



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
STUDENT REPORT

Exploring unwanted mobility at the Danish-German border region

The case of the Danish wild boar fence



10. semester thesis

MSc in Development and International Relations with
a specialization in Global Refugee Studies

Aalborg University Copenhagen

Student: Mads Andreas Ibberskov Rødvig (20180629)

Supervisor: Michael Alexander Ulfstjerne

Hand in date: 1st February 2021

The number of characters: 166.048

Abstract

In the beginning of 2019, the Danish Government, the Danish People's Party and the Social Democrats decided to erect a wild boar fence along the Danish-German border. This was a part of the solution to stop the invasion of wild boars migrating into Denmark, which could bring the much-feared African Swine Fever into Danish territory and as a consequence cause an estimated annual loss of 11 billion DKK and risk 33.000 jobs within the Pig Industry. This measure generated a lot of arguments for and against the fence on both sides of the border. In this thesis, I aim at answering: *On what grounds was the Danish wild boar fence between Denmark and Germany erected, and how does this reflect broader discussions about borders and illegitimate flows?* For answering this, I have chosen to draw on two methods; the Case Study method and document analysis as well as two analytical frameworks; an object-oriented and historic framework by Nasser Abourahme and Securitization theory by the Copenhagen School. Additionally, I have also chosen to utilize literature concerning border-, territoriality- and mobility research by Lisa Malkki and Wendy Brown etc. The conclusion of this investigation is that the long history of physical barriers, border controlling measures and the negative consequences of an invisible unprotected border between Denmark and Germany have conditioned the erection of the wild boar fence. The erection of the fence was successfully legitimized and justified by two grounds. The fence protected the Pig Industry and more generally Denmark against the migration of potentially ASF infected wild boars as well as protected the Danish society from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees. In addition to this, I have revealed that the wild boar fence shares four common features with other recent proliferated barriers in the world. First, its multifunctional purposes. Second, its inefficiency and lack of evidence towards its primary purpose. Third, the fact that it targets transnational flows. Four, some of the symbolic purposes of physical barriers, where the primary is to keep something unwanted out of its territory and the nation-states' ambition of enhancing the collective and individual identity of its people.

Keywords: The Danish wild boar fence; Danish-German border history; Securitization; the National Order Of Things; sovereignty of nation-states; Wendy Brown; Nasser Abourahme; the Copenhagen School; African Swine Fever; the 2015 'migration crisis'

Table of contents

Abstract.....	1
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Methodology	7
2.1. The empirical data and related considerations	7
2.2. The Case Study Method and the case of the Danish wild boar fence	8
2.3. Document analysis	10
3. Theory	11
3.1. An object-oriented and historic framework	12
3.2. Securitization as a way of legitimizing extraordinary measures	13
3.3. Literature review about border, territoriality and mobility research.....	14
4. Analysis	18
4.1. Part one: A historic and object-oriented perspective of the Danish-German border.....	18
4.2. Part two: The rationales for and against the wild boar fence	27
4.3. Part three: Discussion of the functions of the wild boar fence in relation to other recent proliferated physical barriers	46
5. Conclusion	53
6. Bibliography	55
7. Appendixes.....	64
7.1. Map of the two referendum zones.....	64
7.2. Map of the previous- and the redrawn border	65

1. Introduction

In the year 2020, the Danes celebrated the 100-year anniversary of Southern Jutland's reunification with Denmark, however it is also the 100-year anniversary for the first observation of a living wild boar on Danish territory, which previously has been extinct since the mid-1700s. Wild boars are originally a native species of Denmark just like wolves and red deer, which all have returned back to Denmark once again. However, this re-emergence of wild boars has been subject to several discussions concerning, whether this species should be allowed to return to Denmark or face extermination in order to eliminate the risk of infecting Danish farm pigs with swine diseases. Consequently, these discussions have turned into several disputes and conflicts between the local farmers, hunters, citizens and governmental authorities. In time, the extermination argument received the greatest support, and the wild boars have been hunted across Southern Jutland since then, although those against this attempted extermination tried and failed to protect this species at several occasions. Consequently, the support for the extermination argument led to an enforcement for all Danish landowners, which now are obliged to shoot all wild boars that may come across their property. Moreover, the first real invasion of wild boars began to take place in 2016, where a couple of lonely wild boars were replaced by larger herds, which could be found in several areas across Southern Jutland, whereas most were located in the southeastern part. Consequently, 150 wild boars were recorded in Denmark by the end of 2017. Additionally, the spreading and numbers of wild boars have since been challenging to limit in Denmark due to the strength, intelligence, endurance and adaptability of this species. As a response to this invasion and the increased fear of the African Swine Fever (ASF) emerging on Danish territory, the Danish Pig Industry formed a task group consisting of some of its representatives such as farmers, butcheries, distributors, importers and exporters (Kristensen, 2019, pp. 10-27). The mission for this group was to come up with several initiatives to eliminate the risk of ASF in Denmark caused by the wild boars. Consequently, the group voiced the idea of a fence along the Danish-German border, which arguably would prevent wild boars migrating to Denmark, since this species was perceived as one of the prime reasons for the spreading and maintaining of ASF within an area. Additionally, the fence along with a series of other initiatives were forwarded to the Danish VLA Government (The Liberals (V), the Liberal Alliance (LA) and the Conservative People's Party (K)), which made a proposal in March 2018 together with the Danish Peoples Party (DPP) consisting of 12 focus areas and a budget of 123,9 million DKK in order to prevent ASF reaching Danish territory. Moreover, the basis of this proposal was to protect

the Danish farm pigs from getting infected with ASF, since the export of pigs and meat products to third world countries would be prohibited immediately, if ASF would be found on Danish territory. Consequently, this could severely damage the Danish Pig Industry, which would cause an annual estimated loss of 11 billion DKK in export revenue and risk losing 33.000 workplaces within this industry. Furthermore, the erection of a temporary wild boar fence was one of the most debated measures included in this proposal, which aimed at preventing and eliminating the possibility of wild boars migrating to Denmark (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, pp. 2-11; Kristensen, 2019, pp. 10-55; TVSYD, 2018). Consequently, this measure received much positive as well as negative attention and generated a lot of arguments, public debates as well as demonstrations on both sides of the border. Some of the rationales for the fence has been that it; secures the export revenue and the workplaces, maintains the good worldwide reputation for the Danish Pig Industry and is a brilliant measure against illegal migration as well as a real step towards a border fence. The rationales against it has been that; it threatens the wildlife, it lacks evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars, it is an agonizing reminder of how the borders used to be before the Schengen Agreement¹ and it damages the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including its people (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018; Jydske Vestkysten, 2018; Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹; New York times, 2018; TVSYD, 2019; TVSYD, 2019¹). Despite all these arguments, public hearings and demonstrations against the fence, the proposal was passed in the Danish Parliament 4th June 2018 by the VLAK Government, the DPP and the Social Democrats. Two months later, the Danish Environmental Protection Agency finished processing 29 hearing statements and approved the project design, which gave the necessary permission to the Danish Nature Agency to start erecting the fence in the beginning of 2019 after all the necessary expropriations have been taken care of. By the end of January 2019, the first of the 27.200 posts were placed in the soil of the border and the fence was finished 2nd December 2019. This industrial construction was called one of the fastest ones in Danish history (TVSYD, 2018; TVSYD, 2019⁹; DR, 2019; DR, 2019¹; Kristensen, 2019, pp. 37-72).

¹ The Schengen Agreement sought to gradually abolish all internal border measures, while strengthening the external borders of the EU in order to enhance the free movement of people and goods (Schengen Visa Info, 2020).

I have in my thesis chosen the Danish wild boar fence at the Danish-German border as my main object of investigation due to three reasons. First, a personal interest in boundaries and physical barriers which derived from my master's study and during several international conflicts. Second, the discussions regarding the wild boar fence awakened a curiosity, and raised questions regarding borders, territoriality, mobility and migration. Third, an interest in exploring boundaries and physical barriers in a historical context. Furthermore, this personal interest and choice of case leads me to this research question and following three sub-questions:

On what grounds was the Danish wild boar fence between Denmark and Germany erected, and how does this reflect broader discussions about borders and illegitimate flows?

- *How has the Danish-German border mediated its action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region and how did this condition the erection of the Danish wild boar fence?*
- *Which rationales for and against the fence have been raised and how did these respectively legitimize the erection or removal of the fence?*
- *Does the fence serve one or multiple purposes and how can this be related to other recent proliferated barriers?*

The way I want to investigate the case of the Danish wild boar fence is by applying two analytical approaches. First, I want to utilize Nasser Abourahme's analytical framework, which takes an object oriented and historic stand, since I was inspired by his investigation of the ethnography of cement, where he examined the everyday life in a Palestinian refugee camp as a material assemblage, in which the subjects and materiality of the camp (e.g. cement) enter mutually constitutive relationships. Consequently, this caused the camp life to spill over its demarcation and challenged a range of actors such as the authorities, politicians, local population, and the local municipality in often unpredictable and unintended ways (Abourahme, 2014, pp. 202-214). Additionally, this analytical approach allows me to analyze the interdependence and co-constitutive effects of objects and subjects, in this case between the border architecture and those who are affected by changes in the configuration of physical boundaries. Consequently, I want to examine some of the historical circumstances of the Danish-German border prior to the wild boar fence to discover, if this border can be perceived as agentic, dynamic and capable of mediating action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region, and how this conditioned the erection of the wild

boar fence? Moreover, I believe that this approach can challenge the perspective, and complement prevailing takes on migration, mobility, territoriality and borders in the existing literature within migration studies, where objects and questions of materiality are often left in the background. Second, I want to explore which rationales for and against the fence that have been raised and how these respectively legitimize the erection or removal of the fence? This is done by utilizing Securitization theory by the Copenhagen School, since the fence arguments do in various ways also give some kind of similarity towards the discussions regarding refugees, which makes a Securitization approach more intriguing to apply in this case. One of these is the rhetoric used within the rationales, which brings some similarity to how migration is often talked about. Another is how some physical barriers have fulfilled several purposes such as the Botswana-Zimbabwe electrified border fence, which serves as a mean to prevent the spreading of foot-and-mouth disease among local herds between the nations, and to stop the migration of Zimbabweans into Botswana (Brown, 2010, p. 19). In my case the wild boars are seen as unwanted subjects, which are being hunted and effectively securitized as a threat towards the Pig Industry. Consequently, the use of Securitization in my case can offer a comprehensive insight into how numerous actors behind the fence rationales use the language of Securitization in order to legitimize and justify extraordinary measures such as the erection or removal of the fence.

The reader should bear in mind that this thesis has some limitations. One is the ongoing worldwide Covid-19 pandemic, where the Danish Government continuously have introduced local, regional and countrywide restrictions such as temporary closing the educational and cultural institutions as well as issuing a ban on gatherings. The Government urge all the Danes to stay home and restricts the possibility to travel within Denmark. Consequently, I have been struggling to get access to books, places to study, engaging in academic discussions, getting into a proper study routine and face to face supervision, which have influenced this investigation in a negative way. Another limitation is, that I was already familiar with the case of the wild boar fence and had a pre-understanding about it. This might have caused me to dismiss crucial data, since I already had an idea of what I wanted to include and exclude in my investigation. In addition to this, I also have my own opinions regarding physical barriers, boundaries, fencing, migration, refugees, nature and wildlife, which might have influenced this thesis in unintended ways, although I tried to remain as objective as possible. A third one was is that I have translated all the Danish quotes and

it is possible that some of my translations may be inaccurate or misinterpreted, which may have caused crucial points to be lost in translation or used incorrectly.

I will begin this thesis with a methodological description of my empirical data, the case study method and document analysis. Subsequently, a theory section will be provided including Abourahme's object-oriented and historic framework, Securitization theory by the Copenhagen school and a literature review about border, territoriality and mobility research. Then, the analysis will be introduced and divided into three-parts; 1. A historic and object-oriented perspective of the Danish-German border, 2. The rationales for and against the wild boar fence, 3. A discussion of the functions of the wild boar fence in relation to other recent proliferated physical barriers.

2. Methodology

I will in this section move on to the empirical data and related considerations, the case study and document analysis method, which has been utilized throughout this investigation. First, I will explain my empirical data and related considerations, which will give a comprehensive insight into my categories of data, what information these sources provide as well as its strengths and weaknesses. Second, I found it relevant to describe the case study method and the case of the wild boar fence, which will provide an understanding of; what a case study is, my reasons for conducting a case study, the process of selecting my case, critique concerning this method and how I will try to overcome some of these challenges. Third, I will explain the document analysis method including how it enables me to assess, select and analyze documents for my investigation and which strengths and weaknesses of this method that I should be aware of.

2.1. The empirical data and related considerations

Let us begin with the empirical basis of this thesis, which roughly can be divided into three categories: News articles, official sources and academic studies. The news articles have provided me with a deeper insight into different perspectives concerning several historical events at the Danish-German border region (prior to the erection of the wild boar fence), the history of the wild boar fence as well as the rationales for and against this fence. In this regard, I have chosen to primarily draw on local and regional Danish newspapers such as Jydske Vestkysten, Flensborg Avis and TVSYD, since I have experienced that these sources offer more detailed reliable information and excellent coverage concerning what has happened and currently takes place within the border region. This encompasses of different actors, meanings, disputes, conflicts and demonstrations etc. Additionally, I have also chosen to utilize some of the national and international newspapers such as DR, TV2,

The Washington Post and The New York Times in order to broaden my perspective and to create a more general overview over the selected historical events in the border region. Some of the weaknesses of news article is that these can be inaccurate, opinionated and contain wrong information, since articles often needs to be written and published as fast as possible in order to be the first news agency writing about this incident. It is also important to bear in mind that this type of data often only report about sensational stories and popular topics without conducting a comprehensive investigation. Additionally, news articles are often written by one journalist to a targeted audience containing the political standpoint of the news agency. The second category, official sources consist in this case of data from authorities such as the EU-Commission, the Danish Parliament, the Ministry of Immigration and Integration, the Ministry of Justice, Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig, the Ministry of Environment and Food including The Danish Nature Agency and the Danish Environmental Protection Agency. These sources have offered me a comprehensive and reliable insight into the historical, political and legal developments at the Danish-German border region including the Danish Government's standpoints, actions as well as how they deal with questions, critique, conflicts and disputes. However, it is crucial to bear in mind that this type of data can sometimes be opinionated, one-sided and shaped by the political agenda of the Government. The third category is academic studies concerning border, migration, mobility research, international relations theory, methodology and local history of Southern Jutland from authors such as Alexander Betts, Lisa Malkki, Nasser Abourahme, Wendy Brown, Robert K. Yin, Glenn Bowen, Thierry Balzacq, Sarah Léonard and Jan Ruzicka. This type of data has given me a comprehensive academic understanding of several relevant and useful methodological and analytical frameworks as well as how borders, mobility, migration and territoriality previously have been understood. Consequently, this enables me to assess and select suitable and trustworthy empirical data as well as providing me with a toolbox to analyze and discuss it in relation to my research question and three sub-questions.

2.2. The Case Study Method and the case of the Danish wild boar fence

Next, I will elaborate on the qualitative case study method. In the beginning of my thesis process, I realized that I wanted to conduct a case study, which according to Robert K. Yin can be described as *"An empirical inquiry about a contemporary phenomenon (e.g., a "case"), set within its real-world context (...)"* (Yin, 2012, p. 4). One of the reasons to do a case study was my desire to conduct a thorough investigation of a single, specific, actual and explorative case with real contextual

knowledge, which would enable me use my selected theories on relevant contemporary issues of political concern. During the investigation process prior to choosing the subject of the thesis, I searched for an extreme case which was unique, atypical and problematical in several ways, and one that also matched my beforementioned personal and professional interests. During my research, I read about the interesting case of the Danish wild boar fence along the Danish-German border, which can be considered unique and extreme in several ways such as how the decision was made, the way the fence was erected along the border, the several debated rationales for and against the fence, the history of the border region and its minorities and the international and national attention the fence was given etc. Consequently, I read, assessed, and selected this case for my thesis project. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that the case study method has been given several critiques. Some have questioned the scientific value of case studies, since it leaves space for subjective opinions and often confirms the researchers preconceived meanings. Bent Flyvbjerg dismisses this critique and argues that case studies often falsify the researcher's preconceived opinions and leads to new understandings and opinions. Another critique is the lack of scientific quality of the practical and contextual knowledge which a case study produces, where some researchers argue that general and theoretical knowledge have a greater scientific quality. This critique has arguably among other things played a role in shaping case study as a method you should use as a part of a pilot investigation to determine if the subject is worth investigating. According to Yin this method goes beyond this preference of application and can be utilized in all sorts of projects (Neergaard, 2011, pp. 23-25; Flyvbjerg, 2015, pp. 497-515; Yin, 2012, pp. 5-18). However, I found this method as the most useful one in terms of, what I want to investigate in my thesis despite the criticism and I will try to overcome these challenges by enhancing the scientific quality of my case study. Consequently, I will try to conduct a thorough case study, while being systematic and stringent towards the collection and analysis of the empirical data by utilizing the document analysis method as well as the selected analytical frameworks on my empirical data. In addition to this, I will try to be open towards limitations and bias and draw on several sources of data (data triangulation) for each section, if this is possible.

