

Study of Approaches to Danish-Arab Dialogue

Theory and Practice

Pace, Michelle; Haugbølle, Rikke Hostrup; Skrubbeltang, Jørgen; Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk; Nielsen, Rikke Kristine

Publication date:
2015

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Pace, M., Haugbølle, R. H., Skrubbeltang, J., Jeppesen, J. A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2015). *Study of Approaches to Danish-Arab Dialogue: Theory and Practice*. Udenrigsministeriet. <http://um.dk/da/udenrigspolitik/lande-og-regioner/mellemsten-og-nordafrika/det-arabiske-initiativ/om-det-arabiske-initiativ/>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Study of Approaches to Danish-Arab Dialogue

Theory and Practice



A Study by Roskilde University

2015

A Study for
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the MENA Office



Roskilde University 2015

Table of Contents

Acronyms	V
List of Figures	VI
Executive Summary	VII
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1. Applied Methodology and Process of the Study	3
Chapter 2 Analysis of Dialogue Assumptions and Approaches of DAPP Interventions, 2003-2013	4
2.1. Introduction of Dialogue: The Historical and Political Context	6
2.2. Terror Threats and Dialogue Assumptions	9
2.1.3. The ‘Dialogue Objective’ as a Part of Danish Foreign Policy	13
2.3. Clear and Unclear Articulation of Dialogue and Its Aim	15
2.3.1. Addition of Aims of the ‘Dialogue Objective’	15
2.3.2. Introduction of Inter-religious Dialogue in the DAPP	16
2.3.3. The 2013 SFD: Many Forms of Dialogue	18
2.3.4. Conclusion: Clear and Unclear Articulation of Dialogue and Its Aim	19
2.4. The MFA’s Articulation of Dialogue under the ‘Dialogue Objective’	20
Chapter 3 Dialogue in Theory – A Theoretical Perspective on the Practice of the ‘Dialogue Objective’	24
3.1. A Theoretical Understanding of Dialogue – Selected Highlights	24
3.2. Dialogue: Everyday Spoken Language versus MFA Discourse versus Theory	28
3.3. Suggestions for Further Conceptualisation of the ‘Dialogue Objective’	31
Chapter 4 Conclusions and Recommendations	33
Chapter 5 Tools for Documentation and Measurement of the ‘Dialogue Objective’: Danish-Arab Dialogue	37
5.1. Identification of the Three Types of Dialogue in Programmes and Projects	38
5.2. Qualitative Measurement and Documentation of the Identified Dialogue	39

5.2.1. Storytelling through Written Representation	40
5.2.2. Storytelling through Photo Essays	40
5.3. Quantitative Measurement and Documentation of Dialogue	41
5.4. Example of Final Documentation Sheet	42
Closing Remarks	43
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	45
Annex 2: The Research Team	51
Annex 3: Literature Review: State-of-the-Art Review of Dialogue Literature	53
Normative and Descriptive Approaches to Dialogue Theory	55
Bakhtin: Dialogue as an Approach to Understanding People and their Practices	55
Gadamer: Dialogue as an Approach to Understanding the Other	57
Theories Relating Dialogue and Democracy	58
Communicative Democracy and Dialogic Democracy	59
A Need for Storytelling in Democratic Dialogue	60
Summary of Presented Dialogue Theories	61
Conclusion	62
Annex 4: Dialogue Identification Sheet and Dialogue Documentation Sheet	64
Annex 5: Guide to Reflective Storytelling – The Good Story	66
Annex 6: Bibliography, Documents and Reports	67
Annex 7: Interview List	70
Annex 8: Applied Methodology and Process of the Study	72
Annex 9: The Three DAPP Modalities	74

Acronyms

AHDR	Arab Human Development Report
DAPP	Danish Arab Partnership Programme
DEDI	Danish Egyptian Dialogue Institute
MENA	The Middle East and North Africa
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
PDR	Partnership for Dialogue and Reform
SFD	Strategic Framework Document
TAO	Technical Advisory Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WMEI	Wider Middle East Initiative

List of Figures

Figure 1: Documents for analysis and DAPP modalities	5
Figure 2: Areas of intervention for the AHDR, the MEPI, the EU and the DAPP	9
Figure 3: Strengthening of Denmark's position through the DAPP	15
Figure 4: Three types of dialogue	21
Figure 5: Split figure of the two DAPP objectives and their related types of dialogue	36
Figure 6: Descriptors of dialogue within the 'dialogue objective'	38
Figure 7: Documentation sheet for the 'dialogue objective'	42
Figure 8: Bakhtin's chosen site for intercultural dialogue	56.
Figure 9: Descriptors of dialogue within the 'dialogue objective'	64
Figure 10: Documentation sheet for the 'dialogue objective'	65

Executive Summary

This study responds to previous critique of the ‘dialogue objective’ of the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP). The ‘dialogue objective’ specifically refers to the second objective of the DAPP which is ‘to improve dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and the MENA region (the Middle East and North Africa)’.¹ A 2009 review² and an evaluation conducted in 2013³ both concluded that the DAPP ‘dialogue objective’ needed to be further clarified. Following from this critique the present study examines the ‘dialogue objective’.

The study was given the following three aims:⁴

1. To analyse dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions.
2. To review academic state-of-the-art theories on and methods for promoting dialogue.
3. To create tools for improving and documenting dialogue interventions.

Given the previous critique of the ‘dialogue objective’ and the size and time frame of the present study the three given aims were related to the ‘dialogue objective’, The study places the ‘dialogue objective’ in a political and historical context through an analytical reading of DAPP documents. For the analysis it was chosen to operate with a broad timeframe in order to grasp as many aspects as possible. Hence, the analysis is based on an analytical reading of DAPP documents from a period of 10 years: from the launch of the DAPP in 2003 to 2013. In this period Danish-Arab partnerships were the main modality of implementing the DAPP. Consequently, the main part of the examples and quotes concern the partnership modality. However, the focus of the study is not the partnership modality, but rather the ‘dialogue objective’.

Through the analysis of the DAPP documents the study concludes that the notion of dialogue within the DAPP is ambiguous. Dialogue was not only limited to the aim of the ‘dialogue objective’ of supporting dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region; rather many types of dialogue and aims existed, among these interreligious dialogue, social dialogue and regional dialogue, just as different interventions unfolded in relation to each of these. As a consequence the ‘dialogue objective’ became blurred, as the preceding review and evaluation

1 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida, p. 4.

2 *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport*. 2009. Skaedkaer Consult for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the MENA Department.

3 *Evaluation of Media Cooperation under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2005-12)*. 2013. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida.

4 See Terms of Reference, Annex 1.

had also pointed out. The study separates and defines the various types of dialogue within the DAPP.

Through the analysis the study furthermore identifies three contexts in which different types of dialogue unfold within the ‘dialogue objective’: 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue. These three types of dialogue are used in the elaboration of tools for measurement and documentation as indicators enabling the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (MFA) to grasp otherwise intangible results of Danish-Arab dialogue. With a view to responding to the critique raised by the 2009 review and the 2013 evaluation this study provides tools for both qualitative and quantitative measurement and documentation of dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’.

Furthermore, based on a presentation of theoretical knowledge on dialogue the study concludes that the use of the concept of dialogue presents a number of challenges. First, dialogue theory points to important criteria for success regarding the accomplishment of dialogic activity without which the positive effects of dialogue as understood in dialogue theory cannot be realised. Second, not just any type of conversation between individuals from Denmark and the MENA region may foster the desired effect of dialogue seen from a theoretical perspective. The study suggests that it should be considered to seek inspiration from alternative fields of research that more adequately address the network building aspect of the ‘dialogue objective’ which has been identified in the analytical reading of the said documents.

Finally, the study provides tools for measurement and documentation of dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’.

The study presents the following recommendations:

- **Establish a strict division between the reform objective and the dialogue objective.** First, dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ supports dialogue and understanding between Denmark and the MENA region, i.e. Danish-Arab dialogue. Second, dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ can be seen as a general approach. This is especially the case for the Danish-Arab partnerships where dialogue must run through and characterise all programmes, projects and activities. All other types of dialogue are means under the reform objective. Dialogue as a means is used by and even mandatory to some but not all partnerships.

The clear distinction between the two objectives should be observed both when describing DAPP activities in documents such as the SFD and when turning objectives

into concrete activities. A potential pitfall is to apply the notion of DAPP dialogue, as this would point to dialogue activities under both the reform objective and the ‘dialogue objective’ and hence reproduce the previous lack of clarity.

- **Clearly articulate that inter-religious, inter-ideological, inter-regional, national and social dialogue, respectively, are means for activities under the reform objective.** These types of dialogue are means which can contribute to the ongoing reform processes in the MENA region and therefore belong under the reform objective. There is room for improvement with regard to the articulation of the aim and underlying assumptions of these types of dialogue.
- **Clearly articulate dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region under the ‘dialogue objective’ as a broad notion in different contexts which can be divided into three types of dialogue:** 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue.
- **Articulate explicitly that the DAPP contributes with important networks, contacts and insights for Danish politicians, diplomats and MFA staff** through the activities of the Danish civil society in the MENA region. In this way, the Danish civil society has an important influence on Danish policy in the MENA region, which in return strengthens Denmark’s position in international fora such as the EU.
- **Consider a rearticulation of the ‘dialogue objective’** along the lines of the following suggestion:
The DAPP ‘dialogue objective’ considers dialogue a human-to-human interaction, which takes place between individuals from Denmark and the MENA region. Dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ is a broad notion which consists of three types of dialogue reflecting the context in which the dialogue unfolds: 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue.

With regard to tools for measurement and documentation the study recommends:

- Focus on qualitative documentation of dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ and storytelling in particular.
- Use of the dialogue descriptors elaborated in the study in order to enable actors within the DAPP to evaluate their daily work and identify the type(s) of dialogue which has unfolded within the ‘dialogue objective’.

- Use as a point of departure the guide to the good story provided by the study when actors elaborate their storytelling.
- That the MFA uses the documentation sheet layout provided by the study, containing qualitative as well as quantitative measurement and documentation of dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’.

In the concluding remarks the study points to the need for future studies of dialogue within other modalities than the partnership modality, the impact of the ‘dialogue objective’ and a closer study of dialogue under the reform objective. Finally, the study suggests a future reconsideration of the overall frame of the DAPP, establishing a more self-confident narrative about the Danish experience of dialogue which could inform EU foreign policy, and considering the potential of dialogic interaction with new and old drivers of transition and democratisation in the MENA region for future engagement with the area.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This study was launched by the MENA department at the MFA in late 2013 in order to respond to the lack of clarity and documentation of dialogue pointed out by a preceding review and evaluation. In 2009 a review of the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP)⁵ concluded that *'despite the relatively clearly defined frames and guidelines for dialogue under the DAPP the review team has identified ... a perception of the dialogue objective and the question of identification and measurement of results are unclear'*. A similar finding was made in 2013 as an evaluation of media cooperation under the DAPP⁶ concluded that the 'dialogue objective' lacked clarity, that the concept of the 'dialogue objective' needed to be more explicitly defined, and that there was a need for tools for improving and documenting dialogue interventions: *'Clarification of dialogue objective and approach: The DAPP dialogue objective needs to be further clarified by MFA in order to facilitate measurement of results. Moreover, the approach to dialogue results – in the form of Danish-Arab partnerships – needs to be reviewed, as per conclusion drawn on the limited dialogue impact'*. The 'dialogue objective' specifically refers to the second objective of the DAPP *'to improve dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and the MENA region'*.

Taking as its point of departure the above critique the objective of the present study has been threefold:⁷

1. To analyse dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions.
2. To review academic state-of-the-art theories on and methods for promoting dialogue.
3. To create tools for improving and documenting dialogue interventions.

The review and evaluation quoted above pointed out that the need for clarification and tools for measurement and documentation was related to the 'dialogue objective'. Since its inception in 2003 the DAPP has had a double strategic objective:

5 *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport.* 2009. Translated and emphasis by the authors of the present study.

6 *Evaluation of Media Cooperation under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2005-12).* 2013. Emphasis by the authors of the present study.

7 See Terms of Reference, Annex 1.

To promote reform and democratisation processes in the MENA region.

*To improve dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and the MENA region.*⁸

The first objective is on a daily basis referred to as ‘*the reform objective by the MFA and actors involved in the DAPP while the second objective is called “the dialogue objective”*’.⁹

Hence, while the given objectives of the study mentioned dialogue in unspecific terms, it seemed that the straightforward task was to provide clarification of the ‘dialogue objective’ and tools for measurement and documentation of the activities unfolding within the framework of the ‘dialogue objective’ – which concerns dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region.

However, when the ‘box of dialogue’ within the DAPP was opened in connection with the present study, it appeared to contain far more dialogue than what takes place within the framework of the ‘dialogue objective’, that many dialogue aims existed, and that a broad variety of actors performed different types of dialogue within the DAPP. The definition of these types of dialogue was unclear and unarticulated. Hence, the analysis of dialogue assumptions and approaches within the DAPP became gradually more complex and multifaceted as the study progressed. This emergence of a ‘Pandora’s box of dialogue’ within the DAPP conformed to the findings of the review and evaluation from 2009 and 2013, respectively. This revelation suggested that in order to be able to elaborate tools for measurement and documentation of dialogue a first and important contribution would be to separate and define the various types of dialogue within the DAPP.

Taking into account the recommendations of the mentioned review and evaluation as well as the time frame and size of the study, the present elaboration of tools for measurement and documentation was limited to dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’, i.e. Danish-Arab dialogue.

⁸ Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. *Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 4.

⁹ The DAPP currently has a programme scope of DKK 275 million annually.

1.1. Applied Methodology and Process of the Study

Specific methodological approaches were applied for each of the three main objectives of the study.¹⁰

Chapter 2 will discuss the first objective of the study: to analyse dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions. It does so against the backdrop of an analytical reading of key DAPP documents, study reviews and evaluation reports¹¹ and interviews with, among others, selected researchers and actors.¹²

Chapter 3 takes this analysis of the ‘dialogue objective’ a step further and analyses it critically against the backdrop of theoretical knowledge on dialogue. Furthermore, this theoretical knowledge is examined with the aim of identifying possible ways of documenting and measuring dialogue.

Based on the findings of the two analytical chapters Chapter 4 will present the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Tools for measurement and documentation were elaborated, tested and adjusted in a second phase through a process which included consultation with the MFA, meetings with a number of selected Danish strategic partners and feedback from the Technical Advisory Office (TAO) in Tunisia and Jordan, embassies in the MENA region and the Danish Egyptian Dialogue Institute (DEDI).

The study was directed by PhD Rikke Hostrup Haugbølle and the core study team consisted of Professor Michelle Pace, PhD Jørgen Skrubbeltang, PhD fellow Jonas Agerbæk Jeppesen and PhD Rikke Kristine Nielsen. The study was hosted by Roskilde University.

The core study team would like to thank all persons consulted during the study for their readiness, ability and wish to contribute to the study.

The present report constitutes the finalisation of the present study.

¹⁰ For a full outline of the applied methodology see Annex 8.

¹¹ See Annex 6 for a complete list of documents.

¹² See Annex 7 for a complete interview list.

Chapter 2

Analysis of Dialogue Assumptions and Approaches of DAPP Interventions, 2003-2013

This chapter approaches the first objective of the study: to analyse of dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions. It does so based on an analytical reading of key DAPP documents, study reviews and evaluation reports¹³ and interviews with, among others, selected researchers and actors.¹⁴

From the inception phase of the study¹⁵ it was clear that different actors had different thoughts in mind when they talked about dialogue, DAPP dialogue, the ‘dialogue objective’ and other forms of dialogue related to the DAPP. These different views reflected, among other things, the given person’s involvement with the DAPP or the moment a given document had been written. People’s views and intentions expressed in documents which dated from the early phase of the DAPP differed significantly from views and documents based on the current DAPP framework. Views on the aim and ability of dialogue also differed with regard to the way in which dialogue was conducted in practice. For instance, some of the DAPP strategic partners paid much attention to how dialogue could be applied in e.g. conflict management, while others struggled with understanding how they could meet the ‘dialogue objective’s’ demand for dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region.

As we gradually gained insight into the DAPP, a ‘Pandora’s box of dialogue’ emerged and many types of dialogue gushed from the box. Therefore, it was decided that a first and necessary task was to separate and define these various types of dialogue within the DAPP. First, in order to be able to see the ‘dialogue objective’ clearly and without the influence of other forms of dialogue, and second, to be able to deliver on the third study objective: to create tools for improving and documenting dialogue interventions.

Methodologically, it was chosen to base the analysis on an analytical reading of key DAPP documents with a view to explain and achieve a separation of these various types of dialogue by placing them in their political and historical context. Furthermore, it was chosen to oper-

13 See Annex 6 for a complete list of documents.

14 See Annex 7 for a complete interview list.

15 See Annex 8 for an outline of the applied methodology and process of the study.

ate with a broad timeframe in order to grasp as many aspects as possible of the ‘dialogue objective’. Hence, the analysis is based on documents from a period of 10 years: from the launch of the DAPP in 2003 to 2013, the year of the publication of the first Strategic Framework Document (SFD) for the DAPP,

According to the 2013 SFD, ‘partnership’ was the first and main modality of implementing the DAPP: *‘From the outset in 2003, the dialogue objective was integrated into all DAPP activities. The main modality of the DAPP was direct collaboration between equal Arab-Danish partners, working together on reform-related issues of common interest, hence nourishing a dialogue between professional and equal peers’*.¹⁶ Consequently, as the majority of documents under analysis in this chapter date from the initial years of the DAPP – when the main modality of implementation was the partnerships – the analysis mainly explores dialogue in relation to the partnership modality. Hence, throughout the analysis the terms partnership, partnership modality and strategic partners are mentioned. This neither means that the analysis focuses on the partnership modality – focus is still on the ‘dialogue objective’ – nor that it is ignorant of the two other modalities (project and programme support and secondment) within the DAPP,¹⁷ but rather that the content of the documents sets the frame for the analysis, examples and quotes.

