170
2.4 Theoretical Hypotheses

The hypotheses will be used to try and explain the behavior of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The first hypothesis will be founded on structural realism. This theory is, as described earlier, concerned with the struggle among states, their security issues, gains and influence respective of one and another. Furthermore, there are differences in states concerning their capabilities, and that the international structure constrains the states’ foreign policy. If the results of the investigation should be related to security, economic benefits and power structural realism therefore gives a satisfactory explanation to the behavior of states. The hypothesis is:

*Denmark, Norway and Sweden motivate their aid donations on the basis that such actions will influence their security, their gains and power in a positive way.*

The second hypothesis will be founded on social constructivism. According to the advocates of social constructivism it is important to study ideas, norms and to understand how they are formed. This theory is nondeterministic in this sense as it states that the international system can change; either into a more conflict ridden environment or a more cooperative one. If the results of the investigation should show that state motives for aid donation can be understood by ideas and norms relating either to security, commercial or altruistic motives; social constructivism gives a sound explanation to the behavior of states. The hypothesis is:

*Prevailing ideas and norms motivate Denmark, Norway and Sweden to donate aid for either economic, security or altruistic reasons.*

The hypotheses can be regarded as a continuum where the theories stand at either end. When analyzing the results, the answers will lie along the continuum. The analytical approach is further explained in chapter 4.
3. Method & Material

*In this chapter the Method and the Material used during the research will be described and discussed.*

3.1 Method

The aim of this essay is to investigate how western governments motivate their aid allocation. To find the answer to this question, three aid donors will be compared. The design chosen for this purpose is the comparative case-study; this is a case study of states’ motives for donating ODA and this essay will compare three states and their motives for aid donation. The use of a comparative approach will allow for a controlled comparison between few cases and to find the answer to the research question. The cases are chosen in accordance to the method of agreement and because of their similarity in the development community.\(^{30}\) Continuing, the goal is to find factors that are different between them; that despite their similarities they donate aid differently.\(^{31}\) Such a result might elucidate on why aid is allocated.

The reasons for why the cases Denmark, Norway and Sweden have been chosen are several. *Firstly*, they are all donor states and all have a long history for allocating aid and claimed altruistic intentions such as poverty reduction and support for human rights are on their agenda. *Secondly*, they are recognized as highly developed states and share a common historical and cultural background. *Thirdly*, all countries cannot be considered globally as great powers and their economical strength and their population sizes are roughly the same. In terms of aid allocation all states give close to 1 percent of the GNI and are considered as leading examples in the aid community. Moreover, they all have outspoken altruistic motives for aid which will be interesting to examine. According to the principles of the most-similar case study the similarities will cancel out, and differences will give answers to the research question.\(^{32}\)

There is a risk however that the cases will fail to give an answer. That they are too similar making the comparison invalid. Additionally, there is a risk that they lack variation and that the answer is not representative to a greater number of cases.\(^{33}\) Nonetheless, an important reason why the named states will be used in the research is because, previous research has shown, e.g. Dollar and Alesina study (see.1.4), that donor states with a history as colonial

\(^{30}\) George, Bennett (2005) p. 151ff
\(^{31}\) Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson Wängnerud (2007) p. 128
\(^{32}\) Riddell (2007) p.56 and 70ff
empires are likely donate money to fund their former colonies. Since the chosen states lack a colonial history, this is that can be eliminated as a motive.\textsuperscript{34}

To find the motives, a method called motive-analysis has been chosen. This method will be delineated in \textit{chapter 4}.

\textbf{3.2 Material}

Primarily, the material consists of two kinds of material, books concerning aid allocation or theory and material published on government websites. For the investigation of the motives material from websites were used. For the Government ministers speeches, articles and other material were taken mostly from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As the objective was to discern the motives of the actors, it was important that the material was linked to them. Material was also taken from the agencies: Danida (Danish International Development Agency), Norad (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation) and Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) to value the motive-indicators. The publication dates of all internet material range between the years 2000-2008. There were several reasons for choosing these dates. Firstly, there was the issue of contemporariness, and secondly the chance of poor internet material dating back earlier than that, and lastly, to have material from the latest governments in power. The \textit{Source Criticism} is not as central to this essay as most sources are \textit{primary sources}.

\textbf{3.2.1 Source Criticism}

\begin{itemize}
\item[i)] \textbf{Authenticity:} the material is taken from websites related to the three different governments and agencies, all with a good reputation abroad. It is published for informative purposes and it holds a high degree of authenticity.\textsuperscript{35} As many of the documents are key to aid policies there should be little risk of it to be false. Additionally, the speeches and articles from the government ministers also bear a high mark of authenticity as they are published in several different websites.
\item[ii)] \textbf{Independence:} there are three important aspects to consider when confirming the independence of the material. The first is possibility to verify stories, the second is the distance between the author and the story and the authors degree of independence.\textsuperscript{36} In this case, the two latter are the more important aspects because the main bulk of the material used is from actual person i.e. the two government minister of each state. Furthermore, it
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{34} Alesina, Dollar (2000) p. 5

\textsuperscript{35} Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson Wängnerud, (2007) p. 317-318

\textsuperscript{36} Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson Wängnerud, (2007) p. 318-320
is possible to verify the content of their stories as it is often the case with their articles that they are published on several different websites. Moreover, as the speeches and articles are primary sources and as Ministers within their policy area they can be asserted with a high degree of independence.