2.3. Document analysis

Let us now consider document analysis, which is a qualitative method that has been used in all sorts of projects in order to provide a system, which gives me the ability to examine and organize all sorts of documents. This method assists me in assessing, selecting and summarizing substantial amounts of data, which gives me the possibility to create a selection of the most relevant data in order to utilize this in my thesis. Additionally, document analysis also offers a way of discovering change and development as well as checking the credibility of the selected data by comparing it with other data sources (Bowen, 2009, pp. 27-31; Lynggaard, 2015, pp. 153-154). According to Glenn Bowen, document analysis can be described as *“(...) a process of evaluating a document in such a way that empirical knowledge is produced, and understanding is developed”* (Bowen, pp. 33-34). During the data selection process regarding the history of the border region and the wild boar fence, I discovered that there was a substantial amount of data available on the internet as well as in the libraries. Moreover, the large quantity of literature means, that I have to conduct a careful and critical assessment and selection of the given documents before including or excluding these in my thesis. Additionally, the assessment consists of understanding and interpreting the text including its meaning, purpose, targeted audience, author, type of document, context, trustworthiness, quality, exactness, authenticity, representativeness, completeness, degree of detail as well as its relevance and contribution to my research. Furthermore, it is also crucial to consider whether each document is based on a firsthand experience or on secondary sources, has it been altered and is it a formally recognized as a genuine news article, academic paper or official document (Bowen, 2009, pp. 32-33; Triantafillou, 2019, pp. 150-152). If I find a document suitable for further examination with the possibility to include it in my paper, then it will undergo a combination of a semi-structured content-² and thematic³ analysis, which will consist of re-reading and reviewing the content of the document several times, more and more carefully in order to separate the relevant pieces of text from the irrelevant ones. This is done by organizing the document’s text with a few codes/categories that I find relevant in my research. Additionally, the codes will only partially be established before reading the text in order to make room for codes, which could emerge while reading the document. I find this to be the best way to find the most useful pieces of data, which enables me to structure the

² Content analysis can be defined as *“(...) the process of organizing information into categories related to the central questions of the research.”* (Bowen, 2009, p. 32)

³ Thematic analysis can be described as *“(...) a form of pattern recognition within the data, with emerging themes becoming the categories for analysis (...).”* (Bowen, 2009, p. 32)

data in order to identify patterns and themes that can be utilized for forming strong key arguments (Bowen, 2009, p. 32). Furthermore, it is crucial that I am trying to remain objective and sensitive throughout the process of accessing, selecting and analyzing the documents. One of the strengths of this method is its efficiency and cost-effectiveness and it does not require near as many resources to conduct a document analysis compared to methods like qualitative interviews and observations. Another one is that there is, as mentioned earlier, a substantial number of documents concerning the history of the Danish-German border region and the wild boar fence, which can be accessed and retrieved. Additionally, the documents are often detailed, exact and unaffected by my presence unlike observations and interviews. In addition to this, the documents provide me with great coverage of the selected case, since it covers 100 years of historical incidents at the border region before the erection of the wild boar fence, what happened during and after the erection as well as relevant perspectives on mobility, migration, territorialization and border research etc. However, this method also has some weaknesses. It is often critiqued for giving insufficient detail about what the researcher investigates, since all the documents are written for different purposes. Furthermore, the selection of data is solely dependent of the researcher, which may have caused me to dismiss crucial data that could have the possibility to change the outcome of this investigation (Bowen, 2009, pp. 31-32; Triantafillou, 2019, p. 147) However, I still find the advantages counterbalances the disadvantages of document analysis, which means that this method will be used in an ongoing process, where all sorts of documents will be subject to investigation.

3. Theory

This section encompasses my two chosen analytical frameworks; Abourahme's object-oriented and historic framework and Securitization as a way of legitimizing extraordinary measures by the Copenhagen School. This will provide an understanding of the theories, my reason for choosing these and what the theories enable me to do, before these are utilized in respectively in part one and in part two of the analysis. Additionally, I have only elaborated on the critique of the Securitization theory, since I was not able to find any critique regarding Abourahme's analytical framework. Finally, this section will also contain a literature review, where I briefly describe how borders, territoriality and mobility previously has been understood in academic research. This will offer an insight to, how the world is organized in the Modern International Order, the dynamics between nation-states, borders, mobility, sovereignty and territoriality as well as elucidating what this literature enables me to do in the discussion in part three of the analysis.

3.1. An object-oriented and historic framework

Abourahme took a historic and object-oriented stand, when he investigated the development and expansion of housing in the Deheishe (Palestinian) refugee camp as a material assemblage, in which the materiality of the camp and the refugees engages in a mutually constitutive relationship. This became evident, when he described the role of cement and how it mediated action through the people of the camp, which caused the ordinary camp life to spill over its boundary and challenged among others the local population and the politicians within the Beit-Jala municipality, regulatory authorities, the Government, refugeehood, rootedness and temporality in unintended and unpredictable ways (Abourahme, 2014, pp. 200-204). In other words, Abourahme stressed that the materiality of the camp such as *"(...) cement, concrete blocks, plastic tubing corrugated tin or zinc sheets (...) do not just play an enabling or intermediary role, they mediate action and practice in contingent and often unexpected ways."* (Abourahme, 2014, p. 202). He further described how affordable cement mediated action through the refugees, which in turn transformed the Deheishe refugee camp from tents and basic housing to self-built concrete housing and improved the infrastructure. This made the camp less like a camp and more into a city and a municipality which became more permanent, dynamic, rooted, raised the living standard as well as improved the people's personal skills instead of remaining passive individuals in a temporary, abject and static camp. Consequently, cement did not only provide these possibilities, but also the capacity to expand the territory of the camp which in time transgressed its previous boundary (Abourahme, 2014, pp. 202-211). Moreover, Abourahme argues that researchers often tend to focus on the subjects, the symbolic-political elements and look past the materiality of the camp, since they perceive objects of a camp as a fixed, immobile and static entity without any kind of agency. Consequently, they miss an important dimension which according to Abourahme is crucial in the understanding of, how the agency of the people always have been influenced by the objects of the camp *"It is not to dismiss human agency, it is to show that this agency has always been entangled with the very 'stuff' of encampment"* (Abourahme, 2014, p. 216). Let us turn to my reason for choosing this theory. I have decided to use Abourahme's analytical framework since it enables me to examine the historical development of the Danish-German border prior to the erection of the wild boar fence. This gives me the possibility to reveal, how this border as an object has mediated its action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region, and how this conditioned the erection of the Danish wild boar fence. Additionally, this theory will also assist me in uncovering, if the border,

as a not fixed, nor immobile or static object, is capable of changing shape, perception and challenging the minorities, Danes, Germans, politicians, governmental authorities, governments and nations etc., which arguably barely has been examined. Furthermore, I felt encouraged to choose this analytical framework perspective for my thesis after reading Hito Steyerl's perspective of objects "*Things are never just inert objects, passive items, or lifeless shucks, but consist of tensions, forces, hidden powers, all being constantly exchanged*" (Abourahme, 2014, p. 216).

3.2. Securitization as a way of legitimizing extraordinary measures

Now turning to the Copenhagen school (CS) which offers a linguistic theory based on social constructivism and examines how some issues become effectively securitized in order to justify and legitimize extraordinary measures for protecting a given society from external threats. This theory consists of two main theoretical concepts, Societal Security and Securitization. The first refers to social groups within the society that have a set of unique values and cultural characteristics (e.g. religion, language and ethnicity), which could be at jeopardized due to shifting circumstances or if potential, as well as current external threats, are not controlled, mitigated or eliminated. The second concept refers to a process, which begins with a securitizing actor conducting a speech act towards a targeted intersubjective audience in order to persuade them, why a certain problems such as the migration of potentially ASF infected wild boars into Denmark is a threat towards the Societal Security of the Pig Industry (Betts, 2009, pp. 70-71; Balzacq, Léonard & Ruzicka, 2016, pp. 495-508; Neal, 2009, p. 337). If the Securitization of this problem is accepted by the audience, then it legitimizes the violation of existing rules and the implementation of extraordinary measures such as the erection of the wild boar fence, which at another instance could be perceived as an excessive, illegal and nonlegitimate measure. I have chosen this theory since it provides me with an analytical tool that enables me to investigate a selection of utterances from local inhabitants, politicians, authorities, representatives from the Pig Industry, the Danish VLAK Government and environmental organizations as well as other relevant speakers, with the lenses of security within the four selected rationales for and against the fence. This will give an understanding of how the wild boars, wild boar fence, migrants as well as refugees become effectively securitized in order to respectively legitimize the erection or removal of the fence. This theory have also been given several critique such as the narrowness of the context in the CS, since it only focusses on speech acts by an influential securitizing actor at an exact moment and the security concerns that he/she expressed at the given time. This explicit focus on speech acts and linguistics means that the CS dismisses the time before

and after the speech is given, as well as posters, pictures and incidents etc., which could have the potential to offer an explanation of, why a certain issue has become unsuccessfully or successfully securitized. Another critique is that the CS leaves some of the dynamics and questions unanswered such as; what makes up an audience, how does the audience differentiate itself from others and which criteria determine whether they accept or reject this issue as a security threat as well as why some securitizing actors are empowered while others are disempowered when they try to securitize a specific issue? (Balzacq, Léonard & Ruzicka, 2016, pp. 499-509; McDonald, 2008, p. 564)

3.3. Literature review about border, territoriality and mobility research

The world today is still organized according to the Modern International Order, which can be traced back to the Westphalian System that arose after the end of the Wars of Religion in Europe in 1648 (called the Peace of Westphalia). Afterwards it was decided to introduce a common principle 'whose realm their religion', which meant that other European states could not interfere in other states matters using the argument of religion. Additionally, the principle of 'sovereign territoriality' was also implemented, which made all nation-states sovereign over the territory within its borders and provided the state with the political authority to solely control all domestic affairs within this territory (Lawson, 2016, pp. 6-7). Moreover, the International Relations theory Realism provides an understanding of how states act in the Modern International Order and reveals the dynamics between the state actors. One of the classical realists, Hans Morgenthau argued that states are self-interested and concerned about their own survival, relative gains and maximizing their own military power in order to secure stability, peace and maintaining the balance of power between the surrounding states in a world based on anarchy without a World Government. Additionally, Realism assume that if state A has equal military power compared to state B, then they will not attack each other. Furthermore, international cooperation would be strictly limited according to realism, because of the egocentric state identity, interest in relative gains and amorality. This means that states would sign as few international conventions as possible and not take them seriously but act upon nationalism. In addition to this, collective action would only take place if it would strengthen the states military power or by self-interested hegemony. Additionally, states are according to these theories not concerned about mobility, forced migration and refugees unless it could strengthen their military power or weaken the surrounding states. They would perceive refugee and migrant movements as well as mobility as a consequence of shifts in the balance of power. In addition to this, these people would arguably be perceived as a National Security threat to the nation-state

because of the tensions and competition between the local inhabitants and the outsiders for resources, religion and culture etc. However, they would be less of a threat and more welcome, if they are considered useful in terms of their social capital (Betts, 2009, pp. 20-25).

On the other hand, Lisa Malkki challenges us to think beyond the Modern International Order, territoriality and mobility in relation to realism, and calls this nationalist way of thinking for the 'National (read: Natural) Order Of Things'. This order explains that the world is composed of sovereign states, which are fixed in space, recognizable on a map and behaves in a certain way. Additionally, people's identities, culture, citizenship and rights are rooted and territorialized in the soil of the state in which they belong (Malkki, 1992, pp. 26-30). According to Malkki, nationalist discourses often use botanical elements as metaphors to describe, how the nation is "(...) *a grand genealogical tree, rooted in the soil that nourishes it*" (Malkki, 1992, p. 28) and how the people are the roots of that tree. Furthermore, the nation-states continually tries to strengthen this belongingness and territorialization of national identity among other things by emphasizing that people can only belong to one tree as well as utilizing territorialized terms such as native, indigenous and culture in order to ensure the survival of the state. However, refugees and migrants challenge the National Order Of Things, since they get territorial uprooted, torn out of their own culture and national identity, when they decide to move away from their motherland in order to pursue better and safer living conditions. This makes them liminal beings, that are considered an anomaly in the National Order Of Things. Consequently, they become a National Security threat and are often securitized as potential terrorists and criminals that cannot be trusted due to the lack of moral, trustworthiness and roots. The solution has often been to place these people into refugee camps to effectively manage and warehouse them. As a last remark, Malkki urges us to move away from this way of thinking and suggests a more rhizomatic and cosmopolitan approach, where the roots and identities of people are mobile, constantly changing and situational through movements, processes and relations with others (Malkki, 1992, pp. 29-38). In other words, identity is according to Malkki "(...) *always mobile and processual, partly self-construction, partly categorization by others, partly a condition, a status, a label, a weapon, a shield, a fund of memories, et cetera.*" (Malkki, 1992, p. 37).

Let us now turn to the Global Mobility Regime and Methodological Nationalism⁴ which arguably also played a role in preserving the Modern International Order by maintaining high levels of inequality. This prevents mobility and access between nation-states for less privileged groups, while allowing others to move freely with the justification of inclusion based on peoples' "roots" (territorial belonging). This is arguably in the interests of the nation-states which tries to ensure its survival by preserving its sovereign power over its territory and domestic affairs, the National Order Of Things and its roots (people). Consequently, nation-states perceive mobility as a threat towards the National Security, while immobility is seen as desired, natural and ensures the individual as well as the political security. Moreover, the recent field of mobility⁵ studies arguably questions this territorialization of people, fixed identities and culture as well as the tendency to look past the history of human movement and interconnectedness, which are "(...) *fundamental to the human condition – past, present and future.*" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 186). Instead this field of study voiced the same arguments as Lisa Malkki, Nina Glick-Schiller and Noel B. Salazar; that people, identities and culture are not bound by the very soil of the nation-state but a result of multiple social relations, networks and processes. (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, pp. 184-192; Malkki, 1992, pp. 36-38). Consequently, Glick-Schiller & Salazar have developed a analytical framework within the field of mobility studies called 'Regimes Of Mobility: Imaginaries and Relationalities of Power' which examines "(...) *the relationships between the privileged movements of some and the co-dependent but stigmatized and forbidden movement, migration and interconnection of the poor, powerless and exploited.*" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 188). In other words, this framework investigates how conflicting Regimes Of Mobility empower the movement of some classes of people (often called cosmopolitans/the elite e.g. academics and business people) which are seen as wanted and celebrated, as well as how the movement of others (often mentioned as the indigenous people e.g. refugees and migrants) are disempowered, criminalized, immobilized, entrapped and warehoused. Moreover, this theory focusses on the dynamics between stasis and movement within unequal relationships of power while at the same time acknowledging the influence of territorialization,

⁴Methodological nationalists "(...) *confine the concept of society to the boundaries of nation-states and the members of those states are assumed to share a common history and set of values, norms, social customs and institutions.*" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 191)

⁵ Mobility can be defined as "(...) *an inclusive category that covers all that have travelled within a country or between several countries such as refugees, migrants, tourists, businessmen and international students*" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 184)

states, global administrations and other actors who influences the inclusion and exclusion of people (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, pp. 186-192).

Wendy Brown provides some different perspectives within border research, where she has investigated the reemergence of physical barriers worldwide and claims that these are to protect, what she calls 'the waning sovereignty of nation-states' as well as measure to prevent additional detachment of sovereign powers. In addition to this, she emphasizes that these walls cannot resurrect the eroding and unviable nation-states, although this is the alleged purpose, but merely encourages to increased narrow-mindedness and xenophobia. Moreover, Brown stresses that these walls are built because of the threat of the disintegrating consequences of globalization and more specifically the threat of transnational flows of people, goods, capital and violence etc. as well as international institutions, which compromises the sovereignty of the nation-state (Brown, 2010, pp. 8-40). In addition to this, Eyal Weizman substantiates Brown's claim about mobility as the real reason for building these structures "*Barriers (...) do not separate the 'inside' of a sovereign, political or legal system from a foreign 'outside' but act as contingent structures to prevent movement across territory.*" (Brown, 2010, p. 32). Furthermore, the way that these walls has been legitimized is arguably the fact that nation states in the Modern International Order are sovereign over their own territory, which means that they can single-handedly make the decision to build a wall in order to preserve its sovereign power. Additionally, walls are also legitimized by the argument that these are temporary measures, although looking like permanent ones (Brown, 2010, pp. 32-34). As a last remark, Brown stresses some of the consequences with this reemergence of walls "*(...) cannot block out without shutting in, cannot secure without making securitization a way of life, cannot define an external "they" without producing a reactionary "we," even as they also undermine the basis of that distinction*" (Brown, 2010, p. 42).