Figure 1 below illustrates the relation between the time span covered by the documents and the DAPP modalities.




Figure 1: Documents for analysis and DAPP modalities.

¹⁶ Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document. 2013. p. 4.

¹⁷ See appendix 9 for an outline of the modalities within the DAPP.

The following research questions were used to guide the analytical reading of the DAPP documents:

1. How and why did the ‘dialogue objective’ become part of the DAPP?
2. What are the perceived aims and benefits of engaging in dialogue with MENA actors?
3. Which ambiguities and fault lines are present in the conceptualisation of the DAPP?

The analysis is presented here in three sections. The first section analyses the **introduction of the ‘dialogue objective’** and seeks to understand the background for how and why dialogue became a part of the DAPP. The second section of the chapter analyses **clear and unclear articulation of dialogue and its aims** in order to be able to identify when and how the definition of the ‘dialogue objective’ became unclear. The third section analyses and identifies **conceptualisations of dialogue** as they have been expressed by the MFA in order to narrow down what the MFA means and has meant when using the word dialogue.

2.1. Introduction of Dialogue: The Historical and Political Context

In 2003 not only Denmark but also international actors such as the US and the EU launched MENA programmes, which were either policy programmes directed towards the region, as was the case for Denmark, or a part of broader interventions. The launch of these programmes, and especially the DAPP, must be seen in a broader context in order to understand why the ‘dialogue objective’ became part of the DAPP in the first place.

The decade preceding the launch of the DAPP, the 1990s, was characterised by profound changes in Europe and its close neighbouring regions as well as in the US, which led to a change of policy frameworks, paradigms and ideological thoughts. After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s the US, under then president Bill Clinton, created a new security policy which took as its starting point the Western idea of a liberal democracy. The defence of human rights, the spread of democracy and market economy were key elements in Clinton’s security strategy from 1993.¹⁸ Recent changes in the map of Europe were also reflected in EU foreign policy. In 1995 the Barcelona Process – also called the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership – was launched to strengthen EU relations with

18 Andersen, Lars Erslev, Hansen, Gunna Funder and Sinclair, Kirstine. 2006. *Betingelser for dialog: Civilisationsskonflikt og anerkendelse. Tematisk studie*. University of Southern Denmark and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

the countries in the MENA region. The agenda behind the Barcelona process was, among other things, to create security and stability in the Mediterranean, promote democracy, good governance and human rights, create a set of trading terms and liberalise the economies in the southern Mediterranean countries. The Barcelona Process was launched as a partnership programme between the EU and individual Arab countries in the southern Mediterranean region.

In January 2001 the US experienced a change of government as George W. Bush took over the presidency from Bill Clinton. The same year, in November 2001, Denmark also experienced a change of government. The Social Democrat-led government which had governed since 1993 lost power to a liberal-conservative government led by then prime minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and supported by the Danish right-wing party Dansk Folkeparti. Member of the Conservative Party Per Stig Møller was appointed minister of foreign affairs. The new Danish government aligned itself with the new US government through its new foreign policy programme which stated that *'As a transatlantic oriented country anchored in Europe Denmark has a crucial interest in a strong Europe in cooperation with a strong US. The transatlantic relationship builds on basic common values, interests and goals. ... policy, economy, security and culture'*.¹⁹

Both the US, Denmark and the EU (re)launched new Middle East programmes. Of significance for these new programmes was the Arab Human Development Report (AHDR) published in 2002 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The report outlined a number of development shortfalls facing the Arab world and identified three key areas which were in urgent need of support and development: 1) Human rights, human freedom and good governance, 2) women's empowerment and gender equality and 3) development of knowledge-based societies.

One of the earliest documents describing the DAPP is the Draft Concept Paper from 2003,²⁰ which states that the DAPP was launched in order to *'Support specific projects and programmes, which are in accordance with the recommendations of UNDP's "Arab Human Development Reports"'*.²¹ From its inception in 2003²² to 2013 DAPP documents make clear reference to the AHDR

19 *En verden i forandring. Regeringens bud på nye prioriteter i Danmarks udenrigspolitik*. 2003. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

20 *Draft Concept Paper. Operational guidance for Planning and Implementation of The Danish Wider Middle East Initiative (Bilateral activities)*. 2003. For preliminary consultation with Danish civil society. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

21 *Draft Concept Paper. Operational guidance for Planning and Implementation of The Danish Wider Middle East Initiative (Bilateral activities)*. 2003.

22 Initially the programme was named 'The Wider Middle East Initiative' (WMEI). In early 2004, however, the WMEI was renamed the 'Danish Arab Partnership Programme'.

when explaining the focus areas of the reform objective. For instance, the current SFD (2013) states, ‘*With regard to the reform objective, the thematic focus of the DAPP has since the inception of the programme been framed by the 2002 UNDP Arab Human Development Report*’. In late 2002 the US inaugurated its Middle East programme called the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI).²³ The MEPI combines Western ideas of liberal democracy with the recommendations of the AHDR; hence, the DAPP was from the outset aligned with US policy in the MENA region with regard to reform objectives.

With regard to the ‘dialogue objective’, however, the DAPP was clearly inspired by and aligned with EU policy. In connection with the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) introduced in 2003 the EU declared ‘*the importance of the Dialogue between cultures and civilisations, as well as its role as an instrument to promote a culture of peace and to achieve mutual understanding, bring peoples closer, remove the threats to peace and strengthen exchanges among civilisations*’.²⁴ The DAPP Draft Concept Paper from 2003 makes reference to the Euromed Report ‘Guiding Principles for Dialogue between Cultures and Civilisations’ also from 2003, which suggests ‘*recalling the very significant contribution which, throughout history, peoples of the Mediterranean basin have made to the mutual enrichment of cultures and civilisations*’. This is echoed in the Draft Concept Paper which reads: ‘*The main objective of the Wider Middle East Initiative is to establish the basis for a strengthened dialogue with the countries of the Wider Middle East – from Morocco in the West to Iran in the East. The dialogue is to be based on common values that have welded our relations through more than two millennia*’.

The following Figure 2 demonstrates how the MEPI, the ENP and the DAPP address the same focus areas, whereas only the ENP and the DAPP include the dialogue aspect.

23 Sharp, Jeremy. 2005. *The Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative: An Overview*. CRS Report for Congress. Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

24 Euromed Report. 2003. Presidency Conclusions. Mid-Term Euro-Mediterranean Conference. No. 59, 28 May, Crete, Greece.

	Arab Human Development Report (2002)	US-Middle East Partnership Initiative (2003)	European Neighbourhood Policy (2003)	DAPP (2003)
<i>Economic</i>		Economic reform, business investment and private-sector development	Economic integration	Promote economic development and job creation (added in 2013)
<i>Democratic values</i>	Human rights, human freedoms and Good Governance	Strengthen civil society and expand political participation	Promote political values, good governance, democracy and cultural exchange and strengthen civil society	Promote good governance, expand human capabilities, choices and freedom and collaborate with civil society and reform actor
<i>Women's rights</i>	Women's empowerment and gender equality	Lift the voices of women		Address the empowerment of women
<i>Knowledge</i>	Knowledge-based societies	Bridge the knowledge gap		
<i>Dialogue</i>			Dialogue	Dialogue

Figure 2: Areas of intervention for the AHDR, the MEPI, the EU and the DAPP.

2.2. Terror Threats and Dialogue Assumptions

Whereas the changes in Europe informed international policy in the 1990s, two major incidents clearly changed the framework for policies involving the MENA region: namely the terror attacks in New York and Arlington, Virginia in 2001 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. The newly elected Bush government's 'war on terror' was especially targeted towards the MENA region. In June 2003 the Danish government presented its new vision for Danish

foreign policy,²⁵ which included the DAPP.²⁶ In this way, the DAPP was by nature a policy programme meant to serve as an integrated part of the Danish MENA policy.

The documents from the first years of the DAPP's existence clearly express concern about the security threat that had emerged, and dialogue is introduced as a tool against the terror threat and of importance to the security aspect. Thus, whereas the Draft Concept Paper (2003) states that '*Extremism and terrorism threatens the Middle East as well as Europe*', A Changing World (2003) argues that '*it is decisive for a peaceful development and on the long term to remove the basis for terror and extremism to promote dialogue between cultures and religious tolerance. The dialogue must build on mutual respect*'.

From 2005 onwards professional partnerships '*were established as the main mode of operation within DAPP*'.²⁷ As stated repeatedly in DAPP policy documents, it was '*assumed that if "professional peers" from Denmark and the Arab worked together on implementing specific projects of common interest, it would automatically lead to "contacts, insight, enhanced understanding etc."*'.²⁸

The assumption of a link between hostility and possible terror and security threats against Denmark, dialogue and partnership was articulated in a pamphlet from 2005,²⁹ where the minister of foreign affairs clearly summarises this point of departure: '*The West and the Arab World must not let terrorism write our history. It must be written by the majority who see common characteristics rather than differences – and possibilities rather than conflicts. Among the common characteristics is the populations' wish to live in peace, prosperity and freedom. Among the possibilities is to enter a partnership between the West and the Arab World to fulfil this wish. A partnership for reform and progress with the Arab World that will benefit all of us. This is, in essence, what the Government's Partnership for Progress and Reform is all about*'.

The idea that the West and the MENA region face the real challenge of a 'clash of civilisations' has been present throughout the life of the DAPP. In the 2005 pamphlet it was stated that '*11 September was to mark the start of a global clash of civilisations, but this must not succeed*',³⁰

25 *En verden i forandring. Regeringens bud på nye prioriteter i Danmarks udenrigspolitik*. 2003.

26 At this point the DAPP was called the WMEI.

27 *Note on the 'dialogue objective' of DAPP*. 2014. For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, MENA Department, p. 11. Also see *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 4. which mentions that partnerships was the main modality from 2003 onwards.

28 *Note on the 'dialogue objective' of DAPP*. 2014. p. 11.

29 *Partnership for Progress and Reform – Denmark, the Middle East and North Africa*. 2005. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

30 *Partnership for Progress and Reform – Denmark, the Middle East and North Africa*. 2005. p. 1.

and an analysis from 2010 writes that *‘The program thus reflected two central concerns in Danish international political thinking at the time: the worrying social, economic and political stagnation of EU’s neighbouring region to the south and the increasing adherence in international political debate to the idea that the “West” and the “Islamic world” were on course for a “clash of civilizations”’*.³¹ Later, in 2011, the tone was softened and there was talk of ‘scepticism of the Arab street’, although focus was still on the need for building bridges: *‘With respect to the implementation of activities under the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme, this scepticism that exists on the Arab street is accepted as an inherent aspect of the activities and it is considered important that all activities should have it as their goal to build bridges and generate greater mutual understanding’*.³² As mentioned above it was assumed that professional partnerships would automatically lead to enhanced understanding. The assumption of a cause-and-effect relationship between the partnership set-up and understanding affected the clarity – or the lack hereof – of the ‘dialogue objective’: *‘As a result of this assumption, many project proposals did not explicitly include objectives on the “dialogue” aspect’*.³³

The assumed relation between the ‘dialogue objective’ and the prevention of stereotypes and mutual prejudices gained a stronger focus after the Cartoon Crisis in 2005, where the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* published 12 cartoons of the Prophet Mohammad. The cartoons soon spread to the Arab world and resulted in anger, boycott of Danish goods and attacks on diplomatic representations. The crisis lasted from October 2005 to 2006. Later in 2006 a report about the DAPP concluded that *‘The Cartoon Crisis demonstrates that there is a need for increased inter-cultural dialogue, including a strengthening of the mutual understanding and fight against stereotypes and misinformation’*.³⁴

The aim of the DAPP ‘dialogue objective’ of dismantling stereotypes and prejudices is articulated in most DAPP documents after the Cartoon Crisis. In the introduction to a pamphlet from 2008 the minister of foreign affairs states, *‘The world is diverse but people in Denmark and the Arab region share the same aspirations towards peace, justice and prosperity. It is exactly through strong people-to-people partnerships that we can overcome stereotypes and build bridges in a joint effort*

31 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform*. 2010. Wegter, Marie-Louise Koch and Pultz, Karina. DIIS report 09. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS). See also *Building Intercultural Bridges: Lessons from the Danish-Arab Partnership Program*. 2010. Wegter, Marie-Louise Koch. DIIS policy brief. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).

32 *Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI)*. 2011. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, December, p. 9. Translated by the authors of the present study.

33 *Note on the ‘dialogue objective’ of DAPP*. 2014. p. 11.

34 *Analyse af Det Arabiske Initiativ og Anbefalinger til næste fase. Synteserapport*. 2006. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Translated by the authors of the present study.

towards this common goal'.³⁵ The terror threat does not figure in 2008, as it did in the 2005 pamphlet introduction. Instead focus is on 'people-to-people', 'partnerships', 'overcome stereotypes' and 'build bridges'.

By linking terrorism, security and dialogue the policy made a link to Huntington's thesis of opposed cultures and civilisations launched and debated in the decade preceding the launch of the DAPP.³⁶ The written documents about the new Danish foreign policy do not directly articulate a 'clash of the Islamic and Western civilisations'; however, an underlying fear of the potential realisation of such a clash was a driver for introducing and strengthening the 'dialogue objective' in the DAPP.³⁷ As the quotes above have demonstrated dialogue and partnership were seen as a means of bridging the gap – or clash – created by terrorism. The assumed cause-and-effect relationship between dialogue and understanding was identified, articulated and analysed in a 2010 study of seven Arab-Danish partnerships within the DAPP.³⁸

*The first assumption about PDR's (Partnership for Dialogue and Reform) contribution to improved dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and the Arab region is as follows: the professional dialogues occurring within twinning arrangements between Arab and Danish sister organizations not only foster exchanges of professional experience, but also reduce mutual prejudice and adjust existing stereotypes.*³⁹

The study shed light on key criteria for success of an initiative that aims to build Arab-Danish social capital and combat mutual prejudices while supporting reform initiatives in the Arab world. It consulted a vast bulk of literature about prejudices, stereotypes and social capital. The study concluded:

Mutual prejudices are generally dismantled in PDR partnerships. The Danish partners unanimously stated that their Arab partners had surprised them positively in terms of professional standards and general affability. For the Jordanian and Moroccan partners,

35 *Partnership for Progress and Reform – Denmark, the Middle East and North Africa*. 2005.

36 Huntington, Samuel. 1993. 'The Clash of Civilizations?'. *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3), 22; Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster; Andersen, Hansen and Sinclair. 2006.

37 Interview with MFA staff conducted by the study team.

38 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform*. 2010. See also *Building Intercultural Bridges: Lessons from the Danish-Arab Partnership Program*. 2010.

39 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform*. 2010. p. 17.

the meeting with the Danish partners effectively changed a widely held stereotype about Danes being cold and impersonal or even unwelcoming to Muslims. In return, a general expectation that Danes would be marked by a negative image of the Arab world was generally confirmed, and many Arab partners therefore saw PDR as a welcome opportunity to reveal the “real” Arab world to their Danish partners.⁴⁰

Following from this the SFD (2013) stated that ‘*The dialogue objective has proven to be highly relevant, not least for ensuring a mutually respectful and reciprocal approach and building long-lasting equal relationships between large numbers of Arab-Danish partners*’.⁴¹ This formed the basis for the SFD’s formulation of the DAPP ‘dialogue objective’: to improve dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and the MENA region.

2.2.1. The ‘Dialogue Objective’ as a Part of Danish Foreign Policy

The documents from 2003 to 2013 clearly show that the DAPP forms part of the broader Danish foreign policy programme. In 2003 it was stated that the government launched ‘*a Wider Middle East Initiative as part of a new vision for Danish foreign policy, “A Changing World”*’.⁴² The DAPP is characterised as part of Danish foreign policy in all documents leading up to the 2013 SFD, which states that ‘*The Danish Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP) has since 2003 been a central pillar in Danish foreign policy in relation to the MENA-region*’.⁴³

The present analytical reading of the documents and interviews points to two main understandings of the DAPP as a political programme: first, that the DAPP is a central pillar of Danish foreign policy in the MENA region, and second, that the DAPP also has the aim of supporting Danish capacities and strengths in multilateral fora. Through e.g. partnership engagement and activities Danish parliamentarians and diplomats can meet and create networks with actors and opinion-makers in the MENA region, which, among other things, may contribute to a strengthened position in the international fora.

Although the latter aim is only vaguely articulated in the documents, it does, nevertheless, stand out in the analytical reading. An example supporting this analysis is the following passage from a 2006 report stating that ‘*The bilateral part of the Arab Initiative will especially focus on*

⁴⁰ *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform.* 2010. p. 4-5.

⁴¹ *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document.* 2013. p. 5.

⁴² *Draft Concept Paper. Operational guidance for Planning and Implementation of The Danish Wider Middle East Initiative (Bilateral activities).* 2003.