The material from the government agencies are guiding documents from the governments and can also be considered as being independent.

iii) Contemporariness: for the material to be relevant and functional it is important that it is contemporary. They have to be produced as close to the event as possible for it to be accurate, if this is not the case the material might be distorted. For example, as mainly speeches or interviews are used they are the information is recent and contemporary as well.\(^{37}\)

iv) Tendency: when using texts for research the tendency criterion is used to determine whether the author deliberately tells a distorted story with a hidden motive, or openly declares his motives.\(^{38}\) When choosing the material that was to be investigated the tendency criterion was important. At a certain point I considered using the descriptions, which described their agenda and work, on the agencies websites. However, I felt that it would be more appropriate to use primary sources instead as it reduced the risk of tendency.


4. Analytical Framework

*In this chapter a description and explanation of the analytical framework will conclude the introduction and theoretical part. The chapter includes a summary of the Motive-Analysis and the Theoretical-Analysis, and also Figures that clarifies the research and which will be used to analyze the data.*

4.1 Finding the Motives

The three states Denmark, Norway and Sweden might share outspoken altruistic motives for aid allocation. Although this might be the reality, perhaps there are other motives as well which perhaps seem more important when taking a closer look. Consequently, an analytical toolbox has to be devised in order to discern important information. The so called *motive-analysis* has been chosen for this purpose. The method seeks to explore and understand the motives that an actor makes before the decision. Motive-analysis will therefore be used to analyze the empirical data in order to find the motives for aid allocation for the three states.\(^{39}\)

When conducting a motive-analysis it is important to define the actor that will be examined. In this case there are two actors in all three states that will be examined, that is the *Foreign Ministers* and *Minister for International Development*. The reason why they have been chosen is because they are most likely to have an impact in the decision making process. Therefore their motives are the most interesting and relevant to pursue. Their statements in speeches, articles and similar material published on websites related to their respective departments will be subject to analysis.\(^{40}\)

This study will look for three different kinds of motives (see *Figure 4.1*). To find significant motive-indicators in the empirical material it will be useful to establish list implications, *Figure 4.2*, for each of the three types of motives that will expose them. The list of implications is based on Odén’s explanation of possible motives for aid donation.\(^ {41}\) For instance, should Denmark have motives concerned with increased security it would be possible to find evidence of this in either its aid allocation or foreign political statements.\(^ {42}\)

The analysis will then begin by valuing the motive-indicators to determine their relevance. Essaisson et. al. (2007) explain that the best way to do this is to compare the motive-indicators with the actions that the actor, and if it there is correspondence a motive has

---

41 Odén (2006) p. 33-34
probably been found. In this analysis the comparison will be done by looking at the documents that the three governments use to regulate ODA. As this is the closest you can come to actual action of how ODA is donated they are appropriate to compare with. Should there be correspondence between the results from both investigations the motive-indicators are strong.\textsuperscript{43}

The results from the investigation of the texts will then be analyzed to clarify what motives each state has for its aid allocation. The analysis will value the motive-indicators to establish what the strongest motive for aid donation for each state is. The motive-indicators where there is strong correspondence and where expressions of the actor are strong will determine the strongest motive.\textsuperscript{44} This will be done by using a constructed diagram of analysis shown as Figure 4.1. The diagram intends to show how the three different motives have been found to be represented by the three states Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Moreover, the numbers 1, 2, 3 will be used to show which motive is strongest represented in each state. Should Sweden for example, be best described as having motives for economic benefit then this box will be given 1, the second strongest 2 and so on.

Lastly, the motives that are found and the results from the investigation will be used to test the theoretical part of the essay. That is to say, to which theory, structural realism or social constructivism, are most apt to explain the motives. How this will be carried out is explained in detail in chapter 2.3 -2.4.

\textbf{Figure 4.1} \textsuperscript{45}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{43} Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson Wängnerud, (2007) p. 337-338

\textsuperscript{44} Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson Wängnerud, (2007) p. 340-341

\textsuperscript{45} Table to determine the outcome of the motive-analysis. Note: The numbers 1,2,3 will be used to indicate in what scale each motive is represented, where 1 is the best represented motive and 3 is the lowest one.
### Figure 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Power</td>
<td>References in to security of the state, more influence /power for the state.</td>
<td>If the materials from the state agencies/government refers to aid allocations in terms of increasing security/power. This indicates neorealist motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References to playing an important role in donor community and international status of state.</td>
<td>If the material from agencies/government refers in this sense it indicates that the motives of the state are limited by int. structures as neorealism says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefit</td>
<td>References to companies having trade interests within the country.</td>
<td>If the material shows that the aid donor desires to establish trade relationships with the aid recipient in a way that is beneficial to themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References to trade agreements, and economic benefits as an outcome</td>
<td>If the material from agencies/government shows that aid should lead to positive economic terms for the donor, e.g. a trade relationship this indicates that aid is motivated by domestic commercial preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity Altruism</td>
<td>References to moral or solidarity obligations to help others by donating aid.</td>
<td>If the material from agencies/government refers and shows that aid is donated because of a sense of moral obligation this indicates that is motivated by altruism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References of aid donation as a means to achieve solidarity and altruistic goals</td>
<td>If the material from agencies/government refers and shows that aid is donated in order to achieve such goals as eradicating poverty, improve health of people in other countries and improve democratic and human rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Using the Theory

As stated earlier, theory will be used as way of explaining this research i.e. why the results are as they are. To do this, *Figure 4.3* has been constructed and will act as a diagram of analysis to clearly show how the results can be described.

When the investigation is complete and motives from Denmark, Norway and Sweden have been found, *Figure 4.3* will be used to see if their motives bear features that can be connected to either theory. As seen below, the table contains the theoretical explanation of the motives and a box that asks if there is a correspondence between the key features and the results. When the analysis is complete a picture should be formed and give some explanation to the

---

*Figure describing the implications that will be used to search for motive-indicators.*
motives. This is also to the test the hypotheses, as it helps understand what the results are saying in light of the theory. For instance are the motives more a social construct or are they explained by nature of the international arena. The flow chart Figure 4.5 delineates the how the analysis will help explain the research question.