This literature gives me, in the case of the Danish wild boar fence, the ability to discuss if the fence serves one or multiple purposes and how can this be related to other recent proliferated barriers. In this regard, I will use the literature and especially Browns theory to discuss the single- or multifunctionality of the fence, the efficiency of it towards its primary purpose, the symbolic purposes of the fence, if the fence can be seen as a sign of waning sovereignty of the nation-state and how the characteristics of the fence does relate to other recent proliferated physical barriers.

4. Analysis

I have in this section found it relevant to divide my analysis into three parts. I will in the first part focus on Abourahme's analytical framework to investigate the historical development of the border between Denmark and Germany in order to reveal, how this object has mediated its action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region, as well as how this have conditioned the erection of the wild boar fence. Subsequently, I will in the second part turn my focus to the Securitization theory by the Copenhagen School in order to analyze the grounds behind the erection of the Danish wild boar fence, the rationales for and against it and how these respectively have legitimized the erection or removal of the fence. Finally, I will in the third part use the literature review and especially Browns theory to discuss the single- or multifunctional purposes of the wild boar fence, its efficiency towards its primary purpose and symbolic purposes in relation to other recent proliferated physical barriers.

4.1. Part one: A historic and object-oriented perspective of the Danish-German border

The border between Denmark and Germany has probably mediated its action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region in decades without being noticed. It has taken many different shapes such as a physical barrier with fences, border guards and checkpoints, a formalized and institutionalized border and as an invisible border, where arguably everybody were able to cross. In addition to this, it has also served as a boundary between nations, a symbol of the Modern International Order and the National Order Of Things as well as the line that distinguished the Danes from the Germans. The border has among other things been through a redrawing, a reunification, several disputes between the Danish minority and the German population as well as between Denmark and Germany. Additionally, the border has probably also played a role in three crucial minority declarations, the erection of a fence against food-and-mouth disease, economic development of the border region, the improvement of the cross-collaboration and relationship between Denmark and Germany including its people as well as the so-called 2015 'migration crisis'. In many ways the border has through the Danish people and the people within the border region arguably influenced and shaped the past, the present and will most likely also shape the future. Let us first consider the reunification of Southern Jutland, in which we celebrated the 100-year anniversary in 2020. During the Second Schleswig War in 1864, the Danes lost North- and South Schleswig (Southern Jutland) to the Germans. This loss of Danish territory was considered a tragedy for the nation, and especially for the Danes south of the new border, that unwillingly became a

minority within Germany. A redrawing of the boundary, and the possibility of gaining lost territory became a reality after the German defeat during the end of the First World War in 1918, which caused the border to be thrown into several political negotiations during the aftermath of the war, including the peace conference in Versailles in 1919 concerning the Versailles Treaty negotiations. Subsequently, Denmark and Germany agreed to a redrawing of the border according to the desire of the local population within North- and Middle Schleswig in terms of, whether they wanted to belong to Germany or Denmark. This was carried out by issuing two referendums (One for North Schleswig, and one for Middle Schleswig) respectively 10th February and 14th March 1920 (see appendix 7.1. Map of the two referendum zones). Consequently, the outcome was that 75% of the people in the Northern part of Schleswig wanted to reunite with Denmark, whereas 80% of the inhabitants in Middle-Schleswig wanted to remain German. Subsequently, the border was revised and redrawn the 15th of June 1920, and the Northern part of Schleswig was officially reunited with Denmark (see appendix 7.2. Map of the previous- and the redrawn border) (The Danish Parliament, 2020; Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020). The outcome of the referendums initiated a lot of discussions and disputes within the border region, which caused the border to cross into the political sphere once again. This turned into the Easter Crisis of 1920, partly due to a nationalistic group that belonged to the Danish minority in Flensburg (called the Flensburg Movement). They were extremely disgruntled by the fact that the Danes in Flensburg would not be reunited with Denmark, since only 20% of Middle Schleswig and 25% of the Flensburg district wanted to belong to Denmark. Consequently, the prospect of the official redrawing of the border challenged the Danish Social-Liberal Government and some of the members of the Parliament, because of the Flensburg Movement together with the Liberals and the Conservative Party launched a series of demonstrations in Copenhagen, asking the Government for a new redrawing of the border to move it further south in order to include South Schleswig and the city of Flensburg. The response from the Danish Prime Minister at the time, Carl Theodor Zahle, was a complete denial of this request. Consequently, the border assisted the Flensburg Movement and its supporters in transgressing, challenging and appealing to the Monarchy outside the formal ways of reaching the king. Additionally, King Christian the 10th shared the same desire and immediately discussed this demand of a new redrawing with the Government, that still wanted to respect the two referendums and the already agreed redrawing of the border. Instead of accepting the wishes of the Government, the

King dismissed them, and they were replaced with a new Government elected by the King. This ignited a series of protests, demonstrations and threats of strikes by the dismissed Social-Liberal Government and its supporting party, the Social Democrats among others, which accused the King of conducting a coup d'état and breaking the Danish Constitution. Eventually, the King deemed it necessary to issue a new parliamentary election the 26th of April 1920, but the newly elected Liberal Government with Prime Minister Niels Neergaard still wanted to respect the referendums and keep the border as it was. However, he emphasized that the Danish minority south of the border would not be forgotten (Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020; Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020², Lange, 2020; Grænseforeningen, 2020⁴). Additionally, Neergaard's promise provided the Danish minority with significant political and financial support from the Danish Government, which (with the acceptance from the German Government) enabled the Danish minority to build schools, churches and form a political party the Schleswig Constituency Association (later changed to; South Schleswig Association (SSW)). Consequently, these institutions helped the minority preserving its Danish roots and raised a hope for a redrawing of the border to include South Schleswig in the future. However, the Danish minority was also actively harassed by numerous actors, especially concerning the Danish schools. One of the incidents was, when Flensburg municipality in the 1920's tried to decrease the number of students in the Danish Municipal School by requiring a Danish linguistic test and documentation as a proof of Danish inheritance from all applicants before giving them access to the school. Another degree of harassment occurred in the beginning of the 1930's, when the Nazi Movement began to gain momentum in the border region and the local German nationalists began using condescending language towards the Danish minority, while also preventing them from accessing social benefits and even firing some of the Danes with the accusation of national unreliability. Moreover, the harassment continued, when German soldiers crossed the border and occupied Denmark 9th of April 1940 during the Second World War. Subsequently, the German Government began to censor statements regarding the relationship between Denmark and Germany and the Danes became more suspicious and doubtful towards the Germans, which they perceived as an enemy once again (Grænseforeningen, 2020²; Delfs et al., 2020, pp. 2-3). When Denmark got liberated the 5th of May 1945, the border was again on the political agenda, since the Danish minority in Flensburg among others saw the opportunity to file a request to the Danish Government concerning a redrawing of the border to include South Schleswig and Flensburg.

However, the Danish Government denied this request with the argument that they did not want to exploit the German defeat for pursuing own territorial ambitions, which could have the potential to ignite a new conflict between the nations and hurt the already severely damaged relationship. During the aftermath of the war, the Danish minority gained popularity among the inhabitants of South Schleswig that suddenly wanted to become a part of the minority and the SSW (1945: 3.000 → 1948: 70.000 members), since this minority were given financial assistance and food from the Danish Government. The reason for this unforeseen popularity was most likely due to the lack of social and financial resources, the Germans were experiencing. Consequently, many Germans of the border region became a part of the Danish minority in order to improve their living conditions and the German Government began to accuse the Danish Government for its role in generating favoritism of Denmark among the Germans in South Schleswig in order to enhance the Danish interests and increase the possibility of moving the border further south. Additionally, the popularity of the Danish minority led to an increased demand for a redrawing of the border. This could have become a reality, when the British Government offered an official redrawing of the border to Denmark in October 1946. However, the Danish Government denied this offer, since they doubted that the favoritism of Denmark would last as well as the fear of problems, which might occur if they included a larger and stronger German minority within Denmark. The Danish Government was right, the favoritism did not last and most of the Germans changed their mind and abandoned the Danish minority, probably because of the recognition of Schleswig-Holstein as a federal state within Germany, the introduction of D-Mark as the new currency and the rebuilding process, which all together improved the overall living conditions (Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020²; Grænseforeningen, 2020; Grænseforeningen, 2020³; Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020¹).

Moreover, the border did later play a crucial role in enhancing the relationship between Denmark and West-Germany, which improved due to a series of reasons such as the German National Security concerns regarding communism and the Soviet Union, West-Germany's desire to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (that needed the acceptance of Denmark), the mutual financial benefits of trading with each other as well as a common interest in ending the disputes between the minorities and the host population within the border region. Consequently, this made West-Germany with the pressure from the British Government to ratify the legal binding Kieler Declaration (1949), which later paved way for the two more extensive moral binding

Copenhagen-Bonn (1955) declarations signed by Denmark and Germany in order to ensure a range of minority rights for the Danish, German and Frisian minority without German or Danish interference, control and harassment. Additionally, this led to a more peaceful co-existence between the Danish minority and the German people within the border region (Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020²; Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020¹; Grænseforeningen, 2020¹; Delfs, Gebauer & Köhl, p. 3). The relationship progressed in the 1980's, when the Danish minority was for the first time spoken as a valuable asset to the German society and the protection of the minority was ensured in the 1990 Schleswig-Holstein declaration. This declaration stated that the Danish minority was under *"The country, municipalities and county's protection [and] claims protection and support/advancement"* (Danmarkshistorien.dk, 2020²). In 1988 the border changed its physical appearance, since a fence along the border was erected with the finances from the Danish Butcheries, and carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture, in order to mitigate the threat of wild animals with foot-and-mouth disease migrating to Denmark, which could infect the Danish farm pigs and cows. In addition to this, it was also to satisfy the American request to erect a fence as a form of guarantee in order to continue to sell these meat products to the United States. However, the maintenance of the fence stopped in 2001 arguably because of the Schengen Agreement, where the Danish Directorate of Agriculture struggled to determine, who was obliged to pay the maintenance costs (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁹; DR, 2018; DR, 2018¹). This fence has until the erection of the wild boar fence been *"(...) forgotten and left to nature."* (DR, 2018). Moreover, the border transgressed into the international political sphere between Germany and Denmark at another incident in 1988, where the border assisted these two nations in improving the cross-collaboration and coordination with the funds from the European Fund For Regional Development. Consequently, these two nations decided to file a common request for financial aid stressing *"The kingdom of Denmark and The German Bundesrepublik [have] the intention to enhance a cross-border coordination of the region development (...) which immediately will dissolve the border as a formal barrier"* (Buch, 1997 p. 29). The border began to change even more physically as well as psychologically through the people of the border region, when the EU Charter For Border And Cross Border Regions and the Schengen Agreement was introduced. Additionally, the people of the peripheral regions North- and South Schleswig saw these agreements as an unique opportunity to improve the financial and social conditions with the EU funds that would be given for cross-

collaboration projects (Buch, 1997, p. 28). Consequently, the border most likely played a part through the people of the border region by encouraging the Danish and German Government's to change the border by ratifying the beforementioned EU Charter in 1986, which enabled the free movement of goods as well as approving the charter's opinion about borders and the ambition to overcome these at the Danish-German border for the greater good "*Borders is the scars of history. Cross-border collaboration limits the disadvantages of these borders, overcome the border districts disadvantages as national peripheral region and to improve the inhabitants living conditions*" (Buch, 1997, p. 28). Additionally, this was also the case of the Schengen Agreement (signed the 14th June 1985), which Germany ratified in 1985, and Denmark in 1996. This agreement made these Nations to effectively abandon the physical barrier and the border controlling measures at the Danish-German border in 2001 (Schengen Visa Info, 2020; EU commission, 2020). Consequently, the invisible border gave all people the possibility to cross the border immediately without waiting in long queues to show passports, being questioned and even harassed by the Danish and German border guards (DR, 2019²). Henrik Gotborg, a farmer and inhabitant at the border provides a great picture of the consequences of the Schengen Agreement "*When the Schengen [agreement] arrives, then all visual boundaries disappear. (...) now everything is calm, and you are not at all harassed to the extent that you were previously*" (DR, 2019²). In addition to this, Katrine Hoop, who is a part of the Danish minority stressed that the physical border was a part of the ordinary lives in the border region, which now suddenly changed "*I remember when I was a child sitting in the queue at the border for hours. The border was a part of the reality, and then it disappeared.*" (DR, 2019²). Consequently, the Danish-German border did through the EU Charter, the Schengen Agreement, the EU funds and the establishment of a series of projects increase the cross-collaboration and coordination, which in time created a need among the decision-makers to create a cross-collaboration focused institution and a formalization of the border in order to remain in control of the development, upholding the national laws and minimizing the cultural and linguistic related problems. This made the border transgress into the political sphere once more, since the prospect of an institutionalization and formalization of the border created discussions among the people of the border region. Many Danes deemed this formalization unnecessary, since it created a fear of German domination and as a consequence initiated a series of demonstrations, demands of a referendum, vandalism and threats towards the supporters of this initiative. Additionally, the

several Danes also expressed their dissatisfaction concerning the proposed name of the institution; Euroregion-Schleswig (later changed to Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig), which arguably sounded more German than Danish. Despite all the negative tensions between the inhabitants of the border region, the border was formalized and the institution was established in 1997. Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig consisted of representatives from Southern Jutland, South-Schleswig and North Friesland, which was responsible for the political and administrative part of enhancing the cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany. In addition to this, the biggest achievement for this institution so far has been the establishment of the cross-border collaboration between the health authorities (Buch, 1997, pp. 30-33; Grænseforeningen, 2020³; Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig, 2020). Although, the border became invisible, it was not the end of the physical border and border controlling measures.

When the so-called 'migration crisis' emerged in Europe in 2015 the Danish-German border again became a much-debated object, which challenged the people of the border region, the Danish population, the authorities and the Danish Government, as well as changed the reality at the border with the introduction of a series of anti-immigration measures. This crisis became the biggest one in Europe since the Second World War. The European citizens and authorities experienced a massive influx of more than a million refugees and migrants that risked their lives across dangerous border crossings in order to get to Europe. Consequently, this massive flow of people induced a huge pressure on the EU's external borders in South Europe, the Schengen Agreement and the adherence of EU's moral and legal obligations. The failure to ensure corporation, mutual decision-making and a fair distribution of migrants and refugees between the European countries caused some countries such as Hungary, Greece and Bulgaria to take the matter into their own hands by erecting physical barriers and implementing border technology in order to stem and control the flow of people (EU Commission, 2017; World Economic Forum, 2015; Reuters, 2016). During this crisis 91.000 migrants and refugees crossed the Danish borders, whereas 13.000 applied for asylum in Denmark. Additionally, Denmark experienced approx. 300 migrants and refugees leaving Frøslev School (a temporary accommodation and registration facility) and began walking along the E45 highway, while they loudly expressed a desire to go to Sweden in order to seek asylum in this country. Additionally, this could be perceived as a response of all the frustration, anxiety and anger this group of people was experiencing due to the Danish obligation of upholding the Dublin

regulation, which obliged the authorities to register all of the unregistered migrants and refugees in order to process their asylum claim in Denmark as the first country of arrival. Consequently, the Danish police decided to temporarily close the highway in order to ensure the safety of the migrants and refugees as well as the road users. In addition to this, they followed the large group and tried to create a dignified and humane dialogue between the police and the group after taken their vulnerability and humanitarian needs into consideration. In addition to this, the purpose of this strategy was to make the refugees and migrants return to the Frøslev School voluntarily. The day after this incident, the police decided to grant all the migrants and refugees in Rødby and Padborg a safe-conduct to continue to the desired destination, since they could not justify detaining them indefinitely (TV2, 2015; TV2, 2015¹; Jydske Vestkysten, 2015; The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration, 2016). This among other incidents caused the border to cross into the political sphere including considerations of the Danish Government, which made the decision to purchase the materials for a 33-kilometer anti-migration fence. This could have changed the perception and visibility of the Danish-German border, affected the good relationship between Denmark and Germany as well as between the inhabitants of the border region towards a negative path once again. This fortification of the border would according to the former Minister Søren Pind (V) have been established as a measure to keep refugees out of Denmark, if Europe would collapse. However, the anti-migration fence was not erected during this crisis, but 90% of the materials are still in the hands of the Danish Government at the Airforce base Skrydstrup, which arguably still can be used to change the configuration of the border, if the necessity for a physical barrier arises at a similar crisis (Jydske Vestkysten, 2019). Furthermore, the configuration of the border between Denmark and Germany changed once again in 2016 after it crossed into the political sphere again, where the Danish Government introduced a series of anti-immigration initiatives 'A stronger Denmark – Control the flow of refugees', which should eliminate the chance of a similar 'migration crisis' emerging on Danish territory. Consequently, this meant changing the invisible Schengen border towards one with border controlling measures from January 2016, which would enable the Danish authorities to reject people that did not possess identification papers, and thereby gaining control of the flow of migrants and refugees with the aim to end illegal migration. This was deemed possible within the Schengen Agreement, since it allows the re-instatement of internal borders in Europe during extraordinary circumstances, which threatens the National Security or the public order.