⁴³ *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document.* 2013. p. 3.

the last point – dialogue and cooperation on political reforms. The bilateral track will also in the future have the aim of creating the necessary contacts and the essential insight into the region on the basis of which Denmark in an active and qualified way can play a role in the multilateral fora'.⁴⁴ A second example is taken from a 2012 document,⁴⁵ which points to one of the overall objectives and principles of the DAPP: 'As has been mentioned earlier, an important objective of Tracks I and II of the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme is to ensure the presence, knowledge and insight necessary to enable Denmark to contribute to strengthening the multilateral cooperation, particularly in the EU'.⁴⁶ This aspect of the DAPP and the 'dialogue objective' has, as mentioned, not been clearly articulated as also pointed out in a report from 2006, which stressed the need for clarifying the policy aspect of the DAPP: 'It is recommended that the DAPP is presented to the public as an integrated part of a broader Danish policy towards the MENA region'.⁴⁷ In the interviews some of the strategic partners expressed scepticism towards the policy aspect of the DAPP: 'we are not in this programme to promote any governments' political agenda. We are in it to promote a cause which we share with (our type of organisation) throughout the whole world'. However, the set-up also leaves the Danish civil society with a unique opportunity of influencing not only Danish foreign policy but also the international fora that Danish politicians meet during visits to the MENA region and the voices of which are heard outside the MENA region. Therefore, as the 2006 report also pointed out, it would help to create more clarity about the aim of the 'dialogue objective' and the partnership set-up if the policy aspect was not vaguely articulated but clearly presented as a strength of the DAPP.

The following figure illustrates how the policy programme of the MFA is carried out in practice in the Danish civil society and the MENA region through partnerships which in turn provide Danish politicians and diplomats with contacts and networks and strengthen Danish capacities in international fora.

44 *Analyse af Det Arabiske Initiativ og anbefalinger til næste fase. Synteserapport*. 2006. p. 20. Translated by the authors of the present study.

45 *Objective and guidelines for the implementation of activities under the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP)*. 2012. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

46 *Objective and guidelines for the implementation of activities under the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP)*. 2012. p. 21.

47 *Analyse af Det Arabiske Initiativ og anbefalinger til næste fase. Synteserapport*. 2006. Translated by the authors of the present study.




Figure 3: Strengthening of Denmark's position through the DAPP.

2.3. Clear and Unclear Articulation of Dialogue and Its Aim

As emphasised in the introduction to this chapter the main aim of the present study is to bring clarity to the notion of dialogue within the DAPP, as previous evaluations have concluded that the concept lacked such clarity. Therefore, in this section the study provides a critical reading of the DAPP documents with a focus on when and how the aim and concept of DAPP dialogue have been clearly articulated. It furthermore pins down sources of DAPP dialogue ambiguity with the objective of uncovering how and under what circumstances the concept of DAPP dialogue became unclear.

2.3.1. Addition of Aims of the 'Dialogue Objective'

Two notions referred to in the documents contribute to the ambiguity of the concept of dialogue, namely communication and the introduction of public diplomacy.

The first notion, communication, relates to the strategic partnership modality as it appears in the preprinted status report formula to be filled in by the strategic partners. The formula

asked for the following information: ‘*Dialogue, communication and information activities: Describe the Danish-Arab dialogue, communication and information activities in Denmark and relevant Arab countries, among this for instance concrete histories which have been printed in Danish and Arab media*’.⁴⁸ In this way, dialogue as people-to-people interaction is mixed with communication to the public through news articles and media stories. While information printed in Danish and Arab media and communication might contribute to an enhanced understanding of ‘the other’ among the broader populations in Denmark and the MENA region, the cause-and-effect relationships of this type of potentially dialogic activity and person-to-person dialogic encounters, respectively, differ to a large extent. As such, a clear separation of these two types of activities seems timely, as the documentation, evaluation and not least dialogic practice are very different. Distinct categories for e.g. ‘media and public relations’ and ‘interpersonal encounters’ may go a long way in minimising this source of ambiguity.

The second notion that emerges from the document analysis as a source of ambiguity is public diplomacy, which relates to the forerunner of what became the second and third modalities in 2013 (project and programme support and secondments) and to the nature of the DAPP as a policy programme. In 2006 a report recommended ‘*increasing the public diplomacy effort in order to communicate motives and values of the Danish engagement in the MENA and to present the DAPP as part of the total foreign policy towards the MENA, which prioritises security policy and socioeconomic aspects equally*’.⁴⁹ This recommendation was repeated in 2009.⁵⁰ The concept of public diplomacy is traditionally used in outreach work by the MFA in foreign countries and as an instrument for transmitting Danish values, culture and policies in a variety of areas. Similar to news articles public diplomacy has a sender – the MFA – and a receiver – foreign countries and their populations. Public diplomacy is thus one-way communication through which the one part wants to teach something to the other.

2.3.2. Introduction of Inter-religious Dialogue in the DAPP

As has already been pointed out there is no doubt that the fear of a clash of civilisations in the wake of the 9/11 terror attacks and the Cartoon Crisis has influenced and informed Danish foreign policy and the DAPP. These events are now commonly seen as marking some form of turning point in Christian-Muslim relations. However, already in the post-WWII years meetings with a view to establishing international inter-religious dialogue took place in

48 *Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI)*. 2011. p. 37. Translated by the authors of the present study.

49 *Analyse af Det Arabiske Initiativ og anbefalinger til næste fase. Synteserapport*. 2006. Translated by the authors of the present study.

50 *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport*. 2009.

Lebanon and Egypt.⁵¹ Whereas informal interaction, trade relations and cultural exchange have existed for centuries between Muslim and Christian communities, the contemporary, modern phase of established Muslim-Christian dialogue can be traced back to the international missionary conference in Edinburgh in 1910, India's growing independence movement in the years before 1947 and the 1962 initiatives of the Vatican II Council, which unfolded parallel to the meetings in Lebanon and Egypt.⁵² In 1971 the World Council of Churches established a subunit on interfaith dialogue. Due to the growing multifaith character of the societies of Great Britain, France, Germany and the Netherlands in the 1960s and 1970s local and national initiatives were taken to enhance Muslim-Christian and faith-based dialogue. In the 1990s Christian-Muslim dialogue became politicised, drew politicians on board – the EU's articulation of a dialogue between cultures has been described above – and political perspectives were discussed at meetings in e.g. the World Council of Churches. From being restricted to religious circles Christian-Muslim dialogue has become more complicated, involving both social and political dimensions.⁵³ Inter- and intra-religious initiatives were furthermore launched in various parts of the MENA region, including the 'Amman Message' in Jordan.⁵⁴ During and after the recent popular uprisings in the MENA region conflicts and tensions between Muslims and Christians have broken out or been intensified – as direct actions of violence in some places and as political tension between Islamist and secular groups in others.

Not until 2006 were activities aimed at strengthening inter-religious dialogue introduced as part of the DAPP. This may partly be explained through the AHDR, which does not mention Islam in any form, neither as the daily practice of millions of people in the region, nor as Islamism or inter-religious dialogue.⁵⁵ However, the analysis also reveals that the introduction of inter-religious dialogue reflects a search for a response to the changes in the MENA region and to the new turns of the political dimensions described above. Certain Danish civil society organisations with roots in a religious/Christian context were selected to carry out so-called inter-religious dialogue projects. In 2013, in an attempt to respond to the many new challenges facing the MENA region after the popular uprisings in 2010-2011, the SFD sought for the first time to address explicitly the tensions between groups with different religious and ideological outlooks within the MENA region. However, this attempt confused the original

51 Nielsen, Jørgen. 2014. 'Social relations, transformation and trust'. Unpublished keynote lecture at a conference with the same name. Centre for Social Relations, Coventry University. 29 March.

52 Goddard, Hugh. 2011. *Den sande tro: Kristne og muslimer mellem konfrontation og sameksistens*. Vandkunsten.

53 Nielsen, Jørgen. 2014. Examples from Great Britain see e.g. <http://www.interfaith.org.uk/>

54 http://ammanmessage.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16&Itemid=30&lang=en

55 For that reason the report met widespread critique from MENA analysts and intellectuals both in the West and in the MENA. See e.g. Levine, Marc. 2002. 'The Arab Human Development Report. A Critique'.

aim of Danish-Arab dialogue with an intention of supporting dialogue between various religious groups in the MENA societies as a way of facilitating reforms.

2.3.3. The 2013 SFD: Many Forms of Dialogue

The introduction of inter-religious dialogue contributes significantly to the ambiguity and loss of clarity of the DAPP by blurring the distinction between the two objectives of the programme: reform and dialogue. Inter-religious dialogue features in the 2013 SFD, which is the first of its kind for the DAPP. However, further forms of dialogue have been added in an attempt to reflect the changes in the MENA region following the popular uprisings in 2010-2011. Unfortunately, these forms of dialogue further blur the 'dialogue objective'.

In the introduction the SFD clearly states that *'From the outset in 2003, the dialogue objective was integrated into all DAPP activities. The main modality of the DAPP was direct collaboration between equal Arab-Danish partners, working together on reform-related issues of common interest, hence nourishing a dialogue between professional and equal peers'*.⁵⁶ This reflects very well the findings of the present analytical reading so far.

In the same section the SFD explains: *'Furthermore, a number of activities have had intercultural dialogue as their stated objective, be that activities of the Danish Egyptian Dialogue Institute (DEDI) or various partnership activities focusing on intercultural and/or interreligious dialogue'*. The use of the word 'furthermore' suggests that the interreligious dialogue has had an objective of its own which differs from the 'dialogue objective'. However, it is not clear from the SFD what this objective of intercultural dialogue is and how it connects to the remaining objectives and aims of the DAPP.

In a later section further ambiguity occurs as the SFD states that dialogue is both a means and an end: *'The success of the programme has partly been due to the consistent efforts to establish and engage in dialogue both as a means and as an end'*.⁵⁷ The reader is at this point familiar with the 'dialogue objective' and the immediate conclusion is that dialogue as a means and an end refers to this objective: The end goal is to support dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region, and dialogue is a means to create better understanding between the two.

However, in the following section the SFD states that the *'DAPP not only encourages direct Arab-Danish dialogue. It also strives to further inter-regional dialogue, where Danish partners engage*

⁵⁶ Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document. 2013. p. 4.

⁵⁷ Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document. 2013. p. 15.

in and facilitate sharing of experiences and synergies between partners from different parts of the region within a specific reform-field of common interest'.⁵⁸ From this it appears that in addition to dialogue that takes place within the 'dialogue objective' – i.e. Arab-Danish dialogue – the DAPP also supports dialogue between various Arab actors facilitated by the Danish partner when and if such Arab-Arab dialogue can contribute to activities and aspects of the reform field. Hence, with the SFD a new type of dialogue is introduced – Arab-Arab dialogue – and it is established that this dialogue can and should be seen in relation to the reform objective. This additional type of dialogue is described further down in the section: '*Secondly, the DAPP promotes Regional dialogue by bringing together partners from different areas of the Arab region with Danish partners as well as to collaborate and/or share specific reform related experiences and insights, hence both creating synergies from preexisting bilateral Arab-Danish collaboration and nurturing regional network and sharing of knowledge and experiences within the Arab region*'.⁵⁹

At this stage the SFD has introduced four types of dialogue: Danish-Arab dialogue, which reflects the 'dialogue objective'; interreligious dialogue and intercultural dialogue, which is obviously an objective in itself for some of the partners, although the SFD is very vague on this point; and Arab-Arab dialogue, which should contribute to the reform field.

Further confusion occurs a few pages further down, as a figure is meant to summarise the above aspects, but places interreligious and intercultural dialogue under the thematic area knowledge-based society. In the same figure a fifth type of dialogue is introduced: social dialogue, which is placed under the thematic area economic growth and job creation.⁶⁰

Whereas all these forms of dialogue were probably introduced in an attempt to address the current needs of the MENA region, they create confusion as to how e.g. interreligious dialogue differs from the 'dialogue objective' if Danes and Arabs establish a partnership on a faith-based context. The new types of dialogue add to a 'box of dialogue' which was already filled to the brim and lacked clarity.

2.3.4. Conclusion: Clear and Unclear Articulation of Dialogue and Its Aim

The detected drift towards including new aspects of dialogue mirrors the highly dynamic and volatile nature of the MENA region, where circumstances may change rapidly necessitating immediate action due to its geographical proximity to Europe. The 'dialogue objective' was launched in a shell-shocked post-9/11 world of fear of terror and has since seen the turmoil

58 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 15.

59 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 15.

60 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 18.

surrounding the Cartoon Crisis in its different phases and more recently the popular uprisings of 2010-2011. The highly different nature of the challenges and potentials of these different situations calls for different kinds of dialogic activity; and so a responsive and flexible MFA reaction to changes in the external environment of the MENA region using the notion of dialogue has blurred the initial intentions of Danish-Arab dialogue. It is therefore not surprising that the perceived lack of clarity concerning DAPP dialogue increases over time, as new purposes and interfaces of dialogue are gradually added to the scope of the initiative. There is nothing to suggest that the MENA region will be less volatile and dynamic in the years to come, which further emphasises the need for a clearly defined 'dialogue objective'. One possible double path towards creating clarity evident from this part of the document analysis is the following: first, to state clearly that as a policy programme the DAPP also – but not solely – contributes to strengthening Denmark and Danish parliamentarians in international fora, and second, to separate activities with the aim of creating understanding between Arabs and Danes from other dialogic activities such as interreligious and Arab-Arab dialogue which, as the SFD seems to suggest, are related to the reform field, i.e. the reform objective.

2.4. The MFA's Articulation of Dialogue under the 'Dialogue Objective'

This last section of the analysis of the DAPP documents aims at determining how the MFA has described the dialogue it has allowed for in relation to the 'dialogue objective', as this has been presented and articulated by the MFA in the documents. Based on this analysis the present study identifies three prototypes of dialogue within the 'dialogue objective': network and connection dialogue, cooperation dialogue and partner dialogue. These three prototypes are used in Chapter 5 as a point of departure for the elaboration of tools for measurement and documentation as proxy indicators. The three prototypes are created in relation to the **context** in which the dialogue has unfolded or taken place, as the context is often referred to by the MFA, as demonstrated in the following. The three prototypes are, of course, a constructed and a stylised way of considering the actual dialogue. They do, however, enable the MFA to grasp otherwise intangible results of Danish-Arab dialogue.

The three types of dialogue are illustrated in the figure below.




Figure 4: Three types of dialogue.

The first type of dialogue takes place within **networks and connections**. It is characterised by being informal and loose and by being conducted at an individual level. E.g. a document from 2008 states that ‘*The main focus is on people-to-people contacts*’ on an informal and personal level.⁶¹ The documents further express the assumption, intention and hope that these contacts will last and become more than just a one-time informal meeting: ‘*It is expected that the professional and personal contacts now being developed will last for long*’.⁶² Such contacts may be established at specific occasions such as workshops, seminars, public events etc.⁶³ When e.g. Danish and Arab partners organise conferences that are open to the public, individuals who are not involved with the partnership may attend the event and conduct dialogue during breaks. When such conferences conclude these individuals may continue the dialogue established during the conference through e-mail or telephone conversations. A Danish diplomat may e.g. exchange contact information with an Arab journalist whom he may choose to contact at a later occasion.

The second type of dialogue concerns contexts of dialogue related to the establishment of **cooperation** between Danish and Arab partners and institutions. A 2011 document gives an example of this with regard to strategic partnership modality: ‘*The partnership programmes have a thematic focus and, geographically, the programmes allow for cooperation with partners from the entire*

61 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 2. Emphasis by the authors of the present study.

62 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 2. Emphasis by the authors of the present study.

63 *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport*. 2009. p. 21.

MENA-region'.⁶⁴ This form of dialogue is characterised by taking place between individuals, who are employed by or affiliated to organisations or civil society movements or institutions and representations. The context and setting for such dialogue can be workshops, seminars and meetings, and the dialogue focuses on establishing cooperation between Danish and Arab partners or institutions and on organising, planning and launching concrete activities of cooperation. In this way, the dialogue has moved from the informal 'street level' and 'loose connections' to become more established, although it is not yet characterised by consolidated close relationships. The aim is to '*establish long-term relations of collaboration between the partners, which reach beyond the concrete project activities. Further aims can be that the organisations strengthen knowledge of Denmark and the MENA regions and, at the same time, increase the capacity to cooperate and establish contact to like-minded sister organisations in both geographical areas*'.⁶⁵

Both Danish and Arab partners are involved in organising and planning activities or events, although the documents suggest that the Danish partner, institution or representation is often the one in charge: '*It is typically one Danish organisation ... which, in collaboration with one or more Middle Eastern partners, has the overall responsibility for the implementation of the partnership programme*'.⁶⁶ Dialogue unfolds in reciprocal communication at meetings, through e-mail or Skype conversations or other forms of communication before, during and after a given activity. The dialogue is characterised by negotiations about responsibility and shared decision-making.

The third and last type of dialogue unfolds between well-established **partners and institutions** and when these agree on common solutions, programme objectives and responsibilities linked to the overall democratisation and reform activity, or when they have equal influence and impact on the formulation and decision-making process of the partnership, the guiding principals of the programme goals and the execution. This is, among other places, articulated in the 2013 SFD: '*The dialogue objective has proven to be highly relevant, not least for ensuring a mutually respectful and reciprocal approach and building long-lasting equal relationships between large numbers of Arab-Danish partners*'.⁶⁷ Dialogue still takes place among individuals – through human-to-human interaction – but has shifted to a consolidated management level, e.g. management meetings, seminars, workshops etc. Danish and Arab partners/institutions/representations

64 Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI). 2011. p. 16. Translated by the authors of the present study.