**Figure 4.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Structural realism</th>
<th>Social constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between result and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>States are motivated by their interest for more security and power</td>
<td>International insecurity forces states to act in order to protect their security and power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>States seek to maximize their economic benefits</td>
<td>Norms and ideas domestically and internationally influence states to lead by their economic interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>States help other states if it furthers their interests</td>
<td>Norms promoting mutual cooperation have been internalized by states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three states donate aid with differing motives</td>
<td>States are bound by international structures and their ability to perform certain tasks.</td>
<td>Prevailing ideas and norms domestically and internationally influence the behavior of states.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4**

---

47 Theoretical figure of analysis. Note: Should the motives and the theory of the feature correspond, it will be indicated with a plus sign (+) if not a minus sign (−).

48 Flow chart illustrating the structure of the essay.
5. Findings of Motive-Indicators

In this part of the essay the results yielded from the investigation will be presented. The motive-indicators revealed by the implications will be discussed in relation to Figure 4.2. The results will be shown state by state with quotes from the Foreign Minister and the Minister for International Development which is representative of the material found on the government websites. Subsequently, the motive-indicators will be presented.

5.1 Denmark

Firstly, motive-indicators for increased security and power were searched for in texts by the Danish Foreign Minister Per Stig Møller and the Minister for International Development Ulla Tørnæs. In the material which was research, implications for motives related to security and power were found.

In most speeches and texts looked at that are from Per Stig Møller and Ulla Tørnæs, there are several connections to security issues and development. There were also indications that Denmark has built up a status internationally as an influential donor country which it wants to preserve. Power however, in connection to aid donations was not found when using the implications.

Figure 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Government sees a threat to Denmark’s security when underdevelopment results in radicalization and terrorism. Denmark allocates aid to LDCs as a way to preempt these security threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark has as a result of a strong commitment to development and a strong amount of aid donation gained status as an important state among other donors. The Danish government wishes to keep this status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Stig Møller

“Our involvement in the Middle East is, naturally, also the reflection of a long-term security policy prioritisation in our, our partners’ and the Arab countries’ interests [...] During our membership of the Security Council, our effort has been very focused. Focus has been on strengthening global security and on contributing to conflict solution— with particular emphasis on Africa [...] In this connection, a small country has a comparative advantage in contrast to large

---
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countries with superpower interests and a colonial past. That does not imply that hard power should be dropped from the toolbox.\(^5\)

"World leaders will meet in New York to take stock of progress in implementation of the Millennium Declaration. This meeting will provide a unique opportunity to break new ground and push ahead the interlinked agenda of peace, security and development,"\(^5\)

Ulla Tørnæs

“For those of us who – like Africa – stand to gain from an upgrading of the development agenda, and for those of us who – like Denmark – believe in the necessity of development as a precondition for security and stability [...] We need to engage the international community in a strengthened partnership in order to meet the challenges in Africa [...] a partnership characterised by a comprehensive strategy encompassing development and security issues alike. You can rest assured that Denmark stands ready to shoulder its part of the deal.”\(^5\)

“I hope that the tool will contribute to future development efforts addressing radicalisation and recruitment for terrorism and thereby to the promotion of development and security in the developing countries and at the global level.”\(^5\)

“Our national efforts are well known. For years Denmark has provided more than the UN 0.7 % target prescribes, and my Government has made a pledge that Danish ODA shall not go below 0.8 %. We are in an exclusive club of only five countries living up to this thirty year old promise.”\(^5\)

Interestingly, in regards to both ministers very little is stated about how aid donation and development work is in the economic interests of Denmark. The investigation was carried out

\(^{5}\) Internet 2: http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/TheMinister/SpeechesAndArticles/Archives2006/SpeechOnGlobalisationByTheDanishMinisterForForeignAffairs.htm
\(^{5}\) Internet 3: http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/TheMinister/SpeechesAndArticles/Archives2004/Statement50thSessionUNGA.htm
\(^{5}\) Internet 5: http://www.um.dk/da/menu/OmOs/Udviklingsministeren/Taler/Arkiv2006/UdviklingsministerensTalePaaSeminarOmdUdviklingOrRadikalisering.htm
\(^{5}\) Internet 6: http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/TheMinisterForDevelopmentCooperation/SpeechesAndArticles/Archives2005/StatementByTheMinisterForDevelopmentCooperationAtThePresentationOfTheUNDPHumanDevelopmentReport2005.htm
by looking for implications that suggest that Denmark donate aid as a means to establish their economic interests in less developed countries. However, both Ulla Tørnæs and Per Stig Møller speak very highly of free trade. Indeed both ministers believe that free trade is a prerequisite for poverty reduction.

**Figure 5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Government wants to use funds and influence to open up trade for LDCs as a way to reduce poverty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per Stig Møller*

“Open and trade-dependent economies have an interest in a world of global free trade with liberal regulations on trade and investments”, and “We all have an interest in an early conclusion of the Doha Round that will bring benefits to developed and, mostly, developing countries.”

*Ulla Tørnæs*

“And further steps to liberalize world trade are equally important. It is necessary to achieve a development friendly and sustainable outcome of the WTO development round in Hong Kong in December. This would imply improved marked access for the poorest countries.”

The two Danish ministers discuss goals and obligations that can be described as altruistic and as being related to solidarity. The implications gave clear indications to motives that reflect such ambitions. Often the statements that related to aid donation were in connection to the Millennium Declaration.