Additionally, the Danish Government assessed this crisis and the increased possibility of a new one fulfilled the requirements. As a consequence, the introduction of the so-called temporary border control changed the physical appearance of the border and has now been existing for five years due to the continuous decisions to extend it (The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration, 2016¹; DR, 2016; The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration, 2016; TVSYD, 2020¹). Another initiative was the so-called emergency brake that according to the Danish Prime Minister at the time, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, enabled the Government to reject asylum seekers at the border and prevent a similar situation at the Danish highways *“We shall not have refugees and migrants travel along the Danish highways. The emergency brake makes it possible to reject asylum seekers at the border and return them, if we are faced with a situation similar to the one, we experienced in September 2015 (...)”* (TVSYD, 2016). In addition to this, the brake has not been used yet, although the Danish minister for Refugees, Immigrants and immigration Mattias Tesfaye, in 2020 expressed the Social Democratic Government’s will to activate it, if a new migration crisis similar to the 2015 crisis would arise. This would change the appearance of the border both physically and mentally for the nations as well as the people of the countries and border region (The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration, 2016¹; Berlingske, 2020).

4.1.1. Sub-conclusion

I have in this analysis discovered how the Danish-German border has mediated its action through the Danish people and specifically the people of the border region in recent history. This became evident through a series of historical incidents, where the border mediated its action through the people which assisted it to cross the political, international and regal sphere several times in order to change some of the conditions within the border region. The border did among other things reunite some of the Danes with Denmark, ensured Governmental support for the Danish minority and paved the way for three crucial minority declarations which ensured the rights of the minorities. Additionally, it did also play a pivotal role in the ratification of the European fund for regional development, the EU Charter For Border And Cross Border Regions and The Schengen Agreement. Consequently, the way the border changed the conditions of the border region, eventually improved the relationships between Denmark and its minority, the Danish minority and the German people and Government as well as Denmark and Germany. However, the border failed to fulfill the Danish minority's desire for a new redrawing of the border. Furthermore, the beforementioned incidents also caused the border to move further south and to change its physical shape from a visible physical

barrier with border controlling measures to an invisible formalized and institutionalized Schengen border, which lasted for 15 years before the need and willingness of a border with controlling measures reemerged. Additionally, the long history of physical barriers and border controlling measures at the Danish-German border as well as the negative experiences of an invisible and unprotected Schengen border can have conditioned the erection of the wild boar fence, since this have probably created a sense of understanding, acceptance, legitimization and normality of physical barriers and border controlling measures at the border among the Danish population and Government in order to protect Denmark and its population from external threats.

4.2. Part two: The rationales for and against the wild boar fence

Let us turn to part two of the analysis, which will investigate the four selected rationales for and against the fence with the lenses of Securitization in order to reveal the grounds behind the erection of the fence, and how the rationales respectively legitimized the erection or removal of the fence. First, I will examine the two rationales for the fence; 1) the fence protects the Pig industry from the threat of potentially ASF infected wild boars, 2) the fence protects the Danish society from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees. Subsequently, I will investigate the two rationales against the fence; 3) the fence threatens the wildlife and lacks evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars, 4) the fence damages the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including its people. Additionally, I find it relevant to use the National Order Of Things theory by Malkki together with the securitization theory in the analysis of the fourth rationale in order to determine if the fence can be perceived as a physical and psychological manifestation of the Danish border and territory and related consequences.

4.2.1. *The fence protects the Pig Industry from the threat of potentially ASF infected wild boars*

The first rationale for the erection of the wild boar fence is the need to protect the Societal Security of the Pig Industry against the threat of potentially ASF wild boars migrating into Denmark. Consequently, this argument has been raised several times by the Danish VLAK Government, its supporting parties (the DPP and the Social Democrats) and the Pig Industry in order to legitimize and justify a series of initiatives against ASF, including the extraordinary measure of erecting a wild boar fence along the Danish-German border in order to eliminate the threat of wild boars migrating into Denmark. Furthermore, the main consequence of ASF emerging on Danish territory is (as mentioned in the introduction) the fact that all export of pig products to third world countries will be prohibited immediately causing an annual estimated loss of 11 billion DKK and increase the risk

of losing 33.000 jobs within the Pig Industry as well as severely damaging this industry's good worldwide reputation (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, pp. 2-11; Kristensen, 2019, pp. 10-55; TVSYD, 2018). It can be argued that the first real Securitization moves from the VLAK Government and the DPP as securitizing actors to justify and legitimize the use of extraordinary initiatives was through the release of the agreed proposal 'Strengthened responses against African Swine Fever in Denmark' in March 2018, which probably was based on suggested initiatives and partly financed by the Pig Industry. In this document the securitizing actors start by emphasizing the seriousness of ASF, which created a sense of fear *"(...) a serious infectious viral disease, that affects pigs with high mortality rate"* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, p. 1). Subsequently, they briefly voiced the previously described economic consequence, if ASF reaches Denmark *"In the event of an outbreak of African Swine Fever in Denmark, then all export to third countries close, which will lead to a very considerable loss of export earnings."* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, p. 1). In addition to this, the Ministry of Environment and Food stressed their reluctance to take any risk, when it comes to the Pig Industry *"The Environment and Food ministry will not with the current level of threat take any risk, when it comes to the protection of the Danish Pig production and -export."* (The Danish Parliament, 2018). The solution according to the Government's and the DPP's proposal was to effectively securitize the wild boars as a threat, which needed to be eliminated, since they arguably was perceived as one of the prime reasons of *"(...) the spreading and subsequent maintenance of ASF in an area (...) [and] the duration of an outbreak will be significantly longer, if the disease spreads to wild boars, and thus the economic losses will be greater"* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, p. 3). Additionally, the elimination of this threat was among other initiatives done by exterminating all the wild boars in Denmark in order to ensure the Societal Security of the Pig Industry. This was according to the proposal done by giving the hunters permission to shoot these animals day and night, and erecting a wild boar fence along the Danish-German border in order to prevent the migration of additional wild boars into Denmark *"As part of the effort to eradicate wild boars in the Danish nature, a wild boar fence is erected at the Danish-German border to prevent wild boars from migrating to Denmark from Northern Germany"* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018 p. 3). In addition to this, Lunde-Larsen elaborated on the fence's main purpose and related benefits, which also legitimized and justified the erection of it *"A fence will prevent infected wild boars from running*

across the border and make the effort to exterminate the wild boars in Denmark easier for the hunters” (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018¹). Later on he acknowledged the symbolic value of the fence in terms of preserving the good image of the Danish Pig Industry towards the importers of Danish pig products, which maintains the Societal Security of this industry *“The wild boar fence sends a signal concerning, that I will not take any risk, when it comes to protecting the Danish pig export and – production”* (Kristensen, 2019, p. 57). Additionally, the Ministry of Environment and Food legitimized and justified the fence among other initiatives included the ASF proposal as well as tried to silence the critique by emphasizing that *“(…) the initiatives together protect Denmark in the best possible way, and that individual measures cannot stand alone.”* (The Danish Parliament, 2018). Moreover, the K, the LA and the DPP as well as the Social Democrats also played a crucial role as securitizing actors in order to securitize the wild boars while making the threat of ASF real and justifying the construction of the fence. The spokesperson (for K) for agriculture at the time, Orla Østerby, created a sense of urgency, fear and importance to erect the fence in order to protect the income of the Pig Industry against ASF, which is heading towards the Danish border *“It’s great that the wild boar fence is going up. We can see the African swine fever moving closer and closer to Denmark, making the threat very real. (...) we have to protect our pork exports.”* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2019). Additionally, the spokesperson (DPP) for agriculture and food at the time, Lise Bach, also justified the pivotal role of the fence (mentioning the same argument as Lunde-Larsen) in the battle against the spreading of wild boars and ASF *“The wild boar fence is a cornerstone in preventing African swine fever spreading to Denmark. The fence will make it easier for hunters to eradicate wild boars from Denmark, and it will keep potentially infected wild boars from crossing the border”* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2019). In addition to this, Henrik Dam, a member of the parliament from the Social Democrats legitimized the fence in another way, when he implied that the financing of the Danish welfare state would be impacted, if ASF reaches Danish territory

“If the Japanese market or the Asian market closes, then we will have quite a serious problem in Denmark. We are in the situation that we can fortunately export a lot of animal products including pork, it helps to create jobs and foreign exchange earnings to Denmark, so it is actually a very important factor when looking at the way we can finance our welfare society” (TVSYD, 2018⁸)

When the fence was incorporated into law no. 694 of 08/06/2018 'Lov om projektering og anlæg af et vildsvinehegn langs den dansk-tyske grænse', it became apparent that the acceptance of this law provided the Minister of Environment and Food with a certain extraordinary authority during the erection of the fence such as the monopoly of taking care of the state interests concerning laws like the game act, protection of nature, protected animals, streams and dykes etc. The right to access private property grounds without permission and the permission to expropriate land and property was also granted to the minister. Additionally, the municipality and district plans were also effectively bypassed within this law. Consequently, all the laws which could have the potential to prevent or delay the erection of the fence was now in the hands of the Ministry of Environment and Food (Retsinformation, 2018, p. 2). This would according to Hans Kristensen, a local hunter, wildlife writer and author of *Svinevirke* (book criticizing the fence) give the Government the authority to dismiss accusations about potential breaches of these laws during the erection of the fence (Kristensen, 2019, p. 73). When the erection of the fence began, the newly appointed Minister of Environment and Food, Jakob Ellemann-Jensen (V), justified and legitimized the fence and the intensified hunt for wild boars as a necessity to ensure the Societal Security of the Pig Industry by stressing the financial argument once again *"We have 11 billion good reasons for doing everything we can in order to prevent swine fever reaching Denmark. (...) with the wild boar fence and our intensified hunt for wild boars, we are breaking the chain of infection, so there is less risk for African Swine Fever reaching Denmark"* (The Danish Nature Agency, 2019). Let us now consider some of the utterances from the representatives from the Pig Industry and how they have played their part as securitizing actors arguably with the ambition of securitizing the wild boars in order to legitimize and justify the fence as an extraordinary measure. Consequently, they have continuously been in the media to support as well as exert pressure on the passing and the implementation of the ASF initiatives, especially the wild boar fence, which they perceive as a necessary precaution to ensure the Societal Security of this industry, thus it would be irresponsible not to erect the fence (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018²; TVSYD, 2019²). One was Mogens Dall, the President of LandboSyd, that responded to some of the critics stressing the same arguments as the Government to justify and legitimize the fence as well as creating a sense of fear by emphasizing the economic consequence and the potential loss of jobs within this industry, which threatens the Societal Security *"It may well be that not many think about it in their daily lives, but 11 billion kroner is a lot of money. The ones*

that stultified this and say it does not matter, they have to see, how they can find 11 billion and jobs for 33.000 people” (TVSYD, 2019). Another representative was Søren Tinggaard, the Vice President of Danish Crown, Randers, that also highlighted the same consequences as Dall and briefly stated the economic consequence for the Danish state in order to justify and legitimize the ASF initiatives “The production of pigs in Denmark is one of our biggest export industries. It [ASF] would lead to direct consequences at the Danish payment balance, unemployment for thousands of people that is working in this sector (...)” (TVSYD, 2018²). He further argued that the fence was the best solution to deal with ASF outbreaks caused by wild boars, the increasing insecurity of the pig and pork purchasing countries as well as the potential damage to the industry’s worldwide reputation “It [the fence] is on top of the list and you see it as the most crucial factor for the foreign nations, costumers and authorities, where it will serve as a precaution, a guarantee that we do everything in our power to keep the wild boars and ASF out” (TVSYD, 2018²). Moreover, the Danish pig farmers also stressed the importance of the fence especially after two devastating incidents, which occurred in Belgium and Romania, where they had to kill respectively 4.000 and 230.000 pigs in order to eliminate the spreading of ASF (TVSYD, 2018³; The New York Times, 2018). The fear of ASF and the likeliness of a successful Securitization move increased and Simon Høj, a Danish pig farmer and a board member of Danske Svineproducenter, used the incident in Belgium to legitimize and justify the fence and the urgency for the Danish Government to erect it in order to protect the Societal Security of the Danish pig industry ““It is terrible news. It is a very frightening disease for the European Pig Industry as well as for the worldwide Pig Industry. (...) We think that the Government should erect this fence as quickly as possible (...)” (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018³). In addition to this, another pig farmer Henrik Refslund Hansen among others responded to the critiques and elaborated on the Societal Security of the pig farmers, which were anxious of losing their livelihood and homes if ASF reached Danish territory “The ones that are participating in the debate, they do not have their hand on the stove. In the way that it is not their animals, house and home it goes beyond if it goes wrong. We are terrified these days. Our animals are in risk of dying a painful death by a horrifying disease” (DR,2019²). When the law concerning the wild boar fence was passed, the permission of the fence was granted, and the fence was erected the 2nd of December 2019, as mentioned in the introduction, representatives from the Pig Industry such as Mogens Dall signaled his satisfaction by stressing the fence as a great necessity, not only for the pig industry, but also for Denmark “It is not a day too soon. It’s great and

unfortunately necessary. Denmark can sleep a little safer tonight (...)" (TVSYD, 2019). Additionally, pig farmer and board member of Danske Svineproducenter, Claus Bruun Jørgensen, also shared his feelings and described the fence as an insurance and a benefit for the Pig Industry *"I almost feel that we should raise the flag. This is a clear benefit for us pig farmers. It is right now an important insurance in our industry (...)"* (TVSYD, 2019²).

4.2.1.1. Sub-Conclusion

It can be argued that the rationale; the fence protects the Pig Industry from the threat of potentially ASF infected wild boars, was the primary reason/ground behind the erection of the wild boar fence along the Danish-German border. The fence was legitimized and justified with the arguments that the fence protects the Pig industry including ensuring the Societal Security (livelihood and reputation) of this industry against the migration of potentially ASF infected wild boars. Furthermore, I have discovered that the securitizing actors (the VLAK Government, the DPP, the Social Democrats and the Pig Industry) were indeed successful since the law concerning the wild boar fence was passed, the permission to erect the fence was granted and the fence was finished in the end of 2019.

4.2.2. *The fence protects the Danish society from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees*

Let us now consider the second rationale for the fence, which is perceived as a brilliant measure to protect the Danish society from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees. The Danish People's Party (DPP) has arguably been one of the securitizing actors behind this reasoning, where the illegal migrants and refugees are effectively securitized as the main threat towards the Societal Security of the Danish society. This became evident during the beforementioned proposal, when Peter Kofod, the spokesperson (DPP) of legal affairs at the time, suggested to reinforce the wild boar fence in order to utilize it as a border fence against the threat of illegal migrants and refugees *"If a fence that keeps wild boars out is established, you might as well make a fence that makes it a little difficult for others [people and refugees crossing the border illegally] to cross the border"* (Jyske Vestkysten, 2018). He further stressed his satisfaction that the fence would strengthen the already existing border control making it even more difficult to cross the border *"(...) no matter how you make the fence, it can only be a strengthening of the border control, and that is gratifying"* (Jyske Vestkysten, 2018) In addition to this, Kenneth Kristensen Berth, the EU spokesperson (DPP) at the time, concurred with Kofod and suggested to increase the height of the fence in order to protect Denmark including the Danes by making it harder for unwanted people to cross the Danish-German border

“I would have liked to have seen that the wild boar fence was not just a fence that kept wild boars out, but a fence that actually protected Denmark. We need that and therefore I would have liked to have seen that it was a three, four, five meters high. But now we get a marking and it has at least become a little harder to get into Denmark if you have a malicious mind (...)” (DR, 2019²)

The Deputy Mayor of Aabenraa Municipality, Erling Schütt (DPP), agreed with Kofod and Berth. Additionally, he also voiced his desire to increase the height of the fence as well as tried to create a sense of fear within the Danish population by securitizing refugees as criminals and terrorists that all wanted to gain access to Denmark *“(...) the fence is too low. It has to be increased with one meter. This makes it more difficult for illegal persons who want to go to Denmark. It can be refugees, bandits and terrorists (...)” (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018)*. Berth stressed again at another occasion his ambition to increase the height of the fence in order to keep the threat of illegal migrants, asylum seekers and vagrants away from the Danish territory *“We should add a couple of meters so the fence not just keeps German wild boars away, but also illegal immigrants, asylum seekers and adventurers” (The New York Times, 2018)*. He further legitimized the need to use the wild boar fence as an anti-migration fence, when he emphasized that migrants and refugees threatens the Societal Security of the Danes, which risked losing their unique cultural characteristics and the ability to remain in control of their own home *“What is most important for the Danes? The pig farms or to preserve the Danishness and be the master of your own house. I think I know what is most crucial” (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹²)*. Additionally, he used the 2015 ‘migration crisis’ to substantiate his argument of legitimizing the need of fortifying the Danish-German border in order to eliminate the threat of a new similar crisis

“I think it is crucial that Denmark is prepared for a similar situation like the one in 2015, where people that wanted to stay in Denmark and other Nordic countries stormed the borders. Nothing in Europe has changed that would prevent a situation like this again, thus it is now that we need a regular fortification at the border” (DR, 2019²).