65 Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI). 2011. p. 5f. Translated by the authors of the present study.

66 Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI). 2011. p. 16. Translated by the authors of the present study.

67 Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document. 2013. p. 5.

sentations cooperate on formulating the programme objectives and have equal influence and impact on the formulation and decision-making process, the guiding principals of the programme goals and the execution. Through dialogue they reach shared answers concerning the development of their programmes. The document points to equality as a result of this type of consolidated cooperation: *'The main modality of the DAPP was direct collaboration between equal Arab-Danish partners, working together on reform-related issues of common interest, hence nourishing a dialogue between professional and equal peers'*.⁶⁸ The partners do not necessarily have influence and impact on the same domains; rather their influence and impact on different areas might be what makes up the balance of equality between the partners.

Based on this part of the analytical reading this study concludes that the MFA has considered dialogue a **broad notion** ranging from networks and (loose) connections between e.g. Danish and Arab journalists to consolidated cooperation between equal partners.⁶⁹ The study further concludes that the MFA has considered all of the activities represented within the three dialogue prototypes equally. The many types of dialogue are not hierarchically ordered and do not unfold in a forward-moving process from 'less dialogue' to 'more dialogue'. Rather, dialogue is considered a vibrant process which oscillates between various forms. The three prototypes are a stylised way of grasping the otherwise intangible Danish-Arab dialogue, and they represent articulations made in documents published between 2003 and 2013. Hence, future changes of the DAPP strategy might necessitate an evaluation and revision of the three prototypes.

In the following chapter the study explores how theoretical literature on dialogue can further inform and strengthen these initial and primary thoughts underlying the DAPP 'dialogue objective'.

68 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 4.

69 Interview with DEDI representatives by the authors.

Chapter 3

Dialogue in Theory – A Theoretical Perspective on the Practice of the ‘Dialogue Objective’

The previous chapter highlighted three context clusters and various types of dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’. Against the backdrop of this empirical exploration of dialogue this chapter aims to contribute to the clarification of the dialogue concept by introducing theoretical knowledge on dialogue. This is done with the aim of shedding light on the basic assumption of the ‘dialogue objective’ that engagement in dialogue enriches understanding. As such, this study echoes and adds to the findings of the earlier DIIS study⁷⁰ on the DAPP, testing the assumption that genuine partnerships, mutual trust and the dismantling of stereotypes evolve within the frame of long-term partnerships as a precondition for fostering understanding and minimising stereotypes. Also, a theoretical perspective is introduced here with the aim of exploring possible avenues for strengthening the conceptualisation of dialogue within the DAPP.

The chapter consists of three sections. The first section provides a summary of main insights from three central theorists of dialogue theory: Bakhtin, Gadamer and Young/Healy. The authors recommend that the interested reader explores the thoughts of the individual theorists in more detail in Annex 3, ‘Literature Review: State-of-the-Art Review of Dialogue Literature’. The second section analyses the DAPP’s take on dialogue against the backdrop of the theoretical overview with a view to establishing commonalities and differences and what can be learned from the identified similarities and differences. The third and final section of the chapter presents theoretical paths for further clarification and conceptualisation of dialogue as a basis for making suggestions based on the previous two sections.

3.1. A Theoretical Understanding of Dialogue – Selected Highlights

That conversation enriches and facilitates understanding is an underlying assumption in many of the everyday situations and contexts involving conversation as a tool for improving the quality of interaction between people, be it inter-nation state or neighbour conflict me-

⁷⁰ *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform.* 2010.

diation, staff development talks in organisations or parent-teacher conferences. Conversation as a vehicle for (better) understanding also features centrally in a theoretical understanding of dialogue; but **from a theoretical point of view the term dialogue is reserved for a particular type of communicative activity**. In the following three theoretical perspectives of dialogue are presented, each highlighting different characteristics, challenges and purposes of engaging in dialogue.

First, dialogue can be studied by focusing on particular forms of communication in communities, but also through studying human discourse dialogically, which means that focus moves from dialogue itself, as a unique form of human activity, to a dialogic view of human practice, i.e. an approach to any human activity. One such example is the theories of **Bakhtin**. Acknowledged as the philosopher of dialogue he developed a view of dialogue as a human condition, an ethical imperative and even a prerequisite for thinking. Thus, his notion of dialogue focuses on the idea of the social nature of language and the outcome of language and the inherent struggle in it (between different ideas, identities and other forms of outcomes). For Bakhtin, language and the outcome of language are always the product of interaction between at least two people or groups; thus, all interaction is dialogic. Bakhtin argues that there are two principal forces in operation whenever language is being used: a centripetal force and a centrifugal force. Building this metaphor on physics, Bakhtin argues that the centripetal force tends to push things towards a central point – an inward direction – whereas the centrifugal force tends to push things away from a central point and out in all directions – an outward direction. According to Bakhtin, monologic language (monologia) operates according to centripetal forces: The speaker of monologic language attempts to push all the elements of language and its various rhetorical modes (journalistic, religious, political, economic, academic, personal) towards one single form or utterance, converging into one central point. Monologia is a system of norms, of one standard or ‘official’ language, a language that everyone would have to speak (and which would then be enforced by various mechanisms; we can apply this argument to the ‘universal’ notions of rule of law, good governance, democracy, human rights etc.). It follows then that a conversation or other communicative interaction may be monologic although there is person-to-person interaction and communication. If the language activated by one or both parties is locked by a particular discourse or standard such as e.g. that of human rights, the creative and emancipatory potential of the dialogic encounter is lost. This in turn places high demands on the competencies, ethics and not least performance expectations of the conversation of the conversation partners to stay clear of the pitfalls of monologic language.

A second theoretical perspective on dialogue is proposed by **Gadamer**.⁷¹ For Gadamer, the spirit of dialogue is to strengthen the argument of ‘the other’. He stressed understanding as a mode of being. Understanding depends on the resources a person brings to a dialogue with another person. Gadamer’s work could in fact be seen not as a theory of dialogue but a theory of understanding. Gadamer dedicated his scholarship to understanding the role of prejudice in our interpretation of events and what we can learn from our prejudices. A Gadamerian approach to dialogue can enlighten us about intangible attitudes and beliefs that exist a priori to decision-making processes. Thus, dialogue may not necessarily be a pleasant exchange, but an event in which we are willing to put our own a priori prejudices to the test or at risk. Gadamer introduced the notion of the fusion of horizons. To the dialogue in which understanding takes place each individual brings a horizon, which comprises a range of visions that includes everything seen from a particular vantage point. The participants’ individual horizons merge in dialogue. This does not imply a surrender of individuality or subjection to an alien outlook. Our horizons are constantly being formed by an ongoing process testing our prejudices. With regard to the characteristics of the outcome of dialogue Gadamer says that through dialogue we rise ‘to a higher universality that overcomes not only our particularity but also that of the other’.⁷² Viewing dialogue through a Gadamerian lens the parties are characterised by a willingness to engage in thinking and action that go beyond their individual positions without selling out or losing themselves in the process. The fusion of horizons is a vehicle for better understanding not only ‘the other’, but also oneself and one another. As with Bakhtin, dialogue is seen here as a two-way street where both parties accept a certain degree of vulnerability vis-à-vis the other party and embrace the fact that one can and will be influenced by the other. Hence, it is not only a question of communicating information to ‘the other’ that will enable the other to see your point of view, but rather to create a third common viewpoint which will change both parties.

A third perspective on dialogue focuses on the inherently emancipatory and democratic potential of dialogue represented by political philosopher **Iris Marion Young** and her concept of communicative democracy,⁷³ and on **Paul Healy** and his elaboration of this concept into

71 See also Pace, Michelle. 2014. ‘The EU’s Interpretation of the “Arab Uprisings”’: Understanding the Different Visions about Democratic Change in EU-MENA Relations’. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 52 (5), 969-84.

72 Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*, ed. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London and New York: Continuum, p. 305.

73 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. ‘Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy’. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 120-35. See also Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk. 2013. *Folktales for Social Change: A Study of Democracy, Oral Culture, and Communication for Social Change in Rural Malawi*. Roskilde: CBIT & CUID, Roskilde University, ch. 3.

the notion of dialogic democracy. Young argues that, despite good intentions, by privileging reasoned argumentation in democratic communication mainstream deliberative democracy excludes possibilities for pluralism and for taking difference into account, limiting or inhibiting the democratising effects of dialogue. To remedy this bias in mainstream deliberative democracy Young suggests that we through communicative democracy ‘*understand differences in culture, social perspective, as resources to draw on for reaching understanding in democratic discussion rather than as divisions that must be overcome*’.⁷⁴ In a similar vein, Paul Healy⁷⁵ recently redeveloped Young’s notion of communicative democracy and introduced the notion of dialogic democracy. Through this concept Healy approaches difference as a necessary resource that enables the different parties engaged in democratic practices to reach enlarged thought of each other’s perspectives. This enables them, in turn, to reach a consensus on matters of collective concern. Accessing this resource, however, requires an inclusive and participatory approach to communication.

Young and Healy can be said to argue against a monologic political discourse of reasoned argumentation and ‘logic’, as this excludes certain groups from political debate and streamlines diversity and pluralism, thus losing important democratic potential in the process. When successful, dialogue accesses the collective wisdom of societies and groups, which in turn fosters consensus on matters of collective concern. This view of dialogue presents the dialogue parties, particularly the more resourceful parties, should a power or resource asymmetry exist, with the challenge of inviting to forms of debate and conversation that are inclusive and open to other types of rationalities than reasoned argumentation. Young points to storytelling as a means of committing and engaging a diverse group of people in resourceful interaction which truly reflects the life world of the other in their own words.⁷⁶

In sum, the theoretical conceptualisation of dialogue emphasises that:

- Dialogue is a meeting between human beings or groups of people. Dialogic relations can be cultivated between different people often belonging to different social, political, cultural or professional groups.
- Dialogue is a relational concept that emphasises the role of both the speaker and the listener, and as such the dialogue partners have an equal standing mutually influencing and being influenced by each other.

74 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. p. 120.

75 Healy, Paul. 2011. ‘Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue’. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 37(3), 295-311.

76 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. p. 128f. For a further elaboration of the potential of storytelling see Chapter 5 in the present report.

- Dialogue often becomes a site for performing and learning about different social, political, cultural or professional practices. In this way, dialogue can become part of the process of and means for maintaining and changing these practices.
- A dialogue between two people is not necessarily dialogic; it can be monologic.
- Dialogue has the potential to lead to creativity, understanding and better and more inclusive and hence resilient and just decision-making and decisions.
- Engagement in dialogue places high demands on both the skills and motivation of the dialogue parties.

3.2. Dialogue: Everyday Spoken Language versus MFA Discourse versus Theory

As stands out from the previous section, a **theoretical reading of the word ‘dialogue’ is reserved for a particular kind of interaction that excludes many types of communicative encounters between people, while at the same time being very open to the channels and contexts of interaction.** In contrast, in everyday language the word ‘dialogue’ is used to describe a conversation or discussion between two or more persons characterised by an exchange of ideas or opinions and directed towards the exploration of a particular subject, possibly of a political or religious nature, or the resolution of a problem.⁷⁷ **Dialogue, then, in the everyday spoken sense of the word is characterised as an open exchange of opinions and stands in contrast to monologue.** Many types of conversations may be included within this understanding of the word, and from the empirical exploration of dialogue in the previous chapter it was evident that the MFA also considers **dialogue to be a very broad notion** spanning from networks and (loose) connections to consolidated cooperation between equal partners. That is, almost any type of verbal or written Danish-Arab interaction is considered a dialogue. In this respect, the word dialogue could often be substituted by the word ‘communication’ without changing the meaning. Therefore, a considerable confusion and/or disagreement can also be detected in the MFA articulation of dialogue with regard to the particular meaning of the word ‘dialogue’, and several parallel or, at times, competing conceptualisations can be identified in MFA dialogue discourse. One example is ‘dialogue as network building’ centred on accessing local MENA knowledge pools.

The existence of such ambiguity is not surprising, as the DAPP documents fail to give a central definition of dialogue, and the initial use of the word ‘dialogue’ does not tie the concept

⁷⁷ Cf. e.g. Den Danske Ordbog or the Oxford English Dictionary.

to a particular (theoretical) definition.⁷⁸ So, even if the documents specify different fora for dialogue (Danish-Arab, regional and national) and desired outcomes, the ‘dialogue machine room’, i.e. the strategic partners’ practice level,⁷⁹ is black-boxed, in effect leaving it up to the individual partner to decide when e.g. interpersonal contact between Danes and Arabs is a conversation that may meet the ‘dialogue objective’ – and when it is not. In this respect, the current conceptualisation does not help the partners prioritise the resources for the most promising activities.

Deciding upon a firm MFA working definition of dialogue – or even renaming one type of dialogic activity – seems timely and would go a long way with regard to clarifying the notion of dialogue. The following paragraphs outline suggestions for how this can be done. The dialogue theory may serve as a source of inspiration in this respect in its capacity to highlight commonalities and differences between the ‘dialogue objective’ and theoretical concepts of dialogue.

The analysis and reading of DAPP documents in the previous chapter identified two main objectives of the ‘dialogue objective’. The first is to establish better knowledge of ‘the other’ in both Denmark and the MENA region in order to prevent prejudices and stereotypes. The second aim of the ‘dialogue objective’, which reflects that the DAPP is ‘*a central pillar in Danish foreign policy*’,⁸⁰ is to **support** Danish capacities and strengths in multilateral fora based on insights, networks and contacts provided for the Danish parliamentarians by the Danish civil society and institutions through partnerships with professional Arab peers. Seen against a dialogue theory backdrop the ‘dialogue objective’ is in keeping with central theoretical arguments, in that knowledge of ‘the other’ and each other has the potential to build bridges and trust through the activation of dialogic language, the fusion of horizons and inclusive communication channels/styles.

It is, however, very important to stress that much hinges on the motivation and ability of the dialogue participants and the quality and intensity of the interaction. If the participants are unwilling or unable to create an atmosphere of equality, reciprocity and openness, the conversation may be monologic and fail to result in network building, trust and mutual understanding. An encounter or conversation may serve the opposite purpose if it is characterised by monologic language: The interaction may dismantle positive expectations when confronted with reality, or a pre-conversation prejudice may turn out stronger after the meet-

78 Interview with MFA staff by the authors.

79 From 2003 until the introduction of further modalities from 2011-2013 as described in Chapter 2.

80 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 3.

ing than before interaction took place. That is, **there is no evident cause-and-effect relation** between dialogue and the result of dialogue. From a theoretical point of view prejudices may be dismantled, but the opposite may also be true.

As dialogue is a mutual endeavour, these competency requirements are not confined to the DAPP actors and partners, though. In order to establish dialogue, seen from a theoretical perspective, both parties in a dialogue must have the necessary motivation and ability to do so. In the same vein, if dialogue presupposes willingness to be influenced by the other party, aiming for a fusion of horizons, it is questionable whether all MENA actors are relevant or attractive dialogue partners.

Engagement in dialogic activity as has been laid out by the theoretical perspectives can be considered a **specific communicative individual competence** beyond the mere ability to ‘talk to other people’. The previous DIIS study on DAPP dialogue⁸¹ e.g. points to personal traits and skills such as trust building and cultural intelligence as important factors for fostering relationships. **So dialogic activity can only yield the desired benefits if the partners have the necessary dialogic competences.** Not just any type of conversation between Arabs and Danes can then foster the sought-after outcomes of dialogue seen from a theoretical perspective. A theoretical understanding of dialogue seems more elaborate and ambitious in terms of the nature and quality of dialogic activity than the general DAPP conceptualisation.

This is not to deny that dialogic activity, regardless of its content or quality, may have a positive effect with regard to relationship building, as has been uncovered in the previous DIIS study. Certainly, a precondition for realising the benefits of dialogue seen from a theoretical perspective is the establishment of contact and the existence of a certain degree of trust to continue an ongoing conversation in a relationship.

A related difference between the ‘dialogue objective’ and a theoretical notion of dialogue is the degree to which reciprocity and mutuality is a key objective. A critical reading of the ‘dialogue objective’ would question the degree to which dialogue activities are engaged in with the aim of creating a creative space for accessing the collective wisdom of groups and of arriving at novel solutions to (social) challenges. Acquiring knowledge of ‘the other’ is not necessarily tantamount to acquiring knowledge of one another. Further, a fusion of horizons presupposes a willingness of both parties to be influenced by the other. Is the MFA really ready to change its priorities as a result of the outcome of dialogic encounters and a fusion

81 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform.* 2010.

of horizons? Or will this run counter to the policy aspect of the DAPP? There is nothing in the data reported in this study to suggest that the existing dialogue activities are not characterised by understanding of one another in a relationship of mutuality or the opposite. It is mentioned here to underscore the fact that openness to being influenced by MENA partners is essential for real dialogue and thus for obtaining the positive effects of dialogue.