---
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56 Internet 7: [http://www.um.dk/da/menu/OmOs/Udenrigsministeren/Taler/Arkiv2004/UMerensAAbningsindlaegVedASEM5Topmoedet.htm](http://www.um.dk/da/menu/OmOs/Udenrigsministeren/Taler/Arkiv2004/UMerensAAbningsindlaegVedASEM5Topmoedet.htm)
Figure 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solidarity/Altruism Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Government believes it has a moral obligation and commitment to donate aid to other states in order to improve the lives of suffering people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Government sets goals for its aid donation, such as poverty reduction, health improvement and universal education that are based on solidarity and altruism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Stig Møller

“A key priority for Denmark will be to speed up the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals. The results so far are not encouraging, particularly not in Africa. Denmark attaches the highest priority to Africa’s development and wants its situation and prospects high on the agenda for the 2005-summit.”

“Denmark remains firmly committed to realising international targets on sexual and reproductive health and rights and gender equality. This commitment has strong support across all political parties represented in the Danish Parliament.”

“The gap between goals and resources must be closed. We are deeply concerned about the inadequacy of the current level of development financing.”

Ulla Tørnæs

“Without gender equality, we will never achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2015, and we will not have lived up to our mutual responsibility to combat poverty [...] There is, however, a fine balance, that is necessary to keep in mind, between investing in the new generations and the need to meet the obligation to help the 771 million illiterate people to retain and realise their right

---
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to acquire reading, writing and numeracy skills. For me it is essential that Denmark continues to keep a focus on primary education.\textsuperscript{62}

“First of all, assistance must target core grievances of people – such as education and health or issues such as good governance, democracy and human rights. As such, quite a few of the types of interventions mentioned in the tool are well known development efforts, in which the Danish government is already actively engaged.”\textsuperscript{63}

“Bilaterally our commitment to the neglected continent will be no less in the future. Not only are almost 60\% of our country specific assistance allocated to Africa, but in addition I am planning to designate one additional programme country, chosen among the poorest of the poor countries.”\textsuperscript{64}

5.2 Norway
Here follows a presentation of the investigation of the Norwegian government ministers: the Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre and the Minister for International Development Erik Solheim. The implications described in the methods chapter will try to reveal the motive-indicators these actors base aid donation on.

A few of the statements taken from speeches and other published material by the Norwegian and Minister for Development Cooperation’s were related to security issues. However, the results were largely inconclusive regarding power, there were also and statements regarding Norway’s status abroad, but they were related to peace and not development. Consequently, Norway uses aid to create a more peaceful world, but it is not related back to Norway’s security policy to a large extent.

\textsuperscript{62} Internet 10: \underline{http://www.mdg3action.um.dk/en/menu/Conference/Copenhagen+April+2008/MinisterForDevelopmentCooperationsSpeech/}
\textsuperscript{63} Internet 11: \underline{http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/TheMinisterForDevelopmentCooperation/SpeechesAndArticles/Archives2006/DevelopmentAndRadicalisationNewApproachesInAChangingWorld.htm}
\textsuperscript{64} Internet 06: \underline{http://www.um.dk/en/menu/aboutus/theministerfordevelopmentcooperation/speechesandarticles/archives2005/statementbytheministerfordevelopmentcooperationatthepresentationoftheundphumandevelopmentreport2005.htm}
Increasing insecurity in other parts of the world as results of underdevelopment. Aid allocation is used to counter this.

Jonas Gahr Støre

“Our efforts for peace, reconciliation and development are not just based on solidarity and respect for human dignity. Our peace policy is becoming a part of our own security policy.”

“And now a few words about Afghanistan: Shows how closely the world is tied together by globalisation and geopolitical change. By a new understanding of security policy. Shows how important war and conflict “far away” are for Norwegian interests and alliances.”

Erik Solheim

“Norway will continue to be at the forefront of international efforts to ease poor countries’ debt burden, both by contributing to better international debt relief mechanisms and by reducing their debts to Norway [...] We consider our international development policy an important part of our new security policy.”

“Environmental and climate change and increased migration may further weaken fragile states, thus creating fertile ground for new conflicts. Humanitarian disasters and extensive migration can also pose a threat to our own security, and we are pleased that the UN Security Council has put this issue on the agenda.”

When moving on to look for implications for donating aid as a way to achieve economic benefit the results were unconvincing. The Foreign Minister discussed the benefits of trade internationally but not often in a development context. The Minister for International


Development on the other hand, often discusses the importance of making Norway’s private sector investing in LDC’s. Nonetheless, the way he talks of it does not indicate that it is done in the interest of Norway, but rather as a way of achieving development.

**Figure 5.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic benefit indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Norwegian Government wants to facilitate development and aid donation by diminishing the role of the state and by funding the Norwegian businesses NGOs possibilities to establish themselves in LDCs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jonas Gahr Støre**

“It is a dilemma that can arise in the interface between human rights and Norway’s economic interests. The Government wants to set a clearer Norwegian policy on corporate social responsibility [...] There is a clear connection between Norwegian business activities and conduct abroad and Norway’s – our – reputation.”

“The world needs a new world trade agreement. [...] This would also give poor countries the regulated access to markets they need. It is uncertain whether there is sufficient political will to conclude the round, but Norway is prepared to do its part.”

“Norway is leading the efforts in the UN to clarify the business community’s responsibility for human rights. This is pioneering work.”

**Erik Solheim**

The Norwegian Government together with the Norwegian private sector have in recent years struggled to make it easier for Norwegian companies to invest in less developed countries.

“The engagement of Norwegian companies in developing countries is positive and important. We need trade and investments, and the values and social views you bring with you. We expect Norwegian operations to be ethical and hope that the
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examples you are setting will be followed by other […] The extensive international activity of Norwegian companies is not only about establishing and running businesses in other countries, but also to a large extent about trade. Many Norwegian companies import agricultural products and various other industrial goods that originate from developing countries.”