In addition to this, Kristian Thulesen-Dahl, the leader of the DPP voiced the symbolic significance of the wild boar fence *“At the symbolic level it[the fence] is a great sign that we want to keep something unwanted out of Denmark” (Kristensen, 2019, p. 41)*. Moreover, the erection of a wild boar fence at the Danish-German border will, according to Berth among others, make it a more permanent

measure just like it happened with the temporary border control, and has the potential to grow larger in time *“The Government also talked about temporary border control, but the fact is that you get more and more in love with this border control, and hopefully this will also be the case with the fence. That you fall so in love with it that it is going to grow bigger (...)”* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹¹). In addition to this, Jacob Toubøl, a professor from Copenhagen University, acknowledges Berth’s claim *“The fact that a physical barrier now exists, makes it much easier [for the far-right] to argue, well, shouldn’t we just extend this since we already have it and put on a couple of meters of steel?”* (The Washington Post, 2019). Consequently, this rationale was given a lot of regional, national and international attention from news agencies such as TVSYD, Jydske Vestkysten TV2, DR, The New York Times, The Guardian and the Washington Post. This attention was according to freelance journalist Martil Selsø Sørensen caused by the DPP’s reasoning and the unusual plan to build a wild boar fence at the border between two countries, whereas the typical solution has been to fence around selected areas in order to prevent ASF infected wild boars from maintaining and spreading ASF (TVSYD, 2018¹; Jydske Vestkysten, 2019¹). Additionally, the Washington Post provides a great explanation of, how this rationale and attempt to securitize migrants and refugees in order to protect the Societal Security of the Danish society goes well together with the international view of Denmark, as one of the most immigration-skeptic countries with border controlling measures and now a fence, which could have the potential to develop into an anti-migration fence

“More than four years after Denmark emerged as one of Western Europe’s most immigration-skeptical nations and reestablished border controls that were once abandoned, the fence is at least symbolically abolishing the idea of a borderless Europe, far-right groups argue. Some of them hope this is only the first step of many that could morph the wild boar fence into tougher border controls or even a wall akin to President Trump’s plans for the U.S.-Mexican border. Its goal would be to keep migrants out of Denmark, too.” (The Washington Post, 2019).

This rationale can perhaps in time play a crucial role in fulfilling DPP’s ambitions of a greater nationalistic focus, a permanent border fence with border controlling measures and stricter immigration policies, which eliminates the threat of illegal migrants and refugees migrating into Denmark. Additionally, the prospect of a border fence could indeed become a reality since the Danish Defense (as mentioned earlier in part one of the analysis) still possesses 90% of the

purchased materials to reinforce 33 kilometer of the wild boar fence into an anti-migration fence with concrete walls and barbed wire (Jydske Vestkysten, 2019).

4.2.2.1. Sub-conclusion

I have revealed that this rationale; the fence protects the Danish society from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees, served as the secondary reason/purpose for the erection of the fence. Some of the representatives from the DPP justified and legitimized the erection of the fence by securitizing the illegal migrants and refugees as potential terrorists, bandits and vagrants with malicious minds capable of threatening the Societal Security of the Danish Society, their Danishness and the ability to remain in control. Additionally, some also suggested to increase the height of the fence and stressed their hopes of a more permanent (like the temporary border control) and reinforced anti-migration fence as well as voiced the symbolic significance of the fence. Consequently, the securitization moves by the DPP succeeded, and generated a lot of regional, national and international attention, since this narrative of the fence goes well together with the common view of Denmark as one of the most immigration skeptic countries with several anti-migration initiatives. Additionally, the fence got erected, which probably will make it easier for the DPP in time to increase the height of the fence, make it a permanent solution and argue for a greater nationalistic focus, stricter immigration policies as well as utilize the previously mentioned materials for an anti-migration fence.

4.2.3. *The fence threatens the wildlife and lacks evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars*

Let us now turn to one of the rationales against the fence, which is perceived as a threat towards the wildlife and lacks evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars into Denmark. Several Danish and German citizens, wildlife experts, professors as well as environmental organizations have as securitizing actors raised this critique and attempted to securitize the fence as a threat towards the Societal Security of the wild animal species in order to stop the erection of the fence or the removal of it, after it was finished. One of the securitizing actors was Hans Tonnesen, a local nature guide, that stressed the significance of the threat, the fence imposed on the wildlife's ability to move freely across countries and to breed with each other in order to maintain the wild animal species *"It has always been of great importance that the animals can move freely, that they can reproduce, immigrate and emigrate. (...) as they have done for millions of years (...)"* (DR, 2019²). He further stated that a lot of animals wanted to cross the border, but are prevented from doing it because of the wild boar fence *"There is a lot of animals that want to cross over [the wild boar*

fence], this is the worst of all in my opinion. For example, an otter and a hedgehog cannot pass through (...)" (DR, 2019²). In addition to this, he voiced the impact of the fence, not only for the wildlife living in the border region, but more generally for the wildlife within North Europe "*(...) it is a massive change for the wild animals in Northern Europe get their walking routes blocked*" (DR, 2019²). Additionally, The Danish Society for Nature Conservation (DN), The World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Naturbeskyttelse.dk, Dyrenes Beskyttelse (DB) and Dansk Pattedyrsforening (DP) voiced the same concerns as Tonnesen at the official hearing concerning the permission to erect the fence, where they expressed the negative consequences of the fence regarding the immigration and emigration of wildlife species and especially of the preserved species (Wolves, Otters and Golden Jackal) (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018, p. 9; TVSYD, 2018⁴). Consequently, this argument later caused an unknown German group in the year of 2020 to steal 22 meters of the wild boar fence and placed the parts around some of the German border towns as a political statement with the writing "*freedom of movement for all (beings)*" (Flensburg Avis, 2020). This could be perceived as an attempt to influence the politicians and population within the border region to remove the fence in order to ensure the Societal Security of the wildlife species. Moreover, the DP, the WWF and Danmarks Jægerforbund tried to stop the erection of the fence with the justification of the wild boars right to return to Denmark. These are a native species of Denmark that possesses an important role in the Danish nature, which in time increases the biodiversity among the wild animals and plants as well as serves as food for the preserved wolves (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018, p. 9; Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹³; WWF, 2020, pp. 1-2) Additionally, Claus Lind Christensen, the chairman of Danmarks Jægerforbund elaborated on the importance of the wild boars in the Danish nature and why this species should be allowed to return "*We need the wild boars in the Danish Nature. They root in the soil, and they do a lot of good for both the plant and animal life.*" (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹³). Furthermore, several landowners, citizens and five environmental organizations (WWF, DN, DP, Ulvetid and the German Hunter's Association) among others, also tried to stop the erection of the fence by questioning the beforementioned permission of the lack of a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the wild boar fence, which among other things elucidates the negative consequences of the fence, according to the wildlife and especially preserved species. The critique was among other things, that the fence threatens the Societal Security of several wildlife species by increasing mortality rates, since these animals would

walk along the fence until they find an opening to cross the border, which often is by roads and railways, where they risk being killed by traffic (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018, pp. 10-11; Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁷). Additionally, Ellen Margrethe Basse, a professor in environmental law, concurred with the beforementioned actors and she also questioned the lack of a comprehensive EIA *“It’s not after the book. It has not been documented that the fence does not cause harm to various wild species (...)”* (TVSYD, 2019⁵). Furthermore, a lot of other environmental organizations supported this rationale against the fence such as, Dansk Ornitologisk Forening, Dansk Botanisk forening, Dansk Jægerforbund, Greenpeace, Det Økologiske råd and Danmarks Sportfiskerforening (Kristensen, 2019, p. 63). During the erection of the fence in October 2019, this rationale sounded even stronger, when a series of incidents proved the capability of the fence to threaten the Societal Security of red deer and roe deer through harming and even killing these animals. Several deer got stuck in the fence in the attempt to jump above it and either got seriously injured and had to be shot or simply died of overexertion. One incident was when Lars Christian Jensen, a local farmer, experienced one of these devastating consequences of the fence, where he had to kill a roe deer after assessing its irreversible injuries *“It lay on the road, suffered and screamed like a small animal, and there was no other option but to shoot it”* (TVSYD, 2019⁵). Additionally, Kenneth Steen Nielsen, a local hunter, experienced another incident and was clearly affected, when he found a dead red deer entangled in the fence. This created a sense of unfairness, when he mentioned the duration of time this animal had been suffering because of the fence *“You can see that this animal has suffered for hours, days, or how long it has been struggling (...) It is simply dead of overexertion. It is grotesque that this is going on”* (TVSYD, 2019⁶). Consequently, the WWF acted upon these incidents and decided to file a complaint to the Bern Convention (protects the wild animals and its habitats) and WWF biologist Thor Hjarsen urged the Danish Government including the Danish Nature Agency to either remove the fence or make sure that it did not harm other species *“(...) If they do not want to remove the fence, then they must do something else to protect the species in alternative ways.”* (TVSYD, 2019⁵). Additionally, wildlife expert Hans Kristensen was certain that the Societal Security of the wildlife would be threatened by the fence in the future leading to even more collisions *“I am sure that there will be more collisions. We have seen red deer and roe deer, that got stuck (...)”* (TVSYD, 2020). Subsequently, the Danish Nature Agency decided to improve the fence several places after these incidents by reducing the mesh size of the upper part of the fence

in order to keep the roe deer and red deer from getting stuck. This would according to this agency mitigate the threat of the fence towards the wildlife and ensure their Societal Security (TVSYD, 2020). In this regard, Bent Rasmussen, a forester and the fence's project leader from the Danish Nature Agency, tried to dismiss the accusations within this rationale by emphasizing that this Agency has, during the erection of the fence, tried to take wildlife and nature into consideration as much as possible *"In the process, we have tried to take as much consideration for nature, the environment and people as possible"* (The Danish Nature Agency, 2018). This reinforcement and justification could perhaps be perceived as an attempt to silence the people and organizations of this rationale as well as to get a more broadly acceptance and legitimization of the fence.

Let us turn to the second part of this rationale concerning the accusation of the fence's lack of documented effect of preventing the migration of wild boars into Denmark. One of the securitizing actors that raised this argument was Kristensen, when he voiced the inadequate level of documentation justifying the wild boar fence provided by the Danish Government

"We are on a level, where a minister in the parliament argues that the fence works since his dog in the garden is stopped by a fence. The Danish Protection Agency and the Parliament has not included any wildlife experts. The provided documentation is very selective. It is inadequate or directly wrong." (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹⁰).

In addition to this, he argued against the VLAK Government's attempt to justify and legitimize the erection of the fence, when he called the fence a huge mistake, which does not keep the wild boars out of Denmark, because of their main entranceway and the places, where they are found in Southern Jutland

"It is a terrible misunderstanding to erect this fence. Primarily because it will not keep wild boars out, which I document in my book [Svinevirke]. The actual passage entranceway for wild boars is via Flensburg fjord, and there are not any wild boars in the area, where the fence is being erected" (TVSYD, 2020).

Additionally, he substantiated this argument in his book by referencing to two scientific investigations made by the Danish Institute for Food and Veterinary Research in 2003 and 2005, which concluded that wild boars are only to be found in the Southeastern part of Jutland within the area north of Flensburg Fjord. In addition to this, he stressed that the Danish Nature agency has according to their own register (in the period from 2017 to 2019) only observed and shot wild boars

within the beforementioned area (Kristensen, 2019, pp. 48-49). Furthermore, Kristensen wrote that some people in the border region even referenced the wild boar fence as 'Svinevirke', since it was similar to the history of Dannevirke in South Schleswig, which was perceived as a strong military rampart at the time with the ability to protect Denmark from an invasion south of the border. However, when Dannevirke was putted to the test during the Second Schleswig war in 1864, it became evident that German troops just walked around it by entering unprotected areas west of the border. This is according to Kristensen the same problem with the wild boar fence, namely the fact that wild boars easily cross this barrier by swimming across Flensburg Fjord (Kristensen, 2019, pp. 76-77). Additionally, DB biologist Michael Carlsen concurred with Kristensen and introduced a humorous metaphor in order to describe the questionable effect of the fence capability to prevent wild boars moving across the Danish border *"The effect of the wild boar fence is similar to drilling a hole in a boat because water flows over the railing"* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁷). In addition to this, The WWF supported these arguments and questioned the lack of scientific literature, which proved the effectiveness of the main purpose of the fence. Hjarsen elaborated on this lack within the provided documentation *"(...) In the screening the only citations are deriving from professionals within The Danish Nature Agency and there are no references to scientific literature (...)"* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁴). Consequently, the WWF perceived the fence as a purely political project (TVSYD, 2018⁴) and as *"(...) tokenism with undesirable consequences for the Danish nature. (...)"* (WWF, 2020, p. 2). Additionally, the WWF addressed this concern to the EU Environmental Commissioner that later urged the Danish Government to do a thorough investigation of the impact of the fence towards the local wildlife as well as the protected natural resorts (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁵). Besides the WWF and Kristensen, the DP, Ulvetid and several citizens raised the same critique during the official hearing of the permission to erect the fence and they also deemed it more as a political decision than a project based on scientific data (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018, pp. 3-4). Moreover, this rationale gained even more momentum when 15 environmental organizations (12 Danish and 3 German) decided to write a letter to the EU-Commission accusing the fence of breaching the EU Habitats Directive in order to stop the erection of the fence. The president of DN, Maria Reumert Gjerding, elaborated on this accusation *"We mean, that this [the fence] is contrary to the EU Habitats directive, which purpose is to create cohesive habitats for animals and plants"* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁶). She further elaborated on the ineffectiveness of the

fence towards the wild boars when she argued that the wild boars will find a way through the 20 permanent openings in the fence *“The fence will be filled with holes, and the wild boars can find their way to Denmark anyway”* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁶). In addition to this, Kristensen agreed with Gjerding and emphasized the significance of the openings as a possibility for wild boars to get into Denmark *“(…) There are many of them [the holes in the fence] because of roads, creeks, buildings. However, the wild boars can make use of those holes (…)”* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹⁰). Additionally, Morten Elmeros, a senior advisor at the institution of Bioscience at Aarhus University, concurred with Kristensen and Gjerding and substantiated this claim by stressing the VLAK Government’s questionable strategy of preventing the migration of wild boars into Denmark, while at the same time allowing other wildlife species to pass in order to ensure the Societal Security of these animals

“You try both to blow and have flour in your mouth [meaning; you cannot have your cake and eat it]. Because you want to stop the wild boars, but you do not want to stop red deer, deer, wolves and so on. And it cannot really be done. Some wild boars will turn around, of course, but others will follow the fence until it stops. And then they just cross the border there.” (TVSYD, 2018⁹)

Consequently, the EU-Commission responded to the beforementioned letter and agreed with the critics by questioning the legality of the fence as well as its negative consequences on the preserved nature. The EU-Commission referenced to two researches made by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) based on international literature and ASF experiences from other EU countries (TVSYD, 2019³; Kristensen, 2019, pp. 46-47). EFSA concurred with the securitizing actors behind this rationale and concluded that *“(…) there is no evidence that the erection of fences over large stretches is effective in reducing the spreading of wild pig species.”* (Kristensen, 2019, p. 62). Additionally, the Commission requested an EIA of the fence from the Danish authorities and reminded the Danish Government *“It is the member states obligation to ensure correct implementation of the directive [the habitats directive] (…)* *It must be in accordance to the directive’s objective of maintaining or achieving a favorable conservation status for all protected species”* (TVSYD, 2019³). Moreover, Peter Pagh, a professor and expert in EU legislation, deemed the wild boar fence illegal because of its missing EIA, which is crucial in order to legitimize the fence *“(…) right now is the fence violating the rules, and a consequence assessment should be done, if it should stand a chance for being*

legitimized” (TVSYD, 2019⁴). This could perhaps also explain why the VLAK Government, the DPP, the Social Democrats and the pig industry tried to securitize the wild boars in order to legitimize and justify the fence as an extraordinary measure, although it harms the wildlife species, lacks evidence documenting its efficiency and is illegal. Furthermore, this rationale led among other things to the creation of the Facebook page ‘Vildsvinehegn – nej tak’ (4.708 followers), the initiation of several demonstrations, debates and disputes as well as a Danish citizen proposal (4.104 people signed) and a German petition (537 people signed) with the aim to remove the wild boar fence because of its inefficiency, the threat it imposes on the Societal Security of the wildlife and eventually that it makes more harm than good (The Danish Parliament, 2020¹; Jydske Vestkysten, 2020; Jydske Vestkysten, 2020¹; Facebook, 2020).

4.2.3.1. Sub-conclusion

In the analysis of this rationale, the fence threatens the wildlife and lacks evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars, I have discovered that several environmental organizations, wildlife experts, professors, the EU-Commission and citizens have been the securitizing actors behind this rationale, which tried to stop the erection of the fence or the removal of it, after it was finished. This was done by emphasizing; the importance of the wildlife’s ability to move freely across countries, the wild boars right to return back to Denmark and the fence’s lack of a comprehensive EIA in order to ensure the Societal Security of the wildlife. Some of the actors also used the devastating incidents that proved the fence’s ability to harm and kill red- and roe deer. Additionally, they also stressed the lack of evidence of the fence’s capability to prevent the migration of wild boars into Denmark, since it does not hinder the wild boars main entranceway (Flensburg Fjord) and the fact that these animals can use the 20 openings in the fence. In addition to this, Kristensen and the EU-Commission used scientific data to substantiate their claim of the ineffectiveness of the fence. Consequently, almost all the actors behind this rationale deemed the erection of the fence to be more a political decision than a project based on scientific data. Despite all the support for this rationale, the securitizing actors failed to justify and legitimize stopping the erection of the fence and the removal of it. However, they did play a crucial role in the Danish Nature Agency’s decision to reinforce the fence in order to mitigate the threat of red- and roe deer getting harmed or killed by this object.