It is clear then that there is considerable focus on how the partnership dialogue should change ‘the other’ – ‘the other’ being people in the MENA region – or provide the MFA with information about ‘the other’ and less focus on the fact that dialogue is a two-way street for creating new understandings. Similarly, the second aim of the ‘dialogue objective’ may also seem to be at odds with the theoretical concept of dialogue. This is due to the fact that the establishment of contact points and access to local MENA pools of information does not necessarily entail that contact points are democratised, emancipated or co-creators of shared, new meaning. Whereas the establishment of resilient and efficient network relations may include communicative exchanges of a dialogic nature, this seems of less importance in the MFA’s view on dialogue, as uncovered in the previous chapter. From a dialogue theory point of view the risk exists that local conversation partners are merely ‘serviceable others’, who are mere bystanders in the construction of a desirable identity or brand of one party.

That said, it is undeniably a first start towards establishing dialogic interaction to identify and contact relevant dialogue partners. Without the ability to recruit relevant partners with which to engage in dialogue, the endeavour comes to a halt. Whether conversation and interaction between these parties can be considered dialogue from a theoretical perspective hinges on the nature and quality of the interaction, the language and formats used. **Generally, dialogue theory provides support for the aims of the ‘dialogue objective’, while at the same time pointing to important success criteria for dialogic activities without which the positive effects of dialogue reported in dialogue theory cannot be realised.**

3.3. Suggestions for Further Conceptualisation of the ‘Dialogue Objective’

Activation of theoretical knowledge may serve several purposes, e.g. provide a common vocabulary of ‘how we talk about things’, lay out a framework for making sense of a diverse and perhaps confusing reality, uncover novel viewpoints and provide inspiration for identifying blind spots and critique of communicative action, which in turns hinges upon the capabilities of the dialogue partners.

From this theoretical analysis it appears that the MFA may benefit from addressing the current ambiguity surrounding the notion of dialogue. One way would be to agree on a universal and generally applicable conceptualisation of dialogue in order to avoid confusion, both theoretically and practically, vis-à-vis both everyday language and a plethora of internal MFA conceptualisations of dialogue, as the emancipatory project of dialogic theory seems to go beyond the intentions of the ‘dialogue objective’. It therefore seems timely to apply a more careful use of the notion of dialogue and possibly discuss the need for renaming some of the dialogue activities. As the establishment of networks is one core aim of the ‘dialogue objective’, the use of the notion of network in connection with the aim of building relations could be taken into consideration. Although not covered in this study, one source of inspiration could be the concept of social capital accentuated by the previous DIIS study on dialogue and relationship building⁸² as an important component of long-term successful partnerships. The concept of social capital, defined as the **expected collective benefits derived from the preferential treatment, willingness to do things for each other and cooperation between individuals and groups**, seems in keeping with one of the two main aims of the DAPP ‘dialogue objective’.

The following chapter takes this last consideration of conceptualisation, aims and renaming into account in a conclusion of Chapters 2 and 3, ending with a series of recommendations.

82 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform*. 2010. p. 19.

Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

Previous reviews and evaluations of the DAPP have noted a lack of clarity regarding the concept of the ‘dialogue objective’ and a need for tools for documentation and measurement of dialogue. This chapter first presents the conclusions of the two previous analytical chapters. Second, based on these conclusions it presents the recommendations of the study.

- The lack of clarity of the ‘dialogue objective’, as pointed out by the 2006 review and the evaluation from 2013, arose because dialogue has been used to address emerging, new challenges without a thorough process of reconceptualisation. As a consequence, various actions and activities have been labelled dialogue, e.g. inter-religious dialogue, social dialogue and regional dialogue. These types of dialogue are very different from the ‘dialogue objective’, which aims to support dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region. Furthermore, dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ is a mandatory approach, as dialogue between Danish and Arab individuals must run through and characterise all programmes, projects and activities within the DAPP. All other types of dialogue, be it as means under the reform objective or as MENA regional and national dialogue, are optional.

Some of the underlying ideas of the ‘dialogue objective’ are in conformity with dialogue in theory:⁸³

- Dialogue often becomes a site for performing and learning about different social, political, cultural or professional practices. In this way, dialogue can become part of the process of and means for maintaining and changing these practices.
- Dialogue theory points to important success criteria for the accomplishment of dialogic activity without which the positive effects of dialogue reported in dialogue theory cannot be realised.
- Not just any type of conversation between Arabs and Danes may foster the sought-after outcomes of dialogue of the DAPP seen from a theoretical perspective.

⁸³ The conclusions are further elaborated in Annex 3.

However, the study also concludes that the use of the concept of dialogue presents a number of challenges:

- Engagement in dialogue with a view to realising the potential benefits of dialogue vis-à-vis the creation of mutual understanding and social capital places high demands on both the skills and motivation of the dialogue parties to avoid monologia and arrive at a true fusion of horizons.
- As discussed in the literature review there is no evident cause-and-effect relation between dialogue and the result of dialogue. Dialogue might, might not lead to better understanding. However, it is assumed by the MFA that this is the case. Finally, the articulation of the ‘dialogue objective’ mentions cooperation.
- The emancipatory project of dialogic theory seems to go beyond the intentions of the ‘dialogue objective’. Therefore, the present study suggests that the use of the notion of network in connection with the goal of building relationships could be taken into consideration. Although not covered in this study, one source of inspiration could be the concept of social capital accentuated by the previous DIIS study on dialogue and relationship building⁸⁴ as an important component of long-term successful partnerships.
- It eases the interaction if the interaction parties are like-minded peers due to the consequent similarity in status, educational background and/or job title/interests, thus increasing the chance of establishing dialogic dialogue. However, the recent uprisings and current changes in the MENA region bring new and important actors onto the reform scene, who may not be ‘like-minded’, but nevertheless important to include as drivers for change. As pointed out by the theory this can be a challenging factor for the success of dialogue, whereas network building is much more likely to be realised.
- The essence of dialogic interaction is that it is open-ended in nature and characterised by reciprocity and equality between the participating parties. A predefined script from one of the parties may then undermine the positive benefits of dialogue, which are precisely the result of the creation of a new creative space for shared sense-making.

⁸⁴ *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform.* 2010. p. 19.

These conclusions lead to the following recommendations:

- **Establish a strict division between the reform objective and the dialogue objective.** First, dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ supports dialogue and understanding between Denmark and the MENA region, i.e. Danish-Arab dialogue. Second, dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ can be seen as a general approach. This is especially the case for the Danish-Arab partnerships where dialogue must run through and characterise all programmes, projects and activities. All other types of dialogue are means under the reform objective. Dialogue as a means is used by and is even mandatory to some but not all partnerships.
The clear distinction between the two objectives should be observed both when describing DAPP activities in documents such as the SFD and when turning objectives into concrete activities. A potential pitfall is to apply the notion of DAPP dialogue, as this would point to dialogue activities under both the reform objective and the ‘dialogue objective’ and hence reproduce the previous lack of clarity.
- **Clearly articulate that inter-religious, inter-ideological, inter-regional, national and social dialogue, respectively, are means for activities under the reform objective.** These types of dialogue are means which can contribute to the ongoing reform processes in the MENA region and therefore belong under the reform objective. There is room for improvement with regard to the articulation of the aim and underlying assumptions of these types of dialogue.
- **Clearly articulate dialogue between Denmark and the MENA region under the ‘dialogue objective’ as a broad notion in different contexts which can be divided into three types of dialogue:** 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue.
- **Articulate explicitly that the DAPP contributes with important networks, contacts and insights for Danish politicians, diplomats and MFA staff** through the activities of the Danish civil society in the MENA region. In this way, the Danish civil society has an important influence on Danish policy in the MENA region which in return strengthens Denmark’s position in international fora such as the EU.
- **Consider a rearticulation of the ‘dialogue objective’** along the lines of the following suggestion:

The ‘dialogue objective’ considers dialogue a human-to-human interaction which takes place between individuals from Denmark and the MENA region. Dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ is a broad notion which consists of three prototypes of dialogue reflecting the context in which the dialogue unfolds: 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue.

The following figure visualises the above recommendations. Note that public diplomacy and communication have been left out, as argued in Chapter 2.




Figure 5: Split figure of the two DAPP objectives and their related types of dialogue.⁸⁵

In the following chapter the concept of the ‘dialogue objective’ is operationalised into concrete tools for measurement and documentation.

⁸⁵ The various types of dialogue under the reform objective are based on *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. 2013. p. 15 and 18.

Chapter 5

Tools for Documentation and Measurement of the ‘Dialogue Objective’: Danish-Arab Dialogue

Tools for measurement and documentation should deliver measurable indicators of the success or failure of a given programme or project. The previous chapters have brought clarity to the notion of dialogue within the DAPP and to the ‘dialogue objective’ in particular. With reference to the findings and recommendations of the 2006 review and evaluation from 2013⁸⁶ this chapter operationalises the findings and recommendations of the present study into tools for measurement and documentation of the ‘dialogue objective’ in accordance with the suggested new conceptualisations.

The tools are elaborated based on the three prototypes of dialogue which were identified in Chapter 2: 1) network and connection dialogue, 2) cooperation dialogue and 3) partner dialogue. The three types of dialogue function as proxy indicators which enable the MFA to grasp otherwise intangible results of dialogue. As argued in Chapter 2 the prototypes were identified through documents which mostly cover and focus on the partnership modality. From this follows that the partnership modality is the focus of the following tools. The authors have kept in mind during the elaboration of the tools that these should, if possible, also be able to cover all actors and modalities within the DAPP.

Whereas tools are presented for both qualitative and quantitative measurement and documentation, emphasis is on qualitative documentation, as this aspect has not been included in previous documentation of dialogue and hence constitutes an unexplored potential for measurement and documentation. Furthermore, the theory presented in Chapter 3 points to documentation by use of qualitative data in order to capture dialogue as human-to-human interaction. This will be elaborated further below.

⁸⁶ *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport.* 2009. and *Evaluation of Media Cooperation under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2005-12).* 2013.

5.1. Identification of the Three Types of Dialogue in Programmes and Projects

The three types identified in relation to the context in which they occur in Chapter 2 were the following:

- 1) Network and connection dialogue
- 2) Cooperation dialogue
- 3) Partner dialogue

The following presentation of tools for documentation and measurement take as its starting point these three types of dialogue.

The first question confronting DAPP actors in the documentation process is how to identify the different type(s) of dialogue reported. For this purpose the articulation by the MFA of dialogue is brought into play (see Section 2.3.), and on this basis a list of dialogue descriptors for each of the three types of dialogue has been elaborated. The full list of dialogue descriptors is presented in Annex 4. Below follows two examples from this list.

Dialogue descriptors	Dialogue type
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danish and Arab individuals meet and gain knowledge of and insight into the MENA/Denmark or a profession. • There are conferences, seminars and workshops with Danish and Arab participants. • Participants from the MENA/Denmark repeatedly participate in seminars, workshops and conferences. 	Network & connection dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Danish partner identifies and invites members of an Arab partner to cooperate. • There is an exchange of experience between Danish and Arab individuals and/or organisations through activities. • There are organised meetings between professional and civil society agents (individuals). 	Cooperation dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individuals from the involved partner organisations have equal influence and impact on decision-making processes. • The individuals from the involved partner organisations have equal influence on the guiding principles of the programme goals and the execution. • Both the Danish and the Arab partners contribute with funding. 	Partner dialogue

Figure 6: Descriptors of dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’.

Taking as their point of departure the left column of dialogue descriptors the strategic partners, institutions and representations can go through their daily work and dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’ and identify which type(s) of dialogue has unfolded in each of the MENA countries in which the partners have projects and programmes.⁸⁷ In the list each dialogue descriptor is presented and related to one of the three types of dialogue. Hence, starting from the left the partners can go through more than 20 different dialogue descriptors. When a descriptor reflects an activity in a given programme or project the partners may move to the second column, which then indicates the type of dialogue that should be reported.

All programmes, projects and activities in the given MENA country should be included if a dialogue has been identified as taking place in the country. Partners who have more than one programme or project in a given MENA country may identify a higher number of dialogue prototypes. All programmes and projects contain at least one of the three dialogue prototypes, as it is a precondition for projects and programmes under the DAPP that they include and deliver in accordance with the ‘dialogue objective’.

5.2. Qualitative Measurement and Documentation of the Identified Dialogue

The analytical reading of DAPP documents (Chapter 2) demonstrated that it is the idea of human-to-human relations that underlies the ‘dialogue objective’. However, the DAPP documents seldom give an impression of the people participating in the human-to-human dialogue established by the partnership modality. Individuals seldom stand out as full or complex characters, but are flattened and generalised into abstract categories such as ‘the Arab’, ‘our partners’ or ‘the Jordanian’. From this follows that it is essential to ask: How can the personal, individual experiences of those engaged in and creating partnership dialogue be transformed into language, visuals and writing? How can this materialise into a form which can be reported back in writing to the MFA?

As discussed in the literature review one way of collecting stories and learning from storytelling is by means of qualitative methods.⁸⁸ Qualitative methods provide images and understandings of humans and human relations. The use of storytelling as data for qualitative studies has a unique potential for bringing the strategic partners, institutions and representations under the DAPP closer to the lived lives of the often distant ‘others’.

⁸⁷ In this way, the reporting of dialogue follows the general reporting of status reports, rolling plans etc., which is done for each MENA country in which activities take place.

⁸⁸ See Annex 3 for an elaboration of storytelling. See also Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk. 2013.

The fundamental idea behind the qualitative approach is to capture the dialogue which is created and emerges as a consequence of (Danish and Arab) personal presence, empathy and experience in the programmes and projects. By describing the dialogue as they have experienced it individuals may generate insight into the Arab-Danish dialogue which has taken place – they are able to document the dialogue. It is through individual descriptions, observations or reflections that the dialogue and benefits are made visible.

This is where storytelling comes into play. The experiences, analyses, reflections and interpretations of dialogue in a given project situation should be documented through brief storytelling. A qualitatively compilation of dialogue experiences and their transformation into words and visuals has a unique potential to capture and materialise otherwise diffuse and intangible exchanges of opinion, conversations, meetings and common experiences.

The storytelling can either be based on words (texts) or visuals (photos).

5.2.1. Storytelling through Written Representation

The stories should be of a length of 10 lines and concentrate on a concrete situation involving human-to-human dialogue between Danes and Arabs. The stories could be a ‘snapshot’ of a concrete situation or refer to dialogue taking place over time.

5.2.2. Storytelling through Photo Essays

Photos are another way of capturing a situation of dialogue. Each photo should be followed by a single line describing the photo, why it was taken and how the photographer experienced the dialogue (or lack of dialogue) in the picture. In this way, a short photo essay can be created, providing new visual documentation of dialogue and work under the ‘dialogue objective’.

A photo essay may contain up to five photos and five written descriptions. Photo essays could be developed in relation to an active social media strategy with the use of Instagram, Facebook and/or the homepage of the DAPP.

As the various people affiliated to the DAPP are engaged in very different types of projects and programmes, the storytelling they produce and use for reporting will be very different, and it is important to stress that there is no prototype or ideal written story or photo essay. Rather it is important to leave room for different storytelling, as this reflects the broad notion of dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’ and the many aspects covered by the ‘dialogue objective’.

5.3. Quantitative Measurement and Documentation of Dialogue

In the document analysis (Chapter 2) it was concluded that the context in which dialogue unfolds is often crucial to the articulation of dialogue by the MFA. Based on this finding the study established the three types of dialogue reflecting the identified contexts. Following from this the study suggests that the context also constitutes the basis for the quantitative measurement and documentation of dialogue.

This implies the following for the three types of dialogue:

- 1) **Network and connection dialogue:** This type of dialogue was based on dialogue contexts where the individual represents him- or herself.⁸⁹
Quantitative reporting on this type of dialogue should consist of: a total number of individuals in accordance with the descriptors of this type of dialogue (see Annex 4).⁹⁰
- 2) **Cooperation dialogue:** Following from the document analysis this type of dialogue was based on contexts where the individual represents a cooperation.⁹¹
Quantitative reporting on this type of dialogue should consist of: a total number of Danish/Arab collaborations according to the descriptors⁹² of this type of dialogue.
- 3) **Partner dialogue:** This type of dialogue was based on contexts where dialogue unfolds between individuals representing well-established partners, institutions and representations.⁹³
Quantitative reporting on this type of dialogue should consist of: a total number of partners, institutions and representations in accordance with the descriptors of this type of dialogue (see Annex 4).⁹⁴

89 See Section 2.3.

90 See Section 5.1. above and Annex 4.

91 See Section 2.3.

92 See Section 5.1. above and Annex 4.

93 See Section 2.3.

94 See Section 5.1. above and Annex 4.

5.4. Example of Final Documentation Sheet

The present study has presented possible ways for the partners, institutions and representations to identify the Danish-Arab dialogue which unfolds within their programmes and projects (Annex 4). It has furthermore argued that qualitative methods provide images and understandings of human-to-human relations and that storytelling as qualitative data has a unique potential for capturing and materialising the dialogue. Therefore, the study has recommended qualitative measurement and documentation of dialogue through the use of storytelling. Dialogue can also be measured and documented quantitatively. This was made possible by the use of the three dialogue types identified through the document analysis.

These three main components which enable measurement and documentation of the ‘dialogue objective’ – the three dialogue prototypes, quantitative measurement and documentation, and qualitative measurement and documentation of dialogue – are compiled in the following documentation sheet. The sheet points to how the MFA may ask the strategic partners, institutions and representations to report dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’.