The extensive international activity of Norwegian companies is not only about establishing and running businesses in other countries, but also to a large extent about trade. Many Norwegian companies import agricultural products and various other industrial goods that originate from developing countries.”

The results were, when looking for implications of solidarity/altruism, more convincing than when looking the economic aspects. When reading through the material from both ministers numerous implications were found that indicated these kinds of motives. From the material it can be deduced that the Norwegian government is aware of its economic status and that it has an obligation to help other states develop.

**Figure 5.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solidarity/Altruism indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Norwegian Government believes it has the financial resources and knowledge to help other states overcome under development and therefore sees a responsibility to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Norwegian Government places strong emphasis on taking altruistic goals such as poverty alleviation, education and health improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jonas Gahr Støre

“*Norway is a prosperous nation in today’s world, in both political and economic terms. We can make a difference, and in my view we have a responsibility to do so.*”

“The international community has defined a number of values and positions, first and foremost through the United Nations. The Millennium Development Goals should be seen as common obligations for all.”

---
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“Norway, with the Prime Minister in the lead, has created an alliance to deliver on two of the key Millennium Development Goals: to reduce child mortality and improve maternal health.”

“Three main tracks of Norwegian foreign policy […] Thirdly, an active quest for opportunities to promote peace and reconciliation, to combat poverty and to stand up for human rights.”

Erik Solheim

“Rich countries must take responsibility for the consequences of their own prosperity.”

“Norway’s engagement in peace and development is underpinned by the population’s sense of solidarity, the understanding that we have a responsibility that extends beyond our borders […] This is part of the effort to make the world more just, fight poverty strengthen the protection of human rights, and promote democracy, peace and reconciliation.”

“We must prevent the food crisis from adding to the burden of fragile post-conflict states and pushing them back into conflict. We must do everything we can to prevent the millions lifted out of poverty over the last couple of decades from sliding back into misery.”

“This is why Norway's new coalition Government sees its international development policy and the efforts to fight poverty as part of a long-term process.”

---


79 Internet 20: [http://www.norway-un.org/News/Archive+2005/20051026_st%C3%B8re_at_lse.htm](http://www.norway-un.org/News/Archive+2005/20051026_st%C3%B8re_at_lse.htm)


5.3 Sweden
The material is taken from speeches and documents were the ministers discuss aid donation and development work. The implications described in the methods chapter will try to reveal the motive-indicators these actors base aid donation on.

During the investigation of these speeches and publications quite a few interesting statements by the Swedish Foreign Minister and Minister for International Development were found. These are related to some extent to security and to a larger extent to international donor status. Concerning power, the results were not indecisive. Consequently, there are indicators for motives relating to security and international status as a donor.

**Figure 5.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security/Power indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government states that because of a more globalized world, events occurring in other parts of the world may have dire consequences for Sweden in the long run and therefore donates aid in order to counteract them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government is aware that as a state it has good status internationally within the development community and maintains an elaborate aid policy to maintain this status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carl Bild**

"Within a quarter of a century the new middle class of the developing countries will be tripled, and more than 90 percent of what we globally call middle class will live in countries which we not long ago called developing countries […] And since we believed in Immanuel Kant that basically was right in his little publication about the “eternal peace” this should also create better preconditions for peace and stability […] Swedes are often sought after when it comes to leading international businesses as well as within the UN-system or to work for peace and reconciliation elsewhere”

---
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85 Internet 25: [http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7417/a/74233](http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7417/a/74233)
"Making it easier for Africa to fully participate, both politically and economically, in our globalised world is in everyone's interest. Sweden must, therefore, also adapt its policy in order to support this development."86

Gunilla Carlsson

"In a more globalised world we are always affected, sooner or later, by what is occurring in our world. Instability in Afghanistan means more narcotics in our part of the world. And it would be naïve to think that an aids-catastrophe on the other side of the Baltic Sea would not have consequences for the spreading of the infection in Sweden in the long run."87

"I am convinced that in this process Sweden will be able to play an important part given our vast experience as well as the good reputation that we enjoy both with other donors as well as with partner countries."88

As the investigation turned to searching for implications of hopes for economic benefit as consequence of aid donation, the results between the two ministers differed. While it proved difficult to find implications for such motives in material from the Foreign Ministers, implications were more readily found from the Minister for International Development.

**Figure 5.8**89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government believes that using aid to open up LDC economies will give mutual benefits for both actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government wants Swedish businesses to invest and establish themselves in LDCs as a part of aid donation work, because it is mutually beneficial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carl Bildt

"The Government is therefore working actively to encourage Swedish businesses to forge new ties in Africa. There is a mutual benefit and a common interest in
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86 Internet 26: [http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7960/a/100735](http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7960/a/100735)
87 Internet 27: [http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/7451/a/75701](http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/7451/a/75701)
88 Internet 28: [http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/3213/a/75141](http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/3213/a/75141)
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trade, investments and Swedish corporate social responsibility being intensified on the African continent.”

“In everything that I have said before is the insight that the open economy and the open community’s great importance for economic and social development – for democracy, rule of law, market economy, the freedoms and rights of the citizen.”

Gunilla Carlsson

“It is this we work for in the free trade negotiations with India and the Gulf states. It is this that I look for support to when I am out traveling with our Swedish businesses. Of course, I am doing it because I believe it benefits Sweden – but I am at the same time convinced that a more open and free world is also world where poverty decreases.”

“And should a Swedish Minister visit the two countries 20 years from now I trust that she or he will find Swedes and Tanzanians and Zambians still working together. But hopefully the Swedes then present in Africa will to a greater extent than today be comprised of private sector representatives, academia and tourists.”

“The Government gives high priority to trade and development in Swedish development assistance.”