4.2.4. The fence damages the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including its people

Let us now consider the second rationale against the fence, which is perceived as a threat capable of damaging the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including the Societal Security of its people. Several mayors, political parties and citizens of the border region as well as environmental organizations have voiced these concerns to securitize the fence in order to justify and legitimize stopping the erection of the fence or the removal of it, after it was finished. During the official hearing concerning the permission to erect the fence, several citizens, the DN and the Working Group Against The Wild Boar Fence voiced the beforementioned concerns as well as securitized the fence as a manifestation of the Danish border and territory, which creates new physical and psychological boundaries between the Danes and Germans as well as threatens the cohesion and the progress made between the people of the border region *“The cohesion between citizens in the EU, in this regard Germans and Danes, which the EU spends so many resources on establishing and expanding, will be set back for many years by establishing of a fence at the border”* (The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018, p. 21). The Administration of Aabenraa municipality concurred with the previous securitizing actors and tried to securitize the fence as a manifestation of the border between the people with mental and physical consequences such as the freedom to move across the border *“The project [the wild boar fence] will not only affect the nature, streams and landscape, but will also have an impact on the population’s possibility of free movement across the border and thereby constitute a physical as well as psychological barrier”* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁸). Consequently, the fence could probably fulfill the Danish Nation-State’s ambition of dividing Germany and Denmark including its people by physically manifesting the Danish border and territory, which strengthens the National Order Of Things in order to emphasize the territorialization, belongingness and rootedness of the Danes including their identity and culture. This could eventually mitigate the threat of Danes moving more towards a rhizomatic and cosmopolitan identity that constantly changes and becomes more situational which weakens the Danish Nation-State and the Modern International Order by mobilizing the roots and identities of people (Malkki, 1992, pp. 29-38). Moreover, Katrine Hoop, who is a part of the Danish minority, agreed and securitized the fence as a physical manifestation of the Danish border and territory, which fulfills the Danish Government’s ambition in order to separate Denmark and Germany including its people from each other, while losing the ability to move freely and to potentially risk the cosmopolitanized,

rhizomatic and unique identities of the Danes and Germans within the border region “(...) *We mark where the border to our country goes. We want a visible sign that Denmark is beginning here, and the soft transition is gone. Metaphorically speaking, the border cuts it [Denmark and Germany] apart*” (DR, 2019²). Moreover, she further emphasized that all people within the border region has an opinion regarding the fence, since it is a part of their daily lives “*One cannot avoid having an opinion to it [the wild boar fence] because it is part of our everyday lives*” (DR, 2019²). Henrik Gotborg elaborated on the need of the Danish Government to manifest its border with the aim of separating the nations including the Danes and Germans from each other, which threatens the Societal Security of the people and strengthens the National Order Of Things “*No matter where you go, you meet the fence. Now the need to make the border visible once again with this fence that states; here is the border. Now there is a total division, Trump would have been proud (...)*” (DR, 2019²). Additionally, Niels Ole Krogh, the News Director of Flensburg Newspaper, voiced how the German’s perceived the fence as well as some of the same concerns as the previous actors concerning the manifestation of the physical border, which also created mental boundaries “*The Germans are tired of this tokenism, which is behind the wild boar fence and the border control. It imposes a barrier both physically, but it also creates a mental feeling that it is blocking*” (TVSYD, 2019⁷). Furthermore, Flemming Meyer, a SSW member of the Schleswig-Holstein Land Parliament, implied that some of the historical events at the border region eventually teared down the mental boundaries between the Danes and Germans within the border region, which in time have moved the identities towards more cosmopolitanized and rhizomatic ones. He further expressed some of the negative emotions that some of the Danes and Germans are feeling towards the wild boar fence, as a new physical manifestation of the border “*(...) it hurts to see that a physical and visible barrier is being built once again (...)*” (Grænseforeningen, 2019). Additionally, Heinz Petersen, a local German Citizen elaborated on how the Germans perceives physical barriers, which provides a great understanding of the German dissatisfaction and feelings about the wild boar fence “*We have bad experiences with walls and fences in Germany through many years and are satisfied that these are gone(...)*”(TVSYD, 2018⁶). Additionally, Gotborg also compared the wild boar fence with some of his bad experiences and emotions to the physical barrier and border controlling measures at the Danish-German border prior to the Schengen Agreement, where his childhood was negatively affected by the border guards, which harassed, stopped, detained and questioned him on his way home from school (DR,

2019²) “(...) *this [the wild boar fence] just makes all the things [fences, border controlling measures and division etc. prior to the Schengen Agreement] come back. (...)*” (DR, 2019²). Furthermore, Jørgen Popp Hansen, the president of the German Agricultural Association, securitized the fence as a bad political signal which will hurt the relationship between the two nations “*A wild boar fence is exactly a bad, political signal and would as a consequence hurt Denmark’s relationship with Germany (...)*” (TVSYD, 2018⁵). This became evident when the Mayors of the border Municipalities Harrislee and Flensburg questioned and criticized the Danish Government’s reluctance of not informing nor involving them in the considerations leading to the erection of the wild boar fence. Additionally, Martin Ellemann, the Mayor of Harrislee, simply heard about the Danish Government’s decision to erect a wild boar fence from the news and he stressed the same physical and psychological consequences in order to securitize the fence as a physical manifestation of the border, which threatens the Societal Security of the Danes and Germans within the border region. Consequently, the identities become more territorialized, rooted and fixed within the minds of the Danes and Germans “*(...) to erect a fence between two countries, it is not just a physical object. But it is also a fence within our minds. It will to a greater extent be a manifestation of the boundary*” (TVSYD, 2018⁷). Additionally, Simone Lange, the Lord-Mayor of Flensburg and the president of Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig, concurred with Ellemann and further elaborated on how the fence serves as a physical manifestation of the Danish border and territory damages the cross-collaboration and relationship between Denmark and Germany as well as between its people, which are forced to withdraw from each other “*I fear that this would be a great handicap for the Danish-German collaboration that we retreat to either side of a fence. (...) this would be a symbol that signals that we once again are withdrawing ourselves from each other*” (TVSYD, 2019⁸). In addition to this, she securitized the fence as a negative symbol of the Danish-German cross-collaboration because of the Danish Government’s reluctance to find a common solution together with the Germans, like they did on previous occasions “*It is a completely wrong symbol to erect a fence. The right symbol on a good Danish-German collaboration would be, that all experts sat down at the same table – German and Danish experts and found a common solution. Not that one side just decides to build a fence*” (TVSYD, 2019⁸). Consequently, she argued that this reluctance will make the cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany more difficult “*The cross-corporation will be more difficult, when we are unable to find common solutions on common problems*” (Kristensen, 2019, p. 64).

Additionally, she wrote on Facebook, how the relationship between the Danes and Germans in the border region had improved significantly during the past 100 years, which now was at risk because of the fence and Danish Government. Consequently, she urged the Danish Government to remove the fence immediately in order to turn back to the good relationship and cross-border collaboration between the two nations and its people (TVSYD, 2019⁸; Jydske Vestkysten, 2020¹). In addition to this, almost all of the political parties of the Schleswig-Holstein Land Parliament (the Christian Democratic Union, the Social Democratic Party, the Green Party, the Free Democratic Party and the SSW) concurred with this rationale and its arguments as well as shared their dissatisfaction regarding the fence and its devastating consequences towards the cross-collaboration and relationship (Kristensen, 2019, pp. 45-67; Grænseforeningen, 2019).

4.2.4.1. Sub-conclusion

In the analysis of this rationale, the fence damages the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including its people, I have argued that several mayors, citizens, environmental organizations and a Danish municipality have as securitizing actors tried to stop the erection of the fence or the removal of it, after it was finished. The way these actors justified and legitimized this was among other things by emphasizing that the fence is a manifestation of the Danish border and territory, which creates physical and psychological boundaries that separates the nations including its people. Consequently, the fence fulfilled the ambition of the Danish Nation-State of strengthening the territorialization, rootedness and belongingness of the Danes, while mitigating the threat of the Danes moving more towards a rhizomatic and cosmopolitan identity, which weakens the sovereign state, the National Order Of Things and the Modern International Order. Moreover, I have discovered that some of these actors also highlighted the Danish and German dissatisfaction and feelings about the fence as a new physical manifestation of the Danish border and territory, which eventually will damage the relationship and be a great handicap for the cross-collaboration between the two nations and its people. Eventually, these Securitization moves failed to stop the permission to erect the fence, its erection or the removal of it after it was finished.

4.3. Part three: Discussion of the functions of the wild boar fence in relation to other recent proliferated physical barriers

Let us now turn to the discussion, where Browns and some of the other theories from the literature review will be utilized. First, I want to discuss whether the wild boar fence has one or several purposes. Subsequently, I find it relevant to examine if the fence serves its primary purpose and elaborate on the symbolic purposes of the fence. Finally, I find it relevant to ask if this fence and other recent proliferated barriers could be a sign of the waning sovereignty of the nation-state.

I will begin the discussion asking this question: Does the fence only serve the function of preventing the migration of wild boars to Denmark in order to protect the Societal Security of the Pig Industry? The answer would be yes, if you ask the Pig Industry, the VLAK Government and the Social Democrats, as well as read the agreed proposal against ASF and the official hearing concerning the permission to erect the fence (4.2.1. pp. 27-32). However, if you ask the DPP the answer would be no, since the fence according to this far-right political party also serves as a brilliant measure against illegal migrants and refugees in order to protect the Societal Security of the Danish Society (4.2.2. pp. 32-35). Consequently, the Danish wild boar fence may serve multifunctional purposes, which Brown emphasizes is a common tendency among some of the recent proliferated barriers such as the electrified border fence between Botswana and Zimbabwe. This physical barrier does on the one hand prevent the spreading of foot-and-mouth disease among local herds between the nations and on the other hand stops the migration of Zimbabweans into Botswana (Brown, 2010, p. 19-21). However, does the wild boar fence serve its primary purpose of preventing the migration of wild boars into Denmark? Again, the answer depends on, who you ask the question. On the one hand the VLAK Government, its supporting parties, the Danish Nature Agency and the Ministry of Environment and Food argued that the fence effectively prevents the migration of wild boars across the Danish border (4.2.1. pp. 27-32). One example was, when the Minister of Environment and Food at the time, Esben Lunde-Larsen stressed that *“A fence will prevent infected wild boars from running across the border (...)”* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2018, p. 3). Another one was the (DPP) spokesperson for Agriculture and Food, Lise Bach, that voiced *“The wild boar fence is a cornerstone in preventing African Swine Fever spreading to Denmark (...) it will keep potentially infected wild boars from crossing the border”* (The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, 2019). On the other hand, several environmental organizations, wildlife experts, citizens, professors and the EU-Commission have accused the fence for lacking documentation of preventing the migration

of wild boars into Denmark. Consequently, many of these actors deemed the erection of the fence to be more a political decision than a project based on scientific data, since the provided documentation from the Danish Government and the Danish Nature Agency was very selective, inadequate, wrong and did not include any references to scientific literature (4.2.3. pp. 41-42). One, that elaborated on the level of provided documentation was Hans Kristensen after the Minister of Environment and Food at the time, Jakob Ellemann Jensen, used his dog as an example of, how the fence effectively will prevent wild boars from moving across the Danish border (Kristensen, 2019, p. 43) *"We are on a level, where a minister in the Parliament argues that the fence works since his dog in the garden is stopped by a fence. The Danish Protection Agency and the Parliament has not included any wildlife experts. The provided documentation is very selective. It is inadequate or directly wrong."* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018¹⁰). Kristensen among others stressed that the fence will not keep wild boars out, due to a number of reasons such as their main entranceway is via Flensburg Fjord, the 20 openings in the fence and that wild boars are only located, observed and shot in the Southeastern part of Jutland in the area north of Flensburg Fjord (4.2.3. pp. 38-40). One that voiced the problem with the 20 openings in the fence was the president of DN, Maria Reumert Gjerding *"The fence will be filled with holes, and the wild boars can find their way to Denmark anyway"* (Jydske Vestkysten, 2018⁶). Additionally, even the EU-Commission implied the inefficiency of the fence by referencing to two EFSA reports, which concluded that *"(...) there is no evidence that the erection of fences over large stretches is effective in reducing the spreading of wild pig species"* (Kristensen, 2019, p. 62). When the Danish Ministry of Environment and Food was questioned about this inefficiency of the fence towards its alleged purpose, they responded that *"(...) the initiatives together protect Denmark in the best possible way, and that individual measures cannot stand alone."* (The Danish Parliament, 2018). This inefficiency of the wild boar fence of serving its primary purpose is according to Brown a common feature among the recent proliferated physical barriers such as the U.S.-Mexican border wall that also lacked documentation towards its efficiency of preventing the migration of illegal migrants into the U.S., since the *"Proclamations of the wall's "success" only refers to reduced illegal crossing and apprehensions in urban areas and not to illegal migration as a whole."* (Brown, 2010, p. 37). Consequently, Brown deemed this barrier inefficient because of *"(...) the limited effectiveness of the barrier in actually deterring, as opposed to rerouting, the flow of illegal immigration."* (Brown, 2010, p. 37).

However, if the wild boar fence like the U.S. Mexican border wall are inefficient towards its primary purpose, could it be that it serves symbolic purposes? Throughout my analysis, I have discovered that some of the representatives from the VLAK Government and the Pig Industry have discussed the symbolic value of the fence. One of the representatives from the Pig Industry that dismissed the symbolic significance of the fence was Mogens Dall *"It [the fence] is not a symbol, but a necessity for us to get where we have done the most (...)"* (TVSYD 2019¹⁰). On the other hand, some of the representatives from the VLAK Government, the DPP and the Pig industry admitted some of the symbolic purposes like Lunde-Larsen that stated *"The wild boar fence sends a signal concerning, that I will not take any risk, when it comes to protecting the Danish pig export and – production"* (Kristensen, 2019, p. 57), and Søren Tinggaard from the Pig Industry that voiced that the fence ensures the worldwide reputation of the Pig Industry and as a consequence *"(...) serve as a precaution, a guarantee that we do everything in our power to keep the wild boars and ASF out"* (TVSYD, 2018²). This was probably also the case with the fence against food-and-mouth disease, which was erected along the Danish-German border in 1988 to preserve the worldwide reputation of the Danish Pig and Cow Industries towards the Americans, which purchased these meat products (4.1. p. 22; 4.2.1. pp. 27-32). Moreover, the DPP leader, Kristian Thulesen-Dahl, provides us with another symbol of the fence as a *"(...) a great sign that we want to keep something unwanted out of Denmark"* (Kristensen, 2019, p. 41). This claim does not only appear in Danish politics but also in international media such as the Washington Post which described the symbol of the fence in another way *"(...) the fence is at least symbolically abolishing the idea of a borderless Europe, far-right groups argue. Some of them hope this is only the first step of many that could morph the wild boar fence into tougher border controls or even a wall akin to President Trump's plans for the U.S.-Mexican border. Its goal would be to keep migrants out of Denmark, too."* (The Washington Post, 2019). In relation to this, Brown reveals a common feature of the recent proliferated walls that *"(...) all walls defining or defending political entities have shaped collective and individual identity within as they aimed to block penetration from without"* (Brown, 2010, p. 40). In other words, the wild boar fence and other recent proliferated barriers are capable of shaping identities, countries and enhances nationalism as well as in this case and in the case of the U.S.-Mexican border wall *"(...) contribute to new forms of xenophobia and parochialism to a postnational era"* (Brown, 2010, p. 40). Consequently, the erection of the wild boar fence could also be a symbolic sign of a victory

towards a more nationalistic focus for the Danish Nation-State since the fence separates the Danes from other nationalities and threatening subjects outside of the state boundary. This is probably done to maintain the Modern International Order and the National Order Of things by strengthening the territorialization, belongingness and rootedness of the Danish identity in order to ensure the roots (people) of the tree (Danish Nation-state), and ultimately its legitimacy and survival (4.2.2. p. 35; 4.2.4. p. 43-44). This became evident, when Henrik Gotborg stressed *“No matter where you go, you meet the fence. Now the need to make the border visible once again with this fence that states; here is the border. Now there is a total division, Trump would have been proud”* (DR, 2019²).