Country name:		
Type(s) of dialogue	Quantitative:	Qualitative:
Network & connection dialogue	The number of individuals living up to the descriptors.	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The meeting between Danish and Arab individuals in seminars, workshops or conferences. – The repeated dialogue between Danish and Arab individuals.
Cooperation dialogue	The number of established Danish/Arab cooperations living up to the descriptors.	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The character of the communication and meetings between the partners. – The exchange of experience, knowledge and insight between Danish/MENA partners and individuals involved. – How activities are developed, consolidated and executed with shared responsibilities.
Partner dialogue	The number of partners (organisations) living up to the descriptors	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How the established partnership is acted out in everyday life. – The concrete decision-making processes of the partnership. – How partners/individuals work together on formulating shared goals for programme objectives. – The bottom-up processes of the partnership. – How the partnership leads to observable changes in the behaviour of both Danish and MENA partners – e.g. on the level of individuals, groups, organisations or institutions.

Figure 7: Documentation sheet for the ‘dialogue objective’.

Closing Remarks

During the study much time has been devoted to the elaboration of the tools and not least to inclusion of, meetings with and consideration of reviews by practitioners within the DAPP, including MFA staff, strategic partners and individuals based in the MENA. Regardless of the scope of the present academic study it has been prioritised to include and take into consideration that the object of the study forms part of the lived everyday working life of a wide range of people. The study is both banal and very complex. Obviously, many aspects have not been covered by the study. It has been difficult to analyse the sources of the ambiguity and lack of clarity of the ‘dialogue objective’. This has now been illuminated, and based on the insights and findings of the study future debates and adjustments of the ‘dialogue objective’ can be undertaken. Aspects which have been outside the scope of this study, but which merit further studies include the following:

- 1) **Focused analysis of dialogue within the second and third modalities** (‘project and programme support’ and ‘secondment’). What is the concept of dialogue within these modalities, and how does it fit with the existing and different types of dialogue under the reform and ‘dialogue objectives’? Do the tools presented in this study apply to these two modalities, or do they need further elaboration? How do these modalities contribute to the suggested theory of change of the ‘dialogue objective’? Is there dialogue within the frame of these two modalities which has not been captured by the suggested theory of change?
- 2) **Impact of the ‘dialogue objective’**. What are the marks that dialogue (both within the reform objective and the ‘dialogue objective’) leaves over time and after the conclusion of concrete projects, cooperation and interventions? Does dialogue contribute to social changes in Denmark and the MENA region? Such a study requires an anthropological approach and the production of qualitative data based on interviews conducted in Denmark and the MENA region.
- 3) **A closer study of the dialogue which this study has placed under the reform objective (Figure 5)**. Some of the strategic partners who e.g. work systematically with interreligious and interideological dialogue have considerable difficulty explaining how their work contributes to reform. There is a need for clarification of the various types of means labelled dialogue under the reform objective and of how they contribute to, on the one hand, the needed reforms in the individual MENA countries and, on the other hand, to the thematic objectives of the DAPP. It would be fruitful to consider

and articulate the concepts, aims and assumptions of other types of dialogue than the ‘dialogue objective’.

It has been outside the scope of this study to assess the overall DAPP strategy, the SFD and the programmes which inform the various objectives of the DAPP. However, the analysis of the history of the DAPP revealed that the AHDR was still referred to as a frame for the DAPP more than 10 years after the publication of the report. In the light of the many recent events in the MENA region it might be timely to reconsider the role of the 2003 AHDR as a frame. The analysis also revealed that the EU policy towards the neighbours in the southern region of the Mediterranean in 2003 set the frame for the introduction of the ‘dialogue objective’ in the DAPP. A future review of the DAPP could reasonably create a self-confident narrative about the Danish experience of dialogue which now in reverse could inform EU foreign policy which at the moment is being reconsidered in the wake of the recent popular uprisings in the MENA region.⁹⁵ Finally, it might prove fruitful to consider the potential of a dialogic interaction with new and old drivers of transition and democratisation in the MENA region for future engagement with the region. New discussions about the societies and needed reforms take place at a daily base. The MENA region continuously throws up challenges that impact on what we thought to be valid. Policy action continues to be a complex matter, and individual countries in the region differ with regard to geo-strategic importance, regimes, socioeconomic institutions and resources and thus demand different addressing.

Hence, people-to-people dialogue and long-term connections are as relevant in 2015 as they were at the launch of the DAPP in 2003. The recent popular uprisings in the MENA region, however, present new obligations of support to the Arabs living in the region hoping and fighting for prosperity, human rights and democratisation. Many new challenges constantly emerge and call for answers. We thus need to stop putting emerging needs and agendas into the ‘box of dialogue’ and instead focus clearly on the agreed concept of the ‘dialogue objective’, its aim and assumptions.

⁹⁵ Cavatorta, Francesco and Rivetti, Paola. 2014. ‘EU-MENA Relations from the Barcelona Process to the Arab Uprisings: A New Research Agenda’. *Journal of European Integration* 36 (6).

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

104.DAN.8.b.81

December 2013

Terms of Reference

Study of Approaches to Danish-Arab Dialogue

Theory and Practice

1. Background

Since its inception in 2003, the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP) has been a key pillar of Danish foreign policy towards the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), currently with a programming scope of DKK 275 million annually.

The DAPP has the following double strategic objective:

1. To promote reform and democratisation processes in the MENA-region
2. To improve dialogue, understanding and cooperation between Denmark and MENA

DAPP is designed to address complex reform-dynamics in a swift and flexible manner. Due to its flexible and multidimensional approach, DAPP has been instrumental in supporting dynamics of political reform throughout the region, where numerous local DAPP-partners have been and continue to be central players in ongoing processes of reform that among other things empower women, strengthen human rights and enhance the freedom of the media.

A number of assumptions undergird the DAPP approach to dialogue: 1) there is a need to enhance intercultural dialogue in order to overcome reciprocal stereotypes and prejudice between Denmark and the MENA-region. 2) stereotypes and prejudice are best addressed through professional partnerships, where equal partners (from both the public and private sphere) cooperate on specific reform projects of mutual interest. 3) Ongoing democratic transitions risks being undermined by increasing sectarianism and ideological segmentation. Accordingly, in order to support democratic transition in the MENA-region in light of

the Arab uprisings, there is a need to contribute to inter-religious and –ideological dialogue.

The DAPP strategy document (SFD) is included in appendix 1.

There is a need, however, to look more closely at the dialogue approach and underlying assumptions in the DAPP programme as well as to look into how best to document and evaluate results and effect of the DAPP’s dialogue initiatives. In 2009, MENA set in motion a first study with the aim to go through the existing theoretical literature on dialogue as well as conduct a pilot study in the form of qualitative interviews with participants from seven partnership projects. The study produced a range of valuable insights.⁹⁶

As a follow-up to this study, there has surfaced a need to conduct further analysis, operationalization and development of specific tools and methods to regularly measure the effect of DAPP’s dialogue activities, at the programme level as well as for the implementing partners at activity level.

This was also underlined by a recent evaluation of media cooperation under DAPP in 2013, which found sustainability of the documented dialogue results to be limited and recommended clarification of dialogue objectives and approaches in order to facilitate measurement of results and rigorous identification of objectives per programmatic intervention.⁹⁷

2. Objective of the study

The overall objective of the present study is to apply more informed approaches to dialogue and document interventions improving intercultural dialogue, cross-cultural dialogue, and dialogical communication under the DAPP.

The specific objectives of the study are threefold:

- 1) **Review** of academic state-of-the-art theories on and methods of promoting dialogue
- 2) **Analysis of** dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions
- 3) **Tools** for improving and documenting dialogue interventions

⁹⁶ *Dialoguing Partnerships* (2010); *Building Intercultural Bridges: Lessons from the Danish-Arab Partnership Program*. Wegter, Marie-Louise Koch, DIIS Policy Brief, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (2010).

⁹⁷ *Evaluation of Media Cooperation under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2005-12) ...* (2013).

3. Scope of work

The scope of work of the study includes but is not necessarily limited to the following principal elements:

- A) **Literature review** of state-of-the-art theoretical and methodological literature on dialogue, with an emphasis on various aspects of dialogue according to the DAPP SFD.
- B) **Analysis of dialogue assumptions and approaches** of DAPP based on state-of-the-art theoretical and methodological literature
- C) **Development of methods and tools** based on A and B above to solidify future DAPP dialogue efforts and their documentation
- D) **Dissemination of findings** to DAPP partners in Denmark and the MENA-region to strengthen future dialogue programming and interventions.

4. Methodology

In 2009, a study was carried out by DIIS analysing dialogue assumptions of DAPP. More specifically, the study combined review of literature on dialogue theory with qualitative interviews with participants from seven DAPP projects.⁹⁸

The current study of approaches to Danish-Arab dialogue will build on the 2009 study whilst expanding the theoretical point of departure to include a more comprehensive review of various fields of theory on intercultural dialogue, cross-cultural dialogue and dialogical communication.

With an academic desk review of existing theory and evidence of dialogue as its point of departure, the study moves on to analyse DAPP assumptions of dialogue as expressed in various documents and reports over time as well as experiences of dialogue in DAPP projects of selected DAPP partners.

The analysis of the theoretical field and dialogue assumptions of DAPP partners will be compared in a synthesis which eventually will point to areas with potential for strengthened dialogue. Recommendations will include overall directions for DAPP dialogue as well as tools for dissemination to dialogue practitioners.

⁹⁸ *Dialoguing Partnerships ...* (2010); *Building Intercultural Bridges ...* (2010).

Thus four phases characterise how this project will unfold:

- 1) **State of the Art** - review of theoretical and methodological literature on dialogue, with a specific focus on various aspects of dialogue. Various researchers and specialists contribute with short papers for review by the team of researchers prior to inclusion in the report.
- 2) **Analysis** - of assumptions of and approaches to dialogue by DAPP partners as evidenced in key documents, review and evaluation reports and meetings key DAPP partners such as DEDI, Danmission, DUF and others and based on the above literature review.
- 3) **Synthesis** - a comparative study of theory DAPP in light of key findings of the academic theory and literature review.
- 4) **Recommendations** - including suggestions for tools to strengthen dialogue efforts and documentation within DAPP

5. Organisation

The study is anchored at University of Roskilde with a core research team of researchers at the *Department for Society and Globalisation (ISG)*. The core research team will direct and supervise the research process and is responsible for the final report. The core team will consist of Professor Michelle Pace and PhD fellow Rikke Hostrup Haugbølle.

A working group with specific experience in the various theoretical fields of and with experience of dialogue will be involved. The working group will consist of researchers from national and international academia, various international dialogue centres, and a number of DAPP partners with an expertise of literature on dialogue, intercultural dialogue, cross-cultural dialogue, and dialogical communication.

Potentially relevant international researchers, DAPP partners and research centres to involve include:

- ❖ Danish Egyptian Dialogue Centre, Cairo and their dialogue project partners
- ❖ Dansk Ungdoms Fællesråd
- ❖ Dignity
- ❖ Euro Mediterranean Human Rights Network
- ❖ Center for Intercultural dialogue, Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz

- ❖ Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Sensitive Reporting, University of Oregon
- ❖ Center for Intercultural Dialogue, University of Birmingham
- ❖ UNESCO: Enhancing Intercultural Dialogue, Venice office
- ❖ Eileen Babbit (Professor, International Conflict Management, Tufts University)
- ❖ Peter Woodrow and Diana Chigas (Collaborative for Development Action)
- ❖ Linda Tropp (Director, Psychology of Peace and Violence Prg, Uni. of Amherst)
- ❖ Rebecca Saxe (Professor, MIT Saxelab Social Cognitive Neuroscience Lab)
- ❖ Amr Abdalla (Vice Rector, UN University Costa Rica)

A study synopsis which will indicate further details of the study will be elaborated within the first month by the core research team and discussed with the MENA office.

The core research team directs the overall study process, including the writing of a study synopsis, selection and inclusion of researchers from academia and DAPP partners, final writing up of the state-of-the-art literature review, selection of DAPP partners in Denmark and MENA for interviews, development of tools and recommendations and the final report and dissemination seminars.

Informal meetings will be held between the core research team and the MENA office on an ad hoc basis and when relevant in order to discuss and adjust the progress of the study.

6. Outputs

Principal outputs of the study include:

(a) *Report of 40 pages plus annexes to be published on www.um.dk*

The report includes analysis of general and DAPP specific dialogue approaches based on state-of-the-art theoretical and methodological literature on dialogue and interview with DAPP partners. Presentation of set-up of dialogue tools for improvement of future DAPP dialogue interventions and documentation.

(b) *Dissemination seminars* for DAPP partner organisations to provide dissemination of study results in Copenhagen and in Cairo (at DEDI)

7. Dissemination of results

The analysis will be made available to the general public on www.um.dk.

DAPP partners constitute a key target group for the study results. Partners will be consulted during the course of the study process and results will be disseminated to partners in the form of two dissemination seminars.

8. Input and timing

The study is expected to commence in February 2014 and be completed by November 2014.

9. Budget

A detailed budget is included in appendix 2

10. Process action plan

Annex 2: The Research Team

The study has been conducted by the following core team of researchers.

Michelle Pace

Professor MSO at the Department of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University

Michelle Pace's areas of expertise are international relations and EU studies with a special focus on the EU's foreign policy particularly towards the MENA region. She is mainly working on perceptions of democratisation in the MENA region as well as in the EU. Michelle has contributed significantly to the academic debate on dialogue, identity building and constructions, particularly in connection with the EU's relations with Mediterranean partners. She has, among other things, carried out studies for and collaborated with EU institutions, various European governments, German foundations such as the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung and the DAAD (the German Academic Exchange Service), the Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network (EMHRN) in Copenhagen and Brussels and the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) in Stockholm.

Rikke Hostrup Haugbølle

Project manager, PhD

Rikke Hostrup Haugbølle holds a PhD in Middle East studies from the University of Copenhagen. Since 2010 Rikke has provided the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark with analyses of the transition process in Tunisia and broader country analyses. She has assisted various Danish and international NGOs and research institutes with analyses and reports. From 2004 to 2009 she was junior lecturer at the Centre for Middle East Studies, University of Southern Denmark. Rikke's international publications treat various aspects of reform and democratisation in Tunisia and in the academic debates.

Jørgen Skrubbeltrang

Anthropologist, PhD

Jørgen Skrubbeltrang is an independent researcher with many years of experience in ethnographic fieldwork. He is trained specifically in participant observation and qualitative interviews and has extensive knowledge and excellent skills in the field of qualitative data analysis. Jørgen's research has covered rural Malawi, where he has conducted extensive fieldwork in order to understand the human reception of Danish NGO development programmes, Ethiopia, where he has spent six months studying the everyday life of journalists under an

authoritative regime, and the Middle East, where he has conducted ethnographic fieldwork among Danish correspondents based in the area at the beginning of the 2010-2011 uprisings.

Jonas Agerbæk Jeppesen

PhD fellow at the Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde University

Jonas Agerbæk Jeppesen is a PhD fellow in communication and social change at Roskilde University, and he holds an MA in communication and philosophy. His research interests range from theorising dialogue and democracy to investigating the organisation and working practices of implementing development NGOs – in particular those that have a Framework Agreement with Danida. Jonas has conducted extended fieldwork on communication of social change initiatives in East Africa, both in academic contexts and as an NGO research consultant in 2011-2012. He is a member of the research groups *Ørecomm* – Centre for Communication and Global Change at Malmø University and Roskilde University and Dialogic Communication at Roskilde University.

Rikke Kristine Nielsen

PhD, lecturer at Copenhagen Business School

Rikke Kristine Nielsen holds a PhD in organisation and management studies from Copenhagen Business School. Her research focuses on global mindset and leadership in multinational corporations as well as the methodological challenges of research-practitioner co-creation of actionable knowledge. Since 2007 Rikke has been employed as a research assistant and subsequently part-time lecturer at the Department of Organisation, Copenhagen Business School, within the field of human resource management. Prior to embarking on a research career Rikke had 10 years of experience as a leadership development and blended learning consultant working with research communication on leadership topics in the small e-entrepreneur LeadingCapacity A/S.

Language revision was provided by PhD Marie Lauritzen at Vision Editing, www.visionediting.dk.

Annex 3: Literature Review: State-of-the-Art Review of Dialogue Literature

This annex provides a more profound state-of-the-art review of theoretical literature on dialogue than the one included in Chapter 3. This review has the double aim of introducing the dispersed field of dialogue studies and selecting and discussing specific dialogue theories relevant to the ‘dialogue objective’, thereby contributing to strengthening the conceptualisation of the ‘dialogue objective’.

The academic field of dialogue studies can be described as a cluster of related thinking spread across diverse academic disciplines. Within each discipline, and depending on the context in which it is used, the term dialogue is taken to mean many different things. This is the main reason why a proper clarification of dialogue is required whenever the term is used. Such clarification can be achieved by pointing to specific theoretical understandings of the term as well as by discussing the aims and motivations for doing so.

The findings of the annex are summarised below:

- Dialogue is a meeting between people or groups of people. Dialogic relations can be cultivated between different people, even if they belong to different social, political, cultural or professional groups. Dialogue is thus a relational concept that emphasises the role of both the speaker and the listener. As such, dialogue is defined as a personal and mutually attentive meeting between human beings.

Dialogue often becomes a site for performing and learning about different social, political, cultural or professional practices. This **supports the overall DAPP framework** of partnerships built on common professional spheres of work and interest.

By attempting to co-construct or use shared languages or ways of speaking, dialogue can become part of the process of and means for maintaining and changing these practices.