Lastly, the implications for solidarity and altruistic motives were looked for. Several statements from both ministers were in concurrence with each other and both of them related in different sources to both moral obligations and towards solidarity. Hence, indicators for solidarity and altruistic goals have been found.

90 Internet 26: http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7960/a/100735
91 Internet 25: http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7417/a/74233
92 Internet 29: http://www.dn.se/opinion/kolumner/vit-mans-borda-1.714053
93 Internet 28: http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/3213/a/75141
94 Internet 30: http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7451/a/82880
Figure 5.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solidarity/Altruism indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government claims a moral commitment to solving issues such as poverty, health problems and promoting human rights when donating aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Government places goals such as poverty alleviation, democracy and human rights in the forefront as the reason for the aid donation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carl Bildt

“How can we ever achieve true progress if women’s crucial role in peace building and development is not recognised? Gender equality and women’s rights, participation, influence and empowerment are key goals in themselves and are also crucial for sustainable poverty reduction. Challenges like these show the urgent need for world leaders to accept shared responsibility for our common future.”

“Sweden have for a long time had a deep commitment for a solution to the Israeli-Palestine conflict [...] And today, we are already one of the largest bilateral donors to the Palestine people. We will continue so, even in the future.”

“The Swedish Government has initiated extensive reforms aimed at creating a new Swedish development assistance policy characterised by quality, efficiency and results in terms of reduced poverty and more democratic societies.”

Gunilla Carlsson

“For this reason, we now have a moral obligation to do our utmost in the EU and the WTO so that today’s developing countries are also able to participate fully in the global economy.”

“We do not only have a moral responsibility to engage ourselves in when other people suffer, regardless if they live in Sweden, Russia or Sudan. It is also to the highest degree in our interest.”

---
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“Swedish efforts will contribute to democracy, stable and formations of state based on the rule of law with a growing welfare that will lead away from poverty.” 101

“Now we will place the content and principal goal of aid – to creating conditions for poor people to improve their living conditions – in centre.” 102
6. Analysis

In this chapter the results from chapter 5 will be analyzed as described in the analytical framework. The motive-indicators will be tested, and an analysis of the results from the investigation will be carried out to determine if the Denmark, Norway and Sweden have different motives for their aid allocation policy. Also, a theoretical analysis of the results will be done in order to find out if one theory stands out as the more explanatory.

6.1 Valuing the Motives

Before establishing what motives the governments of Denmark, Norway and Sweden base their aid allocation on it is relevant to assess the motive-indicators found in chapter 5. It is important that this is done so that it can be confirmed that the motives that were indicated actually are significant. In this investigation it will be done by looking if there is correspondence between the statements and the directives from the governments to the development agencies. The agencies in this case being: Danida, Norad and Sida.

To start with, the security and international status motive-indicator will be assessed. The indicators were:

**Figure 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Security/international status indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>The Danish Government sees a threat to Denmark’s own security when underdevelopment results in radicalization and terrorism. Denmark allocates aid to LDCs as a way to reduce these security threats. Denmark has as a result of a strong commitment to development and a strong amount of aid donation gained status as an important state among other donors. The Danish government wishes to keep this status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>The Norwegian Government considers increasing insecurity in other parts of the world as a result of underdevelopment. Aid donation is used to counter this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>The Swedish Government states that because of a more globalized world, events occurring in other parts of the world may have consequences for Sweden in the long run and therefore donates aid in order to counteract them. The Swedish Government is aware that it as a state, has good status internationally within the development community, and maintains an elaborate aid policy to maintain this status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key government directive illustrating Denmark’s development policy is *Partnership 2000*, which lays out the plan of action for Danida. When reading it, a correspondence between the two motive-indicators deduced earlier can be found. This is a representative
quote taken from the chapter about ‘Armed Conflicts’: “The crucial concern will be to prevent clashes of interest from escalating into armed conflict or lasting instability.”

In a publication six years later, improved security is still an important goal for development along with other ones. Being one of five thematic themes the government directs Danida to work for, the security motive-indicator Denmark seems to be strong:

“As part of its long-term policy, the Government will promote the positive consequences of globalisation developing countries by continuing to focus on five thematic areas that all pose particular challenges:... Stability, security and the fight against terrorism”

Moreover, the paper asserts that Denmark will play an ”active role” internationally and:

“maintain Denmark’s position as one of world’s largest donors.”

The investigation found few strong motive-indicators for security motives in the investigation of the Norwegian government. The results correspond from the government directives, i.e. few implications were found, yet the ones that were support the indicator. Additionally, the documents issued from Sida were also corresponding to the Swedish government indicator. By donation of aid and reducing poverty global security is increased.

**Figure 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Economic Profit Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>The Danish Government wants to use funds and influence to open up trade for LDCs as a way to reduce poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>The Norwegian Government wants to facilitate development and aid donation by diminishing the role of the state and by funding the Norwegian businesses NGOs possibilities to establish themselves in LDCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>The Swedish Government believes that using aid to open up LDC economies will give mutual benefits for both actors. The Swedish Government wants Swedish businesses to invest and establish themselves in LDCs as a part of aid donation work, because it is mutually beneficial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105 Internet 36: [http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/6784/index.htm](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/6784/index.htm)
106 Internet 36: [http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/6784/index.htm](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/6784/index.htm)
108 Internet 38: [http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/10/10/82/03480187.pdf](http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/10/10/82/03480187.pdf)
109 Summary of motive-indicators
In the Danida documents there has hardly been any discussion of how aid donation would be beneficial for Denmark in terms of economic issues. Danida claims that were the less developed countries to increase and improve their international trade they could draw the benefits that comes with international trade. Nonetheless, results from the Danida material corresponded to the indicator.