When this is said, can the wild boar fence and the recent proliferated barriers in general be a sign of waning sovereignty of the nation-states? Brown has argued that these recent proliferated barriers *“(...) are themselves sometimes monuments of the fading strength or importance of nation-state sovereignty”* (Brown, 2010, p. 32), since these physical barriers including the wild boar fence are built to counteract the dissolving consequences that globalization have on nation-state sovereignty and especially *“(...) to blockade flows of people, contraband and violence which troubles the unviable sovereign state power”* (Brown, 2010, p. 39) In other words, the threat of mobility is, according to Brown and Eyal Weizman, the real reason for building these structures in order to prevent transnational flows as well as international institutions which detaches sovereignty from the nation-states (3.3. p. 17). During my part two analysis it became evident, that the wild boar fence also targets nonstate transnational flows including illegal migrants, refugees and wild boars instead of following the thoughts of realism, where physical barriers served as a defense against the invasion of other states like the military rampart Dannevirke did. The reason for targeting transnational flows is probably done in order to mitigate the threat of the Danish Nation-State losing its roots (people), legitimacy, sovereignty as well as compromising the National Order of Things and the Modern International Order. But, why do the Danish Nation-State as well as other European member states choose to erect these physical barriers at their borders instead of abolishing these and working together to find common solutions to common problems? During and in the aftermath of the 2015 ‘migration crisis’, the corporation amongst the EU member countries, the EU, the Schengen Agreement and the Dublin Regulation, legal and moral obligations was putted to the test. Additionally, it was not only the nation-states that were under pressure but also the very supra-national bodies like the European Union (EU) including the beforementioned agreements,

which were in risk of failing and eventually collapsing. Consequently, the EU member states failed to comply with the EU and to cooperate with other member states in order to ensure a common response, mutual decision-making, a fair distribution of migrants and refugees as well as to uphold moral and legal obligations. This failure probably caused the EU member states to turn back to realism and nationalism, where some decided to erect physical barriers and implement border controlling measures in order to protect themselves, their sovereignty, legitimacy and ultimately their survival against the threats of the transnational flows of migrants and refugees. Additionally, the Danish Government also acted in terms of realism by reinstating temporary border controlling measures, purchasing the materials for an anti-migration fence and made it legally possible to reject asylum seekers at the border (4.1. pp. 24-26). Another example of Denmark turning to Realism and nationalism was, when the Danish VLAK Government single-handedly decided to use its sovereign power to erect a wild boar fence at the border in order to deal with the threat of ASF and wild boars, which are common enemies of Europe. Instead of finding common solutions and working together with other countries like Germany, the Danish Government found it more relevant to use a nationwide solution, which included the erection of the wild boar fence and a series of other initiatives against ASF. The erection of the fence proved its capability of damaging the good relationship with Germany and especially with the German municipalities within the border region. Consequently, most of the German political parties shared their dissatisfaction about this decision just like Martin Ellemann, the Mayor of Harrislee, and the Lord-Mayor of Flensburg Simone Lange (1. pp. 3-4; 4.2.4. pp. 42-45). Additionally, Lange accused the Danish VLAK Government for this nationalistic way of dealing with common problems, which may hurt the cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany

“It is a completely wrong symbol to erect a fence. The right symbol on a good Danish-German collaboration would be, that all experts sat down at the same table – German and Danish experts and found a common solution. Not that one side just decides to build a fence. (...) (TVSYD, 2019⁸)

She further elaborated on the damage the decision to erect the fence imposed on the cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany *“I fear that this would be a great handicap for the Danish-German collaboration that we retreat to either side of a fence. (...) this would be a symbol that signals that we once again are withdrawing ourselves from each other.” (TVSYD, 2019⁸).*

Moreover, Denmark and several other countries also acted individually and in terms of realism during the on-going Covid-19 pandemic, which hit the Nordic countries in March 2020. Additionally, the Danish Government decided to utilize the wild boar fence and concrete blocks as a border fence in order to temporarily close the border to stem, control and contain this virus by eliminating the threat of potentially Covid-19 infected people from other nations migrating to Denmark and infecting the Danes. Consequently, foreigners were only granted access to Denmark if they possessed a creditable purpose (Altinget, 2020; TVSYD, 2020²). Once again appeared a common enemy of the world that has not been met with a common response from the nation-states and instead many responded individually in terms of realism and nationalism. States like Denmark and Sweden pursued their own strategy of dealing with the outbreak. Sweden aimed at creating herd immunity among its people by allowing the disease to spread in a controllable way, whereas Denmark tried to repress this disease until the Danes were effectively vaccinated (Videnskab.dk, 2020). This was done by temporarily shutting down as much of the society activities as possible. Additionally, states like Germany and the U.S. tried to outbid other states for masks, vaccines, respirators and other much needed medical equipment (TV2, 2020; The Guardian, 2020). These three events elucidated some of the dynamics of how nation-states tend to act individually according to realism, nationalism and with the use of physical barriers in order to deal with threats towards its sovereign powers. However, can these proliferated barriers in general be seen as a sign of the waning sovereignty of the nation states? If you ask Brown, her answer would be yes, since these proliferated barriers cannot resurrect the sovereignty of the eroding and unviable nation-states although this is the alleged purpose (3.3. p. 17). However, if you ask the Danish Government for example, the answer would probably be no, since they argue that the wild boar fence protects the Danish Nation-State including its sovereign powers, finances and the Societal Security of the Danish Society and the Danish Pig Industry. In addition to this, it is difficult to argue if Brown or the Danish Nation-State is right, and it will most likely depend on your point of view and future events.

4.3.1. Sub-conclusion

After this discussion, it can be argued that the fence serves multifunctional purposes, on the one hand to prevent the migration of wild boars into Denmark in order to protect the Societal Security of the Pig industry. On the other to prevent the migration of illegal migrants and refugees crossing the Danish border in order to protect the Societal Security of the Danish Society. Additionally, the

fence fitted into the common tendency of multifunctionality of other recent proliferated barriers like the Botswana-Zimbabwe border fence. Additionally, I have also discovered that many deemed the fence inefficient towards its primary purpose and a purely political decision, since it lacked scientific evidence of documenting its efficiency. This inefficiency of the fence is a common feature among the recent proliferated barriers such as the U.S.-Mexican border wall, where its efficiency of preventing the migration of illegal migrants into the U.S. was not documented. Moreover, the symbolic value of the fence was also subject to discussion, where some denied the symbolic purposes, while others admitted these. It can be argued that the fence served several symbolic purposes such as ensuring the worldwide reputation of the Danish Pig Industry, a sign that Denmark wants to keep something unwanted out of its territory and the abandonment of a borderless Europe. Additionally, the fence, as well as other proliferated barriers like the U.S. border wall, helped shaping the collective and individual identity within the nation-state. This can be interpreted as a symbolic victory for the Danish Nation-State towards a more nationalistic focus with increased xenophobia and narrow-mindedness, which enhanced the rootedness and territorialization of the Danes in order to ensure the roots of the tree (Danish state), the National Order Of Things, the Modern International Order and ultimately its legitimacy and survival. It also became evident that the wild boar fence, the U.S. Mexican border wall and the Zimbabwe-Botswana border fence all targeted nonstate transnational flows. Whether the wild boar fence and other recent proliferated barriers can be seen as a sign of the waning sovereignty of nation-states is difficult to fully determine and left for the future to elucidate.

5. Conclusion

This thesis has investigated the grounds behind the erection of Danish the wild boar fence between Denmark and Germany and how this reflected broader discussions about borders and illegitimate flows. During this investigation, it became evident that the Danish-German border has as an object mediated its action through the Danish people and the people of the border region in recent history. I also discovered that the long history of physical barriers and border controlling measures in the border region have conditioned the erection of the wild boar fence, since it created some kind of acceptance, legitimization and normality of physical barriers among the Danish population and Government in order to protect Denmark and its population against external threats. Additionally, the 2015 'migration crisis' revealed the negative consequences of an invisible unprotected border and increased the willingness to reinstate border controlling measures at the Danish-German border once again, while also paved the way for a new fence to be erected at the border. Furthermore, I have discovered that the erection of the Danish wild boar fence was successfully legitimized and justified with the use of Securitization by two grounds. The primary one was that it protected the Pig Industry against the migration of potentially ASF infected wild boars, which would have negative consequences for this industry and Denmark more generally and the secondary was that it protected the Danish Society and ensured their Societal Security from the threat of illegal migrants and refugees. Additionally, the two rationales against the fence were that the fence threatened the wildlife and lacked evidence of preventing the migration of wild boars as well as the fence damaging the good relationship and cross-collaboration between Denmark and Germany including its people. The securitizing actors behind these rationales tried and eventually failed to justify and legitimize the stopping of the erection of the fence or the removal of it. Moreover, I have throughout this investigation argued that the fence has four things in common with other recent proliferated barriers. First, its multifunctional purposes which is similar to the ones of e.g. the Botswana-Zimbabwe border fence. Second, its inefficiency and lack of evidence towards its primary purpose, which also became evident in the case of the U.S.-Mexican border wall. Third, the fact that the wild boar fence, the U.S.-Mexican border wall and the Botswana-Zimbabwe border fence all target nonstate transnational flows. Fourth, some of the symbolic purposes of the fence. These are primary that Denmark wants to keep something unwanted out (e.g. wild boars, illegal migrants and refugees) of its territory and the Danish Nation-State's ambition of enhancing the collective and individual identity just like the U.S.-Mexican border wall did. This eventually led to a more rooted

and territorialized identity of the Danes in order to ensure the roots (Danes) of the tree (the Danish state), the National Order Of Things, The Modern International Order and ultimately this state's legitimacy and survival. After this thesis, it would be interesting to examine the on-going Covid-19 pandemic in relation to the fence and further investigate why the discussion about the fence suddenly became silent, whereas the importance to use it as a border fence increased in order to keep unwanted and potentially covid-19 infected humans out? Additionally, it will be interesting to see, if this so-called temporary fence in time will become a more permanent measure, just like the Danish border control, and have the ability to increase its height and eventually transform more into an anti-migration fence.

6. Bibliography

Abourahme, N. (2014). Assembling and spilling-over: Towards an 'Ethnography of Cement' in a Palestinian Refugee Camp. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 200-207.

DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.12155

Altinget (2020). *Regeringen lukker grænsen: "Mange danskere kommer til at blive berørt"*.

Retrieved 15.01.2021 from: <https://www.altinget.dk/eu/artikel/regeringen-lukker-graensen-for-at-bremse-corona-smitten>

Balzacq, T., Léonard S., & Ruzicka J. (2016). 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases.

International Relations 2016, 30(4), 494-531. DOI: 10.1177/0047117815596590

Berlingske (2020). *Flygtningekrise: Regeringen er parat til at bruge "asylnødbremser"*. Retrieved

26.04.2020 from: <https://www.berlingske.dk/nyheder/flygtningekrise-regeringen-er-parat-til-at-bruge-asylnødbremser>

Betts, A. (2009). *Forced migration and global politics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. DOI: 10.3316/QRJ0902027

Brown, W. (2010). *Walled states, Waning Sovereignty*. Zone Books.

Buch, J. (1997). Hvor går grænsen? *Sønderjyske Årbøger*, 109(1), 27-36.

Danmarkshistorien.dk (2020). *Genforeningen 1920*. Retrieved 08.04.2020 from:

<https://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/genforeningen-1920/>

Danmarkshistorien.dk (2020¹). *København-Bonn erklæringerne 1955*. Retrieved 06.03.2020 from:

<https://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/koebenhavn-bonn-erklaeringerne-1955/>

Danmarkshistorien.dk (2020²). *Det danske mindretal i Sydslesvig 1920-*. Retrieved 09.04.2020

from: <https://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/det-danske-mindretal-i-sydslesvig-1920/>

Delfs, R., Gebauer, M., & Kühl J. (2020) Sønderjysk Genforening 1920-2020. *Akademisk Kvarter*, 21, 1-7.

DR (2018). *Vildsvinehegn er ikke det første: Myndigheder har glemt at fjerne 30 år gammelt grænsehegn*. Retrieved 25.11.2020 from:

<https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/regionale/syd/vildsvinehegn-er-ikke-det-foerste-myndigheder-har-glemt-fjerne-30-aar-gammelt>

- DR (2018¹). *Inden vildsvinehegn: Råddent grænsehegn ikke vedligeholdt i 15 år – koster 200.000 kroner at rive ned*. Retrieved 25.11.2020 from: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/regionale/syd/inden-vildsvinehegn-raaddent-graensehegn-ikke-vedligeholdt-i-15-aar-koster>
- DR (2019). *Udskældt vildsvinehegn en realitet: Nu er første pæl sat i jorden*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/regionale/syd/udskaeldt-vildsvinehegn-en-realitet-nu-er-foerste-pael-sat-i-jorden>
- DR (2019¹). *Sidste stolpe til vildsvinehegn sættes i dag*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/indland/sidste-stolpe-til-vildsvinehegn-saettes-i-dag>
- DR (2019²). *Hjælp, vildsvinene kommer*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: https://www.dr.dk/drtv/program/hjaelp-vildsvinene-kommer_155150
- EU Commission (2017). *EU og migrationskrisen*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/e9465e4f-b2e4-11e7-837e-01aa75ed71a1>
- EU Commission (2020). *Schengen agreement & Convention*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/e-library/glossary/schengen-agreement-convention_en
- Facebook (2020). *Vildsvinehegn – nej tak*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://www.facebook.com/vildsvinehegnet/>
- Flensborg avis (2020). *Anonym aktionsgruppe fjerner 22 meter vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 19.03.2020 from: <https://www.fl.a.de/wp/dailys/anonym-aktionsgruppe-fjerner-22-meter-vildsvinehegn/?fbclid=IwAR06K05oMnAViy4sF-a2a1pVYDruFraTyuhpDZGOiV620kvLwuj1ZH3aQmk%20+%20>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2015) 24. Fem misforståelser om casestudiet. In Brinkmann S. & Tanggaard L., *Kvalitative Metoder – En Grundbog* (2nd ed, pp. 497-520). Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Glick-Schiller, N., & Salazar, N. B. (2013). Regimes of Mobility Across the Globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(2), 183-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.723253>
- Grænseforeningen (2019). *Vildsvinehegnet vækker stærke følelser i Tyskland*. Retrieved 23.03.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/magasinet-graensen-nr-5-oktober-2019/vildsvinehegnet-vaekker-staerke-foelelser-i-tyskland>
- Grænseforeningen (2020). *Grænselandets historie*. Retrieved 13.04.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/om-graenselandet/graenselandets-historie>
- Grænseforeningen (2020¹). *København-Bonn erklæringernes baggrund*. Retrieved 13.04.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/om-graenselandet/leksikon/koebenhavn-bonn-erklaeringernes-baggrund>

Grænseforeningen (2020²). *Sønderjyllandshistorie 1920-1945*. Retrieved 14.04.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/om-graenselandet/leksikon/soenderjyllands-historie-1920-1945>

Grænseforeningen (2020³). *Sønderjyllands historie 1945-*. Retrieved 15.04.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/om-graenselandet/leksikon/soenderjyllands-historie-1945#det>

Grænseforeningen (2020⁴). *Påskekrisen i 1920*. Retrieved 20.04.2020 from: <https://graenseforeningen.dk/om-graenselandet/leksikon/paaskekrisen-i-1920>

Jydske Vestkysten (2015). *Status: Flere udlændinge er på egen hånd nær Rødekro*. Retrieved 24.04.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/status-flere-udl%C3%A6ndinge-er-p%C3%A5-egen-h%C3%A5nd-n%C3%A6r-r%C3%B8dekro>

Jydske Vestkysten (2018). *Grænsehegn skal stoppe andet end vildsvin*. Retrieved 08.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/df-gr%C3%A6nsehegn-skal-stoppe-andet-end-vildsvin>

Jydske Vestkysten (2018¹). *Vildsvinehegn bekymrer grænsekommuner: Vidtgående og skadeligt for dansk-tysk samarbejde*. Retrieved 08.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-bekymrer-gr%C3%A6nsekommuner-vidtg%C3%A5ende-og-skadeligt-for-dansk-tysk-samarbejde>

Jydske Vestkysten (2018²). *Landbruget: Hegn skal slet ikke stoppe vildsvin*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from: [https://jv.dk/artikel/landbruget-hegn-skal-slet-ikke-stoppe-syge-vildsvin-2018-8-25\(6\)](https://jv.dk/artikel/landbruget-hegn-skal-slet-ikke-stoppe-syge-vildsvin-2018-8-25(6))

Jydske Vestkysten (2018³). *Svinepest i Belgien ryster danske svinelandmænd: - Det er frygteligt*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/svinepest-i-belgien-ryster-danske-svinelandm%C3%A6nd-det-er-frygteligt>

Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁴). *WWF går til EU for at stoppe omstridt vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: [https://jv.dk/artikel/wwf-g%C3%A5r-til-eu-for-at-f%C3%A5-stoppet-omstridt-vildsvinehegn-2018-8-28\(6\)](https://jv.dk/artikel/wwf-g%C3%A5r-til-eu-for-at-f%C3%A5-stoppet-omstridt-vildsvinehegn-2018-8-28(6))

Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁵). *Vildsvinehegn til afstemning: kan påvirke dyrelivet*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: [https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-til-afstemning-kan-p%C3%A5virke-dyrelivet-2018-6-4\(6\)](https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-til-afstemning-kan-p%C3%A5virke-dyrelivet-2018-6-4(6))

Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁶). *Naturvenner vil have EU til at bremse vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: [https://jv.dk/artikel/naturvenner-vil-have-eu-til-at-bremse-vildsvinehegn-2018-9-19\(6\)](https://jv.dk/artikel/naturvenner-vil-have-eu-til-at-bremse-vildsvinehegn-2018-9-19(6))

Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁷). *Svinehegn øger faren for vildtulykker*. Retrieved 19.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/svinehegn-%C3%B8ger-faren-for-vildtulykker>

Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁸). *Vildsvinehegn bekymrer grænsekommuner: Vidtgående og skadeligt for dansk-tysk samarbejde*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-bekymrer-gr%C3%A6nsekommuner-vidtg%C3%A5ende-og-skadeligt-for-dansk-tysk-samarbejde>

- Jydske Vestkysten (2018⁹). *Vildsvinehegn ikke det første: Glemte grænsehegn fra 80'erne forfalder flere steder*. Retrieved 25.11.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-ikke-det-f%C3%B8rste-glemte-gr%C3%A6nsehegn-fra-80-erne-forfalder-flere-steder>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2018¹⁰). *Vildsvinehegn: Over 1100 har meldt sig som nej-sigere*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/vildsvinehegn-over-1100-har-meldt-sig-som-nej-sigere>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2018¹¹). *Esben Lunde slår fast: Vildsvinehegn er kun midlertidigt*. Retrieved 23.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/esben-lunde-st%C3%A5r-fast-vildsvinehegn-er-kun-midlertidigt>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2018¹²). *Eksminister og DF-ordfører mundhugges i sag om vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 03.12.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/eksminister-og-df-ordf%C3%B8rer-mundhugges-i-sag-om-vildsvinehegn>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2018¹³). *Danmarks Jægerforbund: Vi har brug for vildsvin i Danmark*. Retrieved 04.12.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/danmarks-j%C3%A6gerforbund-vi-har-brug-for-vildsvin-i-danmark>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2019). *V-regering planlagde grænsemur af pigtråd for 21,7 millioner: ville holde flygtninge ude*. Retrieved 13.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/v-regering-planlagde-gr%C3%A6nsemur-af-pigtr%C3%A5d-for-21-7-millioner-ville-holde-flygtninge-ude>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2019¹). *Dansk vildsvinehegn får international opmærksomhed*. Retrieved 13.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/dansk-vildsvinehegn-f%C3%A5r-international-opm%C3%A6rksomhed-2019-1-29>
- Jydske Vestkysten (2020). *Protester mod vildsvinehegn er på vej fra Tyskland*. Retrieved 19.03.2020 from: https://jv.dk/artikel/protester-mod-vildsvinehegn-er-p%C3%A5-vej-fra-tyskland?fbclid=IwAR2wLcexLFzvQmhl8lzOgWHaH4e9qKjTLLRapF8HSmf3jGeeyZzJOXZPP_w
- Jydske Vestkysten (2020¹). *Modstandere af vildsvinehegn gav hegnet hårde ord med på vejen: Det er til skade for vildtet*. Retrieved 19.03.2020 from: <https://jv.dk/artikel/modstandere-af-vildsvinehegn-tog-til-orde>
- Kristensen, H. (2019). *Svinevirke – Historien om et hegn*. Bogjagt.dk.
- Lange, O. (2020). *Påskekrisen 1920*. Retrieved 08.04.2020 from: http://denstoredanske.dk/Danmarks_geografi_og_historie/Danmarks_historie/Danmark_1849-1945/P%C3%A5skekrisen_1920
- Lawson, G. (2016). The rise of modern international order. In Baylis J., Smith S. & Owens P., *The Globalization Of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (pp. 37-51). Oxford University Press.

- Lynggaard, K. (2015). 7. Dokumentanalyse. In Brinkmann S. & Tanggaard L., *Kvalitative Metoder – En Grundbog* (2nd ed., pp. 153-167). Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Malkki, L. (1992). National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 24-44.
- Mcdonald, M. (2008). Securitization and the Construction of Security. *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4), 563-587. DOI: 10.1177/1354066108097553
- Neal, A. (2009). Securitization and Risk at the EU Border: The Origins of FRONTEX. *JCMS 2009*, 47(2), 333-356.
- Neergaard, H. (2001). *Udvælgelse af Cases i kvalitative undersøgelser*. Samfundslitteratur.
- Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig (2020). *Regionssamarbejdet*. Retrieved 11.04.2020 from: https://www.region.dk/region/dk/ueber_uns/region/kooperation.php
- Retsinformation (2018). *Lov om projektering og anlæg af et vildsvinehegn langs den dansk-tyske landegrænse*. Retrieved 22.04.2020 from: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2018/694>
- Reuters (2016). *How Europe built fences to keep people out*. Retrieved 16.01.2021 from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-fences-insight-idUSKCN0X10U7>
- Schengen Visa Info (2020). *The Schengen Agreement*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://www.schengenvisainfo.com/schengen-agreement/>
- Sekretariatet for Genforeningen (2020). *Afstemningerne 10 februar og 14 marts og resultatet*. retrieved 06.03.2020 from: <https://genforeningen2020.dk/historien/afstemningerne-10-februar-og-14-marts-og-resultatet/>
- The Danish Environmental Protection Agency (2018). *Bilag E: Resume af høringsvar fra privatpersoner, foreninger, kommuner og statslige myndigheder over Miljøstyrelsens udkast til anlægstilladelse*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://mst.dk/media/151048/bilag-e-resume-af-hoeringssvar-fra-privatpersoner-foreninger-kommuner-og-statslige-myndigheder-over-miljoestyrelsens-udkast-til-anlaegstilladelse.pdf>
- The Danish Ministry of Culture (2020). *Afstemningszoner fra folkeafstemningerne i 1920*. Retrieved 10.05.2020 from: https://kum.dk/fileadmin/ImageVault/Kulturpolitik/Sydslesvigudvalget/101102_mindretalzone_st_or.jpg
- The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food (2018). *Aftale mellem regeringen og Dansk Folkeparti om styrket indsats mod afrikansk svinepest i Danmark*. Retrieved 06.03.2020 from: https://mfvm.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/MFVM/Natur/Aftale_afrikansk_svinepest.pdf

The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food (2018¹). *Vildsvinehegn langs grænsen skal beskytte den danske svineeksport mod afrikansk svinepest*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from:

https://www.foedevarestyrelsen.dk/Nyheder/Aktuelt/Sider/Nyheder_2018/Vildsvinehegn_langs_gr%C3%A6nsen_skal_beskytte_den_danske_svineeksport_mod_afrikansk_svinepest.aspx

The Danish Ministry of Environment and Food (2019). *Construction begins on wild boar fence*.

Retrieved 14.02.2020 from: <https://en.mfvm.dk/news/news/nyhed/construction-begins-on-wild-boar-fence/>

The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration (2016). *Regeringen indfører midlertidig grænsekontrol*.

Retrieved 25.04.2020 from: <https://uim.dk/nyheder/2016/regeringen-indforer-midlertidig-graensekontrol>

The Danish Ministry of Immigration and Integration (2016¹). *Regeringens nye udlændingeudspil*.

Retrieved 25.04.2020 from: <https://uim.dk/nyheder/2016/regeringens-nye-udlaendingeudspil>

The Danish Nature Agency (2018). *Røde og gule flag markerer startskuddet på vildsvinehegnet langs grænsen*. Retrieved d. 07.12.2020 from:

<https://naturstyrelsen.dk/nyheder/2018/oktober/roede-og-gule-flag-markerer-startskuddet-paa-vildsvinehegnet-langs-graensen/>

The Danish Nature Agency (2019). *Nu sættes vildsvinehegnet op*. Retrieved 02.12.2020 from:

<https://naturstyrelsen.dk/nyheder/2019/januar/nu-saettes-vildsvinehegnet-op/>

The Danish Parliament (2018). *Høringsnotat vedrørende høring over udkast til forslag til lov om projektering og anlæg af et vildsvinehegn langs den dansk-tyske landegrænse*. Retrieved

16.11.2020 from: <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20171/lovforslag/L228/bilag/1/1886293/index.htm>

The Danish Parliament (2020). *2020 – 100 år siden, Sønderjylland blev genforenet med Danmark*.

Retrieved 06.03.2020 from: <https://www.ft.dk/da/aktuelt/tema/genforening-2020>

The Danish Parliament (2020¹). *Fjern vildsvinehegnet ved den dansk/tyske grænse*. Retrieved

19.03.2020 from: <https://www.borgerforslag.dk/se-og-stoet-forslag/?Id=FT-03824>

The Guardian (2020). *US accused of 'modern piracy' after diversion of masks meant for Europe*.

Retrieved 18.01.2021 from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/03/mask-wars-coronavirus-outbidding-demand>

The New York Times (2018). *Denmark Plans fence to stop a pig disease. Will it work?* Retrieved

08.03.2020 from: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/24/world/europe/pig-disease-denmark-swine-fever.html?action=click&contentCollection=europe&contentPlacement=7&module=stream_unit&pgtype=sectionfront®ion=stream&rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Feurope&version=latest

The Washington Post (2019). *Denmark's far right wanted a Trump-style border barrier. It got a fence against wild boars instead*. Retrieved 13.03.2020 from:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2019/12/05/denmarks-far-right-wanted-trump-style-border-barrier-it-got-fence-against-wild-boars-instead/>

Triantafillou P. (2019). Kapitel 9 - Analyse af dokumenter og dokumentation. In Kristensen C. J. & Hussein M. A., *Metoder i Samfundsvidenskaberne*. (2nd ed. pp. 147-159). Samfundslitteratur.

TV2 (2015). *7 historiske øjeblikke da flygtningekrisen kom til Danmark*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from:

<https://nyheder.tv2.dk/2015-09-13-7-historiske-oejeblikke-da-flygtningekrisen-kom-til-danmark>

TV2 (2015¹). *Motorvej spærret i begge retninger: Flygtninge går fra Padborg mod Sverige*.

Retrieved 24.04.2020 from: <https://nyheder.tv2.dk/krimi/2015-09-09-motorvej-spaerret-i-begge-retninger-flygtninge-gaar-fra-padborg-mod-sverige>

TV2 (2020). *Tyskland går enegang og køber vaccinedoser udenom EU*. Retrieved 26.01.2020 from:

<https://nyheder.tv2.dk/udland/2020-12-22-tyskland-gaar-enegang-og-koeber-vaccinedoser-udenom-eu>

TVSYD (2016). *Husker du flygtningene på motorvejen? Sådan vil regeringen undgå lignende scener*.

Retrieved 25.04.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/graensekontrollen/husker-du-flygtningene-pa-motorvejen-sadan-vil-regeringen-undga-lignende-scener>

TVSYD (2018). *Overblik alt om vildsvinehegnet ved grænsen*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from:

<https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/overblik-alt-om-vildsvinehegnet-ved-graensen>

TVSYD (2018¹). *Amerikanere interesserede i vildsvinehegnet*. Retrieved 13.03.2020 from:

<https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/amerikanere-interessererede-i-vildsvinehegnet>

TVSYD (2018²). *Tilhængere: Vildsvinehegn giver mening*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from:

<https://www.tvsyd.dk/nyheder/04-10-2018/1930/tilhaengere-vildsvinehegn-giver-mening?autoplay=1#player>

TVSYD (2018³). *Se Video: Vildsvin spæner i flok*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from:

<https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/se-video-vildsvin-spaener-i-flok>

TVSYD (2018⁴). *WWF: Vildsvinehegn skader andre dyrearter i grænselandet*. Retrieved 17.03.2020

from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/wwf-vildsvinehegn-skader-andre-dyrearter-i-graenselandet>

TVSYD (2018⁵). *Sønderjysk formand: Vildsvinehegn bør være den sidste udvej*. Retrieved

20.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/sonderjysk-formand-vildsvinehegn-bor-vaere-den-sidste-udvej>

TVSYD (2018⁶). *Tysk nabokommune skuffet over Danmark*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/nyheder/21-06-2018/1930/tysk-nabokommune-skuffet-over-danmark?autoplay=1#player>

TVSYD (2018⁷). *Skuffet tysk borgmester: Hørte intet om grænsehegn*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/sydslesvig/skuffet-tysk-borgmester-horte-intet-om-graensehegn>

TVSYD (2018⁸). *Tilhængere: vildsvinehegn giver mening*. Retrieved 02.12.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/nyheder/04-10-2018/1930/1930-04-okt-2018-2?clip=d1959c08-5a34-4530-87cb-8d9ce63b3684#player>

TVSYD (2018⁹). *Grænsehegn skal holde vildsvin ude – men det skal være fuldt af huller*. Retrieved 07.12.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/tv2dk/graensehegn-skal-holde-vildsvin-ude-men-det-skal-vaere-fuldt-af-huller>

TVSYD (2019). *Politiske uenigheder overdøves nu af pælebanken*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/aabenraa/politiske-uenigheder-overdoves-nu-af-paelebanken>

TVSYD (2019¹). *Vildsvinehegn giver fyldt ordrebog og nye arbejdspladser*. Retrieved 09.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-soenderjylland/vildsvinehegn-giver-fyldt-ordrebog-og-nye-arbejdspladser>

TVSYD (2019²). *Nu er vildsvinehegnet oppe: Svineformand hejser flaget*. Retrieved 14.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-soenderjylland/nu-er-vildsvinehegnet-oppe-svineformand-hejser-flaget>

TVSYD (2019³). *EU sætter spørgsmålstegn ved vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/tonder/eu-saetter-sporagsmalstegn-ved-vildsvinehegnet>

TVSYD (2019⁴). *Professor i EU-ret: Vildsvinehegn bryder reglerne*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-sonderjylland/professor-i-eu-ret-vildsvinehegn-bryder-reglerne>

TVSYD (2019⁵). *Kampen om vildsvinehegnet fortsætter*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/aabenraa/kampen-om-vildsvinehegnet-fortsaetter>

TVSYD (2019⁶). *Vildsvinehegn blev 35 millioner billigere: Brug pengene på at beskytte dyrene, siger jægerne*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/aabenraa/vildsvinehegn-blev-40-millioner-kroner-billigere-brug-pengene-paa-beskytte-dyrene-siger>

TVSYD (2019⁷). *Nyhedschef: Det er ren symbolpolitik fra Flensborg*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/vildsvinehegnet/nyhedschef-det-er-ren-symbolpolitik-fra-flensborg>

TVSYD (2019⁸). *Overborgmester mod vildsvinehegn*. Retrieved 20.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/nyheder/1930/overborgmester-mod-vildsvinehegn?autoplay=1#player>

TVSYD (2019⁹). *I dag står vildsvinehegnet færdigt: Sådan fik Danmark sit grænsehegn*. Retrieved 22.04.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-soenderjylland/i-dag-staar-vildsvinehegnet-faerdigt-saadan-fik-danmark-sit-graensehegn>

TVSYD (2019¹⁰). *Vildsvinehegn til debat: Socialdemokrat bryder partilinjen*. Retrieved 19.01.2021 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/sonderborg/vildsvinehegn-til-debat-socialdemokrat-bryder-partilinjen>

TVSYD (2020). *Bog og borgerforslag protesterer mod vildsvinehegnet*. Retrieved 17.03.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-soenderjylland/bog-og-borgerforslag-protesterer-mod-vildsvinehegnet>

TVSYD (2020¹). *Danmark forlænger grænsekontrol til maj 2021*. Retrieved 05.11.2020 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/syd-og-soenderjylland/danmark-forlaenger-graensekontrol-til-maj-2021>

TVSYD (2020²). *Det betyder grænselukningerne for dig*. Retrieved 20.01.2021 from: <https://www.tvsyd.dk/covid-19/det-betyder-graenselukningerne-dig>

Videnskab.dk (2020). *Sverige følger sin helt egen corona-strategi – men hvor længe?* Retrieved 25.01.2021 from: <https://videnskab.dk/kultur-samfund/sverige-foelger-sin-helt-egen-corona-strategi-men-hvor-laenge>

World Economic Forum (2015). *Europe's refugee crisis explained*. Retrieved 29.01.2021 from: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/11/europes-refugee-crisis-explained/>

WWF (2020). *WWF Verdensnaturfondens høringsvar på udkast til lov om projektering og anlæg af et vildsvinehegn langs den dansk-tyske grænse (sagsnummer 2018 – 2437)*. Retrieved 07.12.2020 from: http://awsassets.wwfdk.panda.org/downloads/horingssvar_vildsvinehegn_wwf.pdf

Yin, R. K. (2012). *Applications of Case Study Research* (3rd ed). SAGE Publications.

7. Appendixes

7.1. Map of the two referendum zones



Picture 1: Map showing the two referendum zones; North Schleswig (1. zone) and Middle-Schleswig (2. zone) (The Danish Ministry of Culture, 2020)

7.2. Map of the previous- and the redrawn border



Picture 2: Denmark was forced, after the defeat in 1864, to redraw its borders along Kongeåen (the red line), and after the reunification, the new border was redrawn (the Green line) (Sekreteriatet for Genforeningen, 2020).