- Working with ‘difference’ in dialogue supports breaking down prejudices and stereotypes. Genuine dialogue often leads to the realisation that people and groups of people are positioned differently in relation to each other and in the world, and that these different positions lead to different preferences, reasons and priorities in decision-making. From this perspective, dialogic interaction is about creating new understandings and broadening our perceptions of the world and people around us.


Dialogic interaction is about creating new understandings and broadening our perceptions of the world and people around us. This type of dialogue **supports the ‘dialogue objective’** of the DAPP.

- Dialogue theory argues that taking our mutual differences into account will enable us to make better, more democratic and inclusive decisions. In a partnership (whether this is personal, organisational or political) dialogue becomes an instrument for learning about and therefore also acting upon mutual differences in a constructive fashion. This does not mean that dialogue should be undertaken to enforce mutual consensus or compromise. Rather, dialogue is here used to point to and thus recognise differences of interest, especially when making decisions affecting both parties. The concepts and definitions of dialogue provided by the dialogue literature are concerned with the cultivation of open relations. This constitutes the aim of dialogue. The political philosophical argument introduced below refers to mutual understanding of multiple points of view as a precondition for cooperation and democratic decision-making.
- Dialogue understood as communicative democracy and dialogic democracy implies understanding differences in political, social and cultural perspectives as resources rather than as divisions that must be overcome. Dialogic democracy prioritises giving space to and learning from the perspectives and views of others without enforcing consensus or glossing over mutual differences. Communicative democracy theory stresses the need for focusing on alternative forms of communication, including storytelling, to facilitate understanding across different perspectives. Both models ultimately aim at expanding the knowledge of deliberant in order to improve the process of democratic decision-making.

Normative and Descriptive Approaches to Dialogue Theory

Annex 3 focuses on what can be termed normative and descriptive approaches to dialogue theory. These two general orientations are crucial for defining how we *understand* dialogue as a theoretical concept, and what we think we can *do* with dialogue practice. To exemplify these two approaches the chapter provides a more detailed presentation of two key thinkers on dialogue, namely the Russian literate Mikhail Bakhtin and the German philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer.

Bakhtin: Dialogue as an Approach to Understanding People and their Practices



We refer to Bakhtin's thinking as a descriptive theoretical approach to dialogue. According to Carbaugh's reading of Bakhtin, dialogue can be studied by focusing on particular forms of communication in communities, but also by studying human discourse dialogically. This entails shifting our focus

from dialogue itself as a unique form of human activity to a **dialogic view of human practice**, i.e. an approach to any human activity.

Bakhtin's theories focus primarily on the concept of dialogue and on the notion that language – i.e. any form of speech or writing – is always a dialogue. Acknowledged as the philosopher of dialogue, he developed a view of dialogue as a human condition, an ethical imperative, and even as a prerequisite for thinking. Thus, his notion of dialogue focuses on the idea of the social nature of dialogue and the idea of struggle inherent in it. According to Bakhtin, dialogue consists of three elements:

- The speaker
- The listener/respondent
- A relation between the two

Language and the outcome of language are thus always the product of interaction between at least two people or groups of people.

Bakhtin argues that there are two principal forces in operation whenever language is being used: a centripetal force and a centrifugal force. Building this metaphor on physics Bakhtin argues that whereas the centripetal force tends to push things towards a central point, i.e. in

an inward direction, the centrifugal force will push things away from the central point and out in all directions, i.e. in an outward direction.




Figure 8: Bakhtin's chosen site for intercultural dialogue.

Bakhtin argues that monologic language (monologia) operates according to centripetal forces: The speaker of monologic language attempts to push all the elements of language and its various rhetorical modes (journalistic, religious, political, economic, academic, personal) towards a central point, converging in a single form or utterance. The centripetal force of language (monologia) tries to get rid of the differences between languages (or rhetorical modes) in order to present one unified language. Monologia is a system of norms, of one standard or 'official' language that everyone would have to speak (and which would then be enforced by various mechanisms; we can apply this argument to the 'universal' notions of rule of law, good governance, democracy, human rights etc.).

Opposed to monologic language and the centripetal forces stand dialogue and the centrifugal forces. One form of dialogue is heteroglossia, which attempts to encompass a multiplicity of languages by including a wide variety of ways of speaking.

Dialogue is a centrifugal force and includes a wide variety of ways of speaking.

According to Bakhtin, 'Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear'.⁹⁹ Language in this sense is always both anonymous and social: something that is formed beyond the individual, but also something concrete, filled with a specific content that is shaped by and even shapes the speaking sub-

⁹⁹ Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 271.

ject. Thus, for Bakhtin, the idea *lives* not in one person's *isolated* individual consciousness; if it remains there it will degenerate and die. The idea begins to live, i.e. take shape, develop, find and renew its verbal expression and give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine a dialogic relationship with other ideas, with the ideas of others. Human thought becomes genuine thought, i.e. an idea, only under the conditions of living contact with another unknown thought, a thought embodied in someone else's voice, i.e. in someone else's consciousness expressed in discourse.

A heteroglossic view of dialogue points to the conceptualisation of politics and the social focus on the importance of language for politics. Language is a creative force, not an empty vehicle for consensus building. Moreover, such a conception of dialogue emphasises the intersubjective and perpetual cognition and meaning formation inherent in this process. It also stresses that everybody, every member of the polity, not only the decision-makers and those who have their ear, has a voice.

Gadamer: Dialogue as an Approach to Understanding the Other¹⁰⁰



Gadamer's theory relates to what is referred to above as a normative approach to dialogue. For Gadamer, the spirit of dialogue is to strengthen the other's argument. He puts emphasis on **understanding** as the goal of dialogue. Understanding is a mode of being, and it depends on the resources a person brings to a dialogue with another person.

Gadamer's work could in fact be seen not as a theory of dialogue, but a theory of understanding.

For Gadamer, dialogue and understanding are closely linked.

Gadamer dedicated his scholarship to understanding the role of prejudice in our interpretation of events and what we can learn from our prejudices. The Gadamerian approach can enlighten us about intangible attitudes and beliefs that exist a priori to decision-making pro-

100 See also Pace, Michelle. 2014. 'The EU's Interpretation of the "Arab Uprisings": Understanding the Different Visions about Democratic Change in EU-MENA Relations'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 52 (5), 969-84.

cesses. Thus, dialogue may not necessarily be a pleasant exchange, but an event in which we are willing to put our own prejudices to the test or at risk.

Gadamer introduced the notion of a fusion of horizons. To the dialogue in which understanding takes place each individual brings a horizon or a range of visions that includes everything seen from a particular vantage point. The participants' individual horizons merge in dialogue. This does not imply a surrender of individuality or subjection to an alien outlook. Our horizons are constantly being formed by an ongoing process testing our prejudices.

A fusion of horizons is a form of transformative learning process that involves mutual integration of each other's worldviews. This relates to the notions of understanding across differences and enlarged thought. In a process of transformative learning the aim is to understand the commonalities as well as the differences of the other, not in our own predefined and definitive terms, but from a mutually co-constructed position that is characterised by being intersubjective and incomplete. Through such dialogue, Gadamer writes, we rise '*to a higher universality that overcomes not only our particularity but also that of the other*'.¹⁰¹

Gadamer argues that language is not an instrument that is subject to our will. In dialogue language '*places a subject matter before those communicating like a disputed object set between them*'.¹⁰² This means that dialogue also '*presupposes a common language, or better, creates a common language*'.¹⁰³ Dialogue offers e.g. a speaker of English an opportunity to ask what the words really mean. The more 'impoverished' the language of the addressee appears to be, the deeper and more fruitful the (self-)questioning can be. According to Gadamer, entering into dialogue means giving listening – to oneself as well as the other – priority over speaking. This point has been further elaborated by Jürgen Habermas in *Discourse Ethics*.¹⁰⁴

Theories Relating Dialogue and Democracy

This section provides a discussion of how dialogue, on a theoretical level, relates to democratic reform and democratic communication. This account draws on both descriptive insight and normative ideals related to a theoretical concept of dialogue. The discussion builds on

101 Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*, ed. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London and New York: Continuum, p. 305.

102 Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. p. 446.

103 Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. p. 378.

104 Habermas, Jürgen. 1990. 'Discourse Ethics'. In *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, pp. 43-115.

recent thinking by political philosopher Iris Marion Young and her concept of communicative democracy as well as on Paul Healy and his elaboration of this concept in the notion of dialogic democracy.¹⁰⁵

Communicative Democracy and Dialogic Democracy¹⁰⁶



Young bases her communicative democracy model on a concern with what she calls mainstream deliberative democracy. Mainstream deliberative democracy builds on an interpretation of Habermas' discursive ethics stating that legitimate democratic decisions can be made only under procedural conditions for reasoned argumentation.¹⁰⁷ Young argues that, despite good intentions, by privileging reasoned argumentation in democratic communication mainstream deliberative democracy excludes possibilities for pluralism and for taking difference into account.

On these grounds, Young asserts that mainstream deliberative democracy from the outset deprives the people who are supposed to participate in democratic discussion of their distinct voices, just as deliberants in the decision-making process do not benefit from the unique possibility of listening to those distinct voices. As a result, privileging reasoned argumentation and ignoring other ways of communicating social perspectives in an inclusive fashion risks further marginalising vulnerable social groups.

Dialogue understood as communicative democracy implies understanding differences in cultural and social perspective as resources rather than as divisions that must be overcome.

To remedy this bias in mainstream deliberative democracy Young suggests that we through communicative democracy '*understand differences in culture, social perspective, as resources to draw on for reaching understanding in democratic discussion rather than as divisions that must be overcome*'.¹⁰⁸ Young's constructive proposal points to **difference as a resource** for making better demo-

105 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. 'Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy'. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, pp. 120-35.

106 See also Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk. 2013. *Folktales for Social Change: A Study of Democracy, Oral Culture, and Communication for Social Change in Rural Malawi*. Roskilde: CBIT & CUID, Roskilde University, ch. 3.

107 See e.g. Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. 'Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy'. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 67-94; and Elster, Jon. 1998. *Deliberative Democracy*, ed. Jon Elster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

108 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. p. 120.

cratic decisions. Individual differences must be taken into account if we are to legitimatise democratic discussion, Young argues.

Dialogic democracy implies an inclusive and participatory approach to communication and making room for other-regarding reflection in political communication..

Paul Healy has recently redeveloped Young's notion of communicative democracy and introduced the notion of dialogic democracy.¹⁰⁹ Through this concept Healy approaches difference as a necessary resource that enables the different parties engaged in democratic practices to broad their knowledge of each other's perspectives. This enables them in turn to reach consensus on matters of collective concern. Accessing this resource, however, requires adopting an inclusive and participatory approach to communication; by making room for other-regarding reflection in political communication the aim of dialogic democracy is to improve ongoing decision-making in any political body. This is the epistemic argument for including and appreciating a multiplicity of voices in order to obtain relevant social knowledge for making just democratic decisions.

The aim of dialogic democracy is to improve ongoing decision-making in any political body.

A Need for Storytelling in Democratic Dialogue¹¹⁰

Young argues that inclusive and other-regarding interaction require acceptance of forms of communication that are often alternatives to reasoned argumentation, and she points specifically to greeting, rhetoric and storytelling as examples of such alternatives.¹¹¹ The affirmative gesture of greetings is vital for maintaining conversations, just as the use of rhetoric implicates important issues of engaging an audience in listening and emotionally relating to the situated proposition and perspective of the speaker. Pointing to these alternatives as important elements in communicative interaction Young asserts that it is neither possible nor preferable to privilege argumentation and dismisses affirmative audience appeal as an empty ritual or 'mere rhetoric'.¹¹² What is important following Young's communicative democracy

109 Healy, Paul. 2011. 'Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue'. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 37 (3), 295-311.

110 Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk. 2013.

111 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. p. 128f.

112 Young, Iris Marion. 1996. p. 130.

theory is focusing on alternative forms of communication, including storytelling, in order to facilitate understanding across different social perspectives and ultimately improve the process of democratic decision-making.

Young's communicative democracy theory stresses the need for focusing on alternative forms of communication, including storytelling, in order to facilitate understanding across different social perspectives and ultimately improve the process of democratic decision-making.

Young sees storytelling and narrative as effective communicative mechanisms for social learning and 'enlarged thought'. The concept of enlarged thought in Young's sense is based on Hannah Arendt's reading of Kant's notion of enlarged mentality, and it relates to the capacity of improving political judgement by *understanding* the perspectives of others without necessarily *adopting* them. Enlarged thought is triggered by communication that allows for understanding across differences (such as culture, identity, age, gender, wealth, political affiliation etc.), an approach that stands in contrast to simply '*reversing perspectives or identifying with each other*'.¹¹³

To enable enlarged thought and understanding across differences, democratic deliberation demands storytelling, among other forms of communication. Storytelling is here broadly understood as narratives (speech, text, photography etc.) that convey the feelings and perspectives of people or groups of people. Storytelling creates an opportunity for listening to 'the other' and learning about different views on the world. And this opportunity helps put one's own parochial preferences and perspectives *into perspective*. As such, storytelling becomes a learning method that enhances other-regarding reflection and helps create more constructive sociopolitical relationships.

Summary of Presented Dialogue Theories

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Bakhtin | Dialogue as the interplay of languages; centrifugal forces in dialogue create different ways of speaking and knowing. |
| Gadamer | Dialogue as a fusion of horizons; establishes links between dialogue, understanding and transformative learning. |

113 Young, Iris Marion. 1997. 'Asymmetrical Reciprocity: On Moral Respect, Wonder, and Enlarged Thought'. *Constellations* 3 (3), p. 341.

- Young The concept of communicative democracy understands social, political and cultural differences as resources for democratic decision-making and not as divisions that must be overcome; to acquire this resource decision-makers must rely not only on reasoned argumentation, they must also recognise alternative forms of communication, including storytelling.
- Healy The concept of dialogic democracy adopts Young's inclusive and participatory approach, but emphasises the possibility of other-regarding reflection and transformative learning in processes of deliberation; the aim of dialogic democracy is to improve ongoing decision-making in any political body.

Conclusion

Based on the above literature review and the one provided in Chapter 3 the study concludes that the use of the concept of dialogue presents a number of challenges.

First, according to dialogue theory dialogue often becomes a site for performing and learning about different social, political, cultural or professional practices. In this way, dialogue can become part of the process of and means for maintaining and changing these practices. Dialogue has the potential to lead to creativity, understanding and better and more inclusive and hence resilient and just decision-making and decisions. Generally, dialogue theory provides support for the aims of the 'dialogue objective', while at the same time pointing to important criteria for success regarding the accomplishment of dialogic activities without which the positive effects of dialogue as understood in dialogue theory cannot be realised.

Second, not just any type of conversation between Arabs and Danes can foster the sought-after outcomes of dialogue seen from a theoretical perspective. This is not to deny that dialogic activity, regardless of its content and (theoretical) quality, may have positive effects with regard to relationship building as has been uncovered in the previous DIIS study. Certainly, a precondition for realising the benefits of dialogue seen from a theoretical perspective is the establishment of contact and the existence of a certain degree of trust to continue an ongoing conversation in a relationship. However, dependent on the quality of the dialogic activity, encounters may also lead to confirmation of prejudices or affirmation of the fixed positions of the parties, which works against achieving a dialogue dividend. The reason for this is that dialogue between two people is not necessarily dialogic; it can be monologic.

Third, engagement in dialogue with a view to realising the potential benefits of dialogue vis-à-vis the creation of mutual understanding and social capital places high demands on both the skills and motivation of the dialogue parties to avoid monologia and arrive at a true fusion of horizons. In this respect it is important to note that the ‘dialogue objective’ foresees dialogue as undertaken between colleagues, peers and other professionals. It eases the interaction if the interaction parties are like-minded peers due to the consequent similarity in status, educational background and/or job title/interests, increasing the chances of establishing dialogic dialogue. As the MFA becomes interested in engaging in dialogue on new issues and with new groups in the MENA region, it is highly likely that the local MENA dialogue parties will have different backgrounds with regard to ideology, religion and education, which will raise the bar for achieving high-quality dialogue. This further emphasises the importance of being trained and experienced in dialogue to reach a positive outcome.

Fourth, it is important to note in this regard that dialogic interaction is open-ended in nature, characterised by reciprocity and equality between the participating parties. A predefined script from one of the parties may then undermine the positive benefits of dialogue, which are precisely the result of the creation of a new creative space for shared sense-making. So, defining a theory of change for dialogic activities with regard to the concrete nature of the subject matter and the content of the dialogue is likely to be counterproductive.

Finally, it is also important not to draw fast conclusions of a direct cause-and-effect relationship between dialogue conducted within the framework of the DAPP and long-term changes in the relationship between Danish or Arab societies. Such changes can be the aim and ambition of a higher level and beyond the direct influence of the DAPP partners, institutions and representations.

As was pointed out in the chapter on dialogue theory, the theoretical concept of **social capital** may be adequate in relation to the identified main aim of the ‘dialogue objective’: relationship building, as social capital is the expected collective benefit derived from preferential treatment, willingness to do things for each other and cooperation between individuals and groups. To a larger degree than the theoretical notion of dialogue, and with the implications mentioned above, the notion of social capital seems in keeping with the aim of network and relation building.

Annex 4: Dialogue Identification Sheet and Dialogue Documentation Sheet

Figure 9: Descriptors of dialogue within the ‘dialogue objective’. This sheet can be used by the strategic partners to identify different types of dialogue in their projects and programmes.

Dialogue descriptors	Dialogue type
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danish and Arab individuals meet and gain knowledge and insight of the MENA/Denmark or profession. • There are conferences, seminars and workshops with Danish and Arab participants. • Participants from the MENA/Denmark repeatedly participate in seminars, workshops and conferences. • Danish and Arab individuals establish social and professional relations. 	Network & connection dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Danish partner identifies and invited members of an Arab partner for cooperation. • There is an exchange of experience between Danish and Arab individuals and/or organisations through activities. • There are organised meetings between professional and civil society agents (individuals). • Both Danish and Arab partners are involved in organising and planning of activities. • There is a common Danish/Arab realisation of the activities. • There are extended communication and meeting activities between Danish and Arab participants before, during and after the execution of activities. • The participants experience an increased knowledge and insight in of the partners and organisations involved. • The Danish and Arab partner has a shared responsibility for the activities. • The Danish and Arab partners develop, launch and consolidate new activities together. 	Cooperation dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals and/or organisations have established a long term, close relationship between Danish and Arab partners. • A broader and deeper knowledge of the partners’ social, cultural and religious context arises. • The relationship between Danish and Arab participants changes from working with common activities and projects to a common and shared work with program objectives • The Danish and Arab partners cooperate closely in formulating parts of the program objectives • The Danish and Arab partners find common answers and solutions to development goals within the partnership. • The administrative work is divided between the Danish and Arab partners. • There is a equal influence and impact on decision-making process between the individuals from the involved partner organisations • There is equal influence on the guiding principals for the programs goal and execution between the individuals from the involved partner organisations • Both the Danish and the Arab partner contribute to the funding. 	Partner dialogue

Figure 10: Documentation sheet for the ‘dialogue objective’. This sheet is a suggestion of how the MFA may ask strategic partners, institutions and other agents within the DAPP to report dialogue under the ‘dialogue objective’.

Country name:		
Type(s) of dialogue	Quantitative:	Qualitative:
Network & connection dialogue	The number of individuals living up to the descriptors.	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The meeting between Danish and Arab individuals in seminars, workshops or conferences. – The repeated dialogue between Danish and Arab individuals.
Cooperation dialogue	The number of established Danish/Arab cooperations living up to the descriptors.	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The character of the communication and meetings between the partners. – The exchange of experience, knowledge and insight between Danish/MENA partners and individuals involved. – How activities are developed, consolidated and executed with shared responsibilities.
Partner dialogue	The number of partners (organisations) living up to the descriptors	One story (written or photo essay) reflecting e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How the established partnership is acted out in everyday life. – The concrete decision-making processes of the partnership. – How partners/individuals work together on formulating shared goals for programme objectives. – The bottom-up processes of the partnership. – How the partnership leads to observable changes in the behaviour of both Danish and MENA partners – e.g. on the level of individuals, groups, organisations or institutions.

Annex 5: Guide to Reflective Storytelling – The Good Story

The stories must describe Danish-Arab dialogue, i.e. dialogue between Danes and Arabs.

Dialogue is an act that takes place between individual human beings or groups of people, and describing dialogue implies tuning into and focusing on exactly human-to-human interaction.

It is important that the individuals involved in the dialogue do not hide behind a facade of seeming distance or objectivity. It is through the lenses of the individuals who have been present and active that natural everyday dialogue is captured.

The professional setting in which the partners work constitute the framework for the human actions.

The written stories must be 10-15 lines long.

The photo essays may consist of three-five photos with descriptive captions explaining the scene/activity.

The following questions serve as guidelines for producing the ‘good story’:

- Which individuals, corporations or partners have engaged in the dialogue (they are the ones who should be included in the story)?
- These can either be described in detail as ‘round’ persons or as ‘flat’ persons, mentioning only a few characteristics.
- Are they in a congruence position to each other – or is the opposite true? How does this influence the dialogue?
- Where does the dialogue take place (geographically, through which media, what kind of personal meeting)?
- How long does the dialogue last (e.g. for one meeting, a series of meetings, daily, continuously)?
- Do you aim to portray the dialogue in a neutral or normative tone?
- What was the character of the dialogue: Did it flow easily, was it awkward, did the parties disagree etc.? It may be useful here to use monologue, speech lines, quotes, indirect quotes etc.
- Which aspect of the Danish/Arab dialogue do you want to present in the story?
- What message about dialogue within the DAPP do you want to communicate through the story?

Annex 6: Bibliography, Documents and Reports

Bibliography

Andersen, Lars Erslev, Hansen, Gunna Funder and Sinclair, Kirstine. 2006. *Betingelser for dialog: Civilisationskonflikt og anerkendelse. Tematisk studie*. University of Southern Denmark and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, Vern McGee and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. 'Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy'. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 67-94.

Carbaugh, Donal. 2013. 'On Dialogue Studies'. *Journal of Dialogue Studies* 1 (1), pp. 18-19.

Cavatorta, Francesco and Rivetti, Paola. 2014. 'EU-MENA Relations from the Barcelona Process to the Arab Uprisings: A New Research Agenda'. *Journal of European Integration* 36 (6).

Elster, Jon. 1998. *Deliberative Democracy*, ed. Jon Elster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Euromed Report. 2003. Presidency Conclusions. Mid-Term Euro-Mediterranean Conference. No. 59, 28 May, Crete, Greece.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*, ed. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London and New York: Continuum.

Goddard, Hugh. 2011. *Den sande tro: Kristne og muslimer mellem konfrontation og sameksistens*. Vandkunsten.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1990. 'Discourse Ethics'. In *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, pp. 43-115.

Healy, Paul. 2011. 'Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue'. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 37(3), 295-311.

Huntington, Samuel. 1993. 'The Clash of Civilizations?'. *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3), 22.

Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Jeppesen, Jonas Agerbæk. 2013. *Folktales for Social Change: A Study of Democracy, Oral Culture, and Communication for Social Change in Rural Malawi*. Roskilde: CBIT & CUID, Roskilde University, ch. 3.

Levine, Marc. 2002. 'The Arab Human Development Report. A Critique'. Available at: <http://www.merip.org/mero/mero072602>. (Downloaded May 2014).

Nielsen, Jørgen. 2014. 'Social relations, transformation and trust'. Unpublished keynote lecture at a conference with the same name. Centre for Social Relations, Coventry University. 29 March.

Pace, Michelle. 2014. 'The EU's Interpretation of the "Arab Uprisings": Understanding the Different Visions about Democratic Change in EU - MENA Relations'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 52 (5), 969-84.

Sharp, Jeremy. 2005. 'The Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative: An Overview'. CRS Report for Congress: Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division. Available at: <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RS22053.pdf>. (Downloaded May 2014).

Young, Iris Marion. 1996. 'Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy'. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 120-35.

Young, Iris Marion. 1997. 'Assymetrical Reciprocity: On Moral Respect, Wonder, and Enlarged Thought'. *Constellations* 3 (3).

DAPP Documents and Reports

- 2003 *Draft Concept Paper. Operational guidance for Planning and Implementation of The Danish Wider Middle East Initiative (Bilateral activities)*. For preliminary consultation with Danish civil society. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.
- 2003 *En verden i forandring. Regeringens bud på nye prioriteter i Danmarks udenrigspolitik*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Available at: www.statensnet.dk/pligtarkiv/fremvis.pl?vaerkid=24193&repid=0&filid=18&iarkiv=1. (Downloaded May 2014).
- 2004 *Contribution to Danida's Annual Report 2004: The multi-lateral track of DAI*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Internal document.
- 2005 *Partnership for Progress and Reform – Denmark, the Middle East and North Africa*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Available at: http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/4838/pdf/Det_Arabiske_Initiativ_ENG.pdf
- 2006 *Analyse af Det Arabiske Initiativ og anbefalinger til næste fase. Synteserapport*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Available at: http://um.dk/da/~/_media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Politik-og-diplomati/International-politik/DAI/Relevante%20dokumenter%20for%20DAI-partnere/Analyse%20af%20det%20Arabiske%20Initiativ.pdf

- 2008 *Danish-Arab Partnership Programme*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. December.
- 2009 *Review af Det Arabiske Initiativ. Dansk syntese rapport*. Skaedkaer Consult for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the MENA Department. Available at: <http://um.dk/da/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Politik-og-diplomati/International-politik/DAI/DAI%20REVIEW%20juni%202009.pdf>
- 2010 Det Arabiske Initiativ. Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI). Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, February.
- 2010 *Dialoguing Partnerships. An Analysis of the Dialogue Assumptions of the Danish Partnership for Dialogue and Reform*. Wegter, Marie-Louise Koch and Pultz, Karina. DIIS report 09. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).
- 2010 *Building Intercultural Bridges: Lessons from the Danish-Arab Partnership Program*. Wegter, Marie-Louise Koch. DIIS policy brief. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).
- 2011 *Dansk-arabiske partnerskaber i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, Resultater af Partnerskab for Dialog og Reform 2009-2010*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Available at: <http://www.ft.dk/samling/20101/almDEL/upn/bilag/161/996659.pdf>
- 2011 *Målsætning og retningslinjer for gennemførelse af bilaterale aktiviteter under Det Arabiske Initiativ (DAI)*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, December.
- 2012 *Objective and guidelines for the implementation of activities under the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP)*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, December.
- 2012 *Det Arabiske Initiativ. Strategisk udmelding - prioriteter i 2013*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Available at: <http://um.dk/da/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Politik-og-diplomati/International-politik/DAI/12%2012%2004%20Strategisk%20udmelding%20om%20prioriteter%20i%202013%20FINAL.pdf>
- 2013 *Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2013-2016. Strategic Framework Document*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida. Available at: http://um.dk/da/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Det-vil-vi/Strategier/Danish%20Arab_web.pdf
- 2013 *Evaluation of Media Cooperation under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2005-12)*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida. Available at: <http://danida-publikationer.dk/publikationer/publikationsdetaljer.aspx?PID=6fc5261d-cd14-47fe-84cc-9b4f129367dd>
- 2014 *Review of the Danish Arab Partnership Programm (DAPP). Final Report*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Technical Advisory Services. Unpublished.
- 2014 *Programme Document – Danish Arab Partnership Programme 2015/2016*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Technical Advisory Services. Unpublished.
- 2014 *Note on the ‘dialogue objective’ of DAPP*. For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, MENA Department. Unpublished.

Annex 7: Interview List

List of persons consulted:

Organisation:	Name:	Position:
MFA	Pernille Mortensen	DAPP, Team Leader
MFA	Rasmus Høgh	DAPP, Head of Section
MENA, MFA	Jens Otto Horslund	MENA, Head of Department
MFA	Anne-Cathrine Legendre	Technical Advisory Services, Senior Advisor
Danish Industries	Niels Tanderup Kristensen	Deputy Director
Danish Institute for Human Rights	Jakob Kirkemann Boesen	Department Director
Danish Institute for Human Rights	Mu'ayyad Mehyar	Programme Manager, the Arab-European Human Rights Dialogue
Danish Institute for Human Rights	Ashraf Mikhail	Project Manager
DEDI	Hans Christian Korsholm Nielsen	Executive Director
DEDI	Jacob Erle	Executive Director
DEDI	Helle Schøler Kjær	Formerly responsible for Danish media contact
	Agnete Holm	Dialogue Consultant
Danmission	Birgitte Søgaard Lauts	Director, MENA region
Danmission	Jens Juul Petersen	Advisor, the Middle East
Danmission	Thomas Skielboe	Advisor, Poverty Reduction
Danmission	Nik Bredholt	Programme Manager, Poverty Reduction
Women's Council in Denmark	Randi Theil Nielsen	Director
Danner	Anna-Maria L. Mosekilde	Project Manager
Dignity	Andrew M. Jefferson	Senior Researcher
Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network	Marc Schade-Poulsen	Executive Director
International Media Support	Jesper Højberg	Executive Director

International Media Support	Thora Gehl	Head of Department, MENA
International Media Support	Michael Irving Jensen	Head of Department
International Media Support	Rasmus Steen	Programme Manager, Twinning
KVINFO	Katarina Blomqvist	Director of International Programmes, Head of MENA Department
KVINFO	Cecilie Poulsen-Hansen Mehyar	Senior Programme Advisor
KVINFO	Gitte Young	Communication and Programme Advisor
LO-FTF	Henrik Als	Head of Department, MENA and Asia
LO-FTF	Rina Lauritzen Trautner	Project Consultant
ActionAid Denmark	Mettine Due	Coordinator, MENA
ActionAid Denmark	Sarah Gjerding	Programme and Network Coordinator, MENA
ActionAid Denmark	Poya Pakzad	Political Communication Advisor
	Jørgen Nielsen	Professor, former head of Centre for European Islamic Thought, University of Copenhagen, and former director of the Danish Institute in Damascus
Adyan Foundation	Fadi Daou	Chairperson and CEO
Danish Centre for Conflict Resolution	Jesper Bastholm Munk	Educator and Mediator
JMW Consulting	Jakob Wichmann	Consultant
Notre Dame University, Beirut	Ziad Fahed	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Humanities
Stockholm Policy Group	Nicklas Svensson	Senior Consultant and Partner
TANA Copenhagen	Mogens Blom	Senior Consultant, former DAPP team leader
University of Copenhagen	Vibeke Vindeløv	Professor, Faculty of Law

Annex 8: Applied Methodology and Process of the Study

The applied methodology and analytical framework were designed to reflect the nature and aim of the study. From this follows that specific methodological approaches were applied for each of the three main purposes:

- 1) **Analysis of dialogue assumptions and approaches of DAPP interventions:** This part of the study analysed key DAPP documents, study reviews and evaluation reports. The analysis was limited to texts published in the period since the launch of the DAPP in 2003 to the launch of the first SFD in 2013, shortly before the beginning of the study. The analysis is presented in Chapter 2. As a supplement to the document analysis interviews were carried out with MFA staff, the 11 Danish strategic partners and researchers and consultants. A qualitative method with open-ended questions was applied in the interviews in order to give the partners as much room as possible to unfold their specific experiences.
- 2) **Review of academic state-of-the-art theories on and methods for promoting dialogue:** This part of the study was carried out as an academic desk review of existing theory, evidence of dialogue and methodological literature. The chapter was triangulated with the document analysis, and it further informed the elaboration of tools for measurement and documentation. This part of the study involved meetings with dialogue researchers and specialists.
- 3) The findings of the document analysis and the literature review constituted the basis for the elaboration of **conclusions and recommendations.**
- 4) In a second phase of the study **tools for measurement and documentation** were elaborated, tested and adjusted in a thorough process which included close consultation with the MFA, meetings with a number of selected strategic partners and feedback from the TAOs in Tunisia and Jordan, embassies in the MENA region and the DEDI. The feedback was important, as it pointed to practical, everyday aspects of documenting, on the one hand, and the actual need for data and documentation, on the other. It was e.g. discovered that measurement and documentation of dialogue could generate a great amount of data, which would be very difficult for the

MFA to handle, and which would require an unproportional amount of work for partners and others collaborating with more than one MENA country.

Most interviews in the first phase of the study were tape-recorded and written out in order to make it easy to return to certain parts of the interviews during the analysis process, and to ensure full access to all data for all the team members in recognition of the different paces at which the various parts of the study unfolded.

The study began in February 2014 and was concluded in February 2015. Initial meetings were held with the MFA in order to clarify the Terms of Reference and coordinate expectations to recommendations and tools. An inception report was submitted to the MFA in April 2014. Various researchers and specialists contributed to the state-of-the-art review of literature on dialogue with short papers incorporated in the final report by the research team. The reading of DAPP documents as well as the analysis of DAPP assumptions of dialogue unfolded in several phases and took new directions as new DAPP documents were provided on a continuous basis. This resulted in new and important insights and, at the same time, challenged the previous assumptions and drafts of recommendations and tools. All consulted strategic partners showed a great interest in sharing their views on dialogue within the DAPP – the ‘dialogue objective’ as well as other types of dialogue. Therefore, interviews and discussions with DAPP partners unfolded in a straightforward and informative way. A dissemination seminar was held with key stakeholders halfway through the study. The seminar served as a testing ground for the initial findings of the study and a place for theory-meets-practice. By the end of the initial study a need occurred for further testing the suggested tools in practice. Therefore, in the second phase the tools and the first draft of the report were presented to selected strategic partners and stakeholders. This led to adjustment and elaboration of various guides, as described above.

Annex 9: The Three DAPP Modalities

The programme document covering the period 2015-2016 presents three modalities for implementation of the DAPP.

- 1) **Strategic partnerships** between Danish and Arab professionals, technical organisations and institutions in Denmark and the MENA region aimed to strengthen Danish-Arab dialogue and cooperation to promote a reform agenda. Strategic partners may be NGOs, CSOs, media institutions, special interest organisations, educational institutions and independent institutions. Three of the strategic partnerships will comprise so-called ‘mini-pools’ providing support for other civil society organisations in minor projects. Hence, the partnership modality is meant to encourage dialogue and networking, while at the same time enhancing partnerships between professionals collaborating on activities related to reform processes. The strategic partnerships accounted for 39 % of the total planned commitments for 2013-2014.¹¹⁴
- 2) **Project and programme support**, which is applied in the two specific areas ‘direct democratisation assistance’ and ‘support of economic growth and job creation’ in countries in transition. Direct democratisation assistance aims at promoting democratic transition processes, e.g. support of election preparations through the United Nations in Tunisia and election monitoring in Egypt. The modality is often implemented as part of a joint donor engagement. Stand-alone bilateral activities may also receive support and include TAOs (Jordan, Tunisia and Yemen) and government-to-government agreements