Norway’s development agency clearly states the importance of a function business sector for development and highlights the importance of international trade. Furthermore, it is indicated by the results that Norway has economic interests in the less developed countries. “The Private Sector is in itself the foundation for economic development and is also the communities growth and development. The Norwegian Private Sector is an important partner in this development work.”

Sida documents clearly state the increasing importance of Swedish actors within the development field, and are in general very supportive of engaging Swedish companies and other actors in aid donation. Not only because they need their expertise but also because it will allow for Swedish companies to establish themselves in the countries. In Sida’s publications Globala utmaningar - vårt ansvar (2008) it is stated that: “Altogether, Swedish policy will contribute to reducing the political risks with investments and business development in developing countries. This benefits local business development and Swedish commercial interests.” This supports the motive-indicators found in the investigation of the Swedish Government.
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Figure 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Solidarity/Altruism Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>The Danish Government believes it has a moral obligation and commitment to donate aid to other states in order to improve the lives of suffering people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Danish Government sets goals for its aid donation, such as poverty reduction, health improvement and universal education that are solidarity and altruistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>The Norwegian Government believes it has the financial resources and knowledge to help other states overcome under development and therefore sees a responsibility to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Norwegian Government places strong emphasis on taking solidarity and altruistic goals such as poverty alleviation, education and health improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>The Swedish Government claims a moral commitment to solving issues such as poverty, health problems and promoting human rights when donation aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Swedish Government places goals such as poverty alleviation, democracy and human rights in the forefront as the reason for the aid donation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, the implications for solidarity and altruism were the most clearly represented in the government texts. This is also the case with the results from the agencies Danida, Norway, and Sida. There is a strong correspondence between the two results and the quotes found would indicate that these are most important ones. Here follows a series of quotes, one from each agency, that are representative of the results:

“We shall live up to our responsibility for creating a global development that makes it possible to improve the living conditions of the world’s poor.”

“Although hundreds of millions of people have escaped the scourge of poverty in the past few decades, more than one billion still live in absolute poverty... Norway has been a flexible donor, but we must now make greater demands on both ourselves and our partners for documented results.”

“"We do this out of solidarity and a commitment to our common responsibility for the future of the world. It is also in our own interest."“

---
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6.2 Establishing the Motives

Now, the investigation has been carried out and yielded several motive-indicators that will be used to find the motives.

The motives for aid donation for Denmark, Norway and Sweden were ambiguous. Reading the material and making use of the different implications, most indications actually pointed to motives related solidarity and altruism, for all three states. The intention was to look for declared motives and in the material from the ministers of all these countries; there is a greater amount of implications for such motives. Considering the indicators that have been found for these motives they point to that the countries have a commitment to relieve global poverty, health issues and environmental problems. Moreover, the ministers often talk about the responsibility that their governments have from a moral commitment to improve the situation for LDCs. That is because Denmark, Norway and Sweden have the capability to help them, they also have the obligation.

Then the states start to differ, especially Denmark in comparison with Norway and Sweden. The difference is whether the states prioritize economic motives above motives for increase, security/power and international status. To begin with, the concept of increased power was not found in the material and was discarded as a motive, while security issues and international status, were highly relevant as motive-indicators. Denmark, Norway and Sweden also spoke of economic issues, albeit differently. While the Danish ministers explained how they wished to improve trade conditions for the LDCs as a way to reduce poverty. However, they did not discuss aid allocation and trade with LDCs or Danish business investing in LDCs, as something that was in Denmark’s interest.

Norway and Sweden does, in contrast, discuss the investment of companies in LDCs as something important and beneficial for both countries. Furthermore, Sweden does this to a greater extent and highlights that it would be positive for Sweden if trading and business with LDCs would increase. Hence for Sweden and Norway, economic profit is a strong motive for aid donation.

Interestingly, Denmark chooses a different path than its neighboring countries. That is to say, the Danish ministers, in their speeches and articles, place emphasis on threats to Danish security in terms of e.g. international terrorism. It is stated that poverty, lack of education and legal rights leads to radicalization which in turn creates a lack of security. Development work and aid donation is described as a way to counter this. The Danish ministers often refer to
Denmark’s efforts and status as a leading country in the donor community as important. Increase of security and international status are strong motives for aid donation for Denmark.

In Figure 6.4 below it is illustrated how the motives are distributed. The number 1 indicates the strongest motives for all three countries. The number 2 indicates that Economic Profit is strong motives for Norway and Sweden and Security and International Status are strong motives for Denmark. The number 3 indicates the least strong motives for all three states. In this way the difference between Denmark, Norway and Sweden is clearly seen by the distribution of the numbers.

**Figure 6.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>International Status</th>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Economic Profit</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
<th>Altruistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.3 Using the Theory II**

The third and the last research question concerned the theoretical part of the essay. It was posed whether the motives of a state can be explained by either structural realism or by social constructivism. To find the answer to this question, the results of the investigation will be analyzed to see what stands in favor for structural realism and what stands in favor for social constructivism. By making use of the analytical framework described in Figure 4.3 it will be determined if the hypotheses are accurate.

Hypotheses

*Denmark, Norway and Sweden motivate their aid donations on the basis that such actions will influence their security, their gains and power in a positive way.*

*Prevailing ideas and norms motivate Denmark, Norway and Sweden to donate aid for either security, economic, or altruistic reasons.*

Starting with structural realism, the theory described the world as a struggle between states for power and security. Moreover, the structure of the world system consisted of some states

---

117 The complete table with the results from the investigation. Note: The numbers 1,2,3 will be used to indicate in what scale each motive is represented, where 1 is the best represented motive and 3 is the lowest one.
being more powerful than other states and that this structure confined the government policy making.

In favor of structural realism is the fact that security is, to some extent, a consideration in the motivation of aid allocation; especially in the case of Denmark. In addition, the ministers often mentioned in their speeches that as small states they did not have the same leverage as greater states. Therefore, they are forced to use other means of conducting foreign policy such as being in the forefront of the development community.

Nevertheless, no implication concerning power could be found that it would be an important motive. According to structural realism however, power should be an important issue and states should in their foreign policy try to increase it. Additionally, structural realists believe in zero-sum gains, meaning that one state gains where the other looses. As the results show that solidarity and altruistic motives are most important to these states and that they often do not stand to gain on donating aid, it speaks against that states act to maximize their own gains.

Social constructivism considers foreign policy as a something that is constructed by social interactions between states internationally and people domestically and which is internalized in the states behavior. The international conditions and norms also change the way states act towards each other.

The investigation showed that Denmark, Norway and Sweden have for a long time donated aid to LDCs. During this time solidarity motives have been internalized in their behavior and become a prominent feature in their development policy. This fact speaks for social constructivism. Also, it seems that these motives have changed over time, e.g. Denmark seems to have developed its security motives lately as the international conditions have changed. Furthermore, international norms and treaties such as the Millennium Declaration and Paris Declaration seem to be important in the formulation of foreign policy.

Social constructivism describes how different world orders can exist that are more or less cooperative or conflictual depending on how internalized this behavior is. Interestingly, statements from the government ministers would imply that the world is becoming more insecure, while at the same time cooperation between states is increasing. This seems strange from social constructivist viewpoint and would therefore be something that would speak against it. However, it also describes the ever changing nature of international relations which would serve as an explanation.
### Figure 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Structural realism</th>
<th>Social constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Correspondence between result and feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Power</td>
<td>States are motivated by their interest for more security and power</td>
<td>−/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefit</td>
<td>States seek to maximize their economic benefits</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity Altruism</td>
<td>States help other states if it furthers their interests</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three states donate aid with differing motives</td>
<td>States are bound by international structures and their ability to perform certain tasks.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete table shows the results from the analysis of the results from the investigation. Note: Should the motives and the theory of the feature correspond, it will be indicated with a plus sign (+) if not a minus sign (−).
7. Conclusions

To summarize the essay, this last chapter will return to the original questions and see if they have been answered. As the research questions were formulated to answer the main question (*How do western states such as Denmark, Sweden and Norway motivate their donation of aid to less developed countries?*), the last part of the conclusion will take on this task.

The first question asked for the declared motives found in official documents from the government, specifically the Foreign Minister and the Minister for International Development, of the three states. The second asked if it was possible to discern a difference in the prioritization between the declared motives. The final data showed that mostly, Denmark, Norway and Sweden are very similar in their motivation of aid allocation and the material showed that the motives that stand out are highly *altruistic*. As the goal was to find the declared motives, and not hidden motives, the result seems probable. That is to say, officially the politician dealing with development issues would most likely try to get the message across that they are helping other countries and people out of *solidarity*.

Denmark, Norway and Sweden are thus very similar. It was however, possible to notice some key differences. The analysis found that while the Danish government motivates their ODA by saying it will improve their *security* in the long run; the material from Norwegian and Swedish politicians indicates that the motive for *economic benefit* through ODA is more important.\(^{119}\) It is hard to speculate in what might be the reason for this. Perhaps security has become an increasingly important issue in Danish politics and therefore become a motive for trying to improve underdevelopment. On the other hand, Norway and Sweden’s interest in economic benefit might be caused by lobbying from the business sector hoping to establish themselves in the LDC’s on a long-term basis, or a desire to improve the national economy from the government. Looking deeper into the motives, trying to explain them might be the basis of future research.

Moving onto the theoretical part of the essay; does social constructivism and structural realism explain the results? Beginning with the latter, structural realism sheds light on how smaller states such as Denmark, Norway and Sweden would seek more security and maximize economic benefits through any means possible, i.e. through ODA. However, the concept of power, central to the realists, does not appear in the investigation. Also, the motives for security and economic benefit do not seem as important as altruistic motives. However, the

---
\(^{119}\) The finding that *Economic Benefit* is an important motivation for Sweden, confirms Shraeder’s, Hook’s and Taylor’s result (see Chapter 1.4).
theory helps explain how smaller states lacking the capabilities of larger states would seek to become leading in other fields of foreign policy. In this case, these states are creating a niche for themselves in the development policy area.  

As there seems to be elements that cannot be explained by structural realism, let us instead turn to social constructivism. The theory helps us understand how a certain kind of behavior has been internalized. The long commitment to development work and the increasing amount of international consensus have perhaps created certain behaviors and a way of thinking that might explain the outspoken humanistic motives. Social constructivism also helps explain why there would be differences between the states. Should structural realism have been the more explanatory theory, the states would have been more similar and be more concerned with security, power and relative gains. However, since there are some differences it suggests that they would have reacted differently to the change in the international environment depending on their background. This would be the scenario that social constructivism would propose.

The research question was aimed at trying to find out how western states motivate their aid. The results from the investigation show that the states in focus of the investigation Denmark, Norway and Sweden primarily motivate their aid out of solidarity and altruistic reason. However, there is a difference as Denmark’s secondary motive is security and Norway and Sweden’s is economic benefit. This difference can to some extent be explained by the theories social constructivism and structural realism. However, further research might bring more light as to why there are differences and what implications this might have for future investigations.

The Norwegian researcher Terje Tvedt, offers some insight into this in his paper *International Development Aid and Its Impact on a Donor Country: A Case Study of Norway* (2007). He highlights how Norway’s work within the development and conflict resolution sector has been a “door-opener” in Washington and Brussels and that: “what is described as Norwegian altruism is justified at the same time both as Norwegian foreign policy realism and as the alternative to that very realism” (p. 619)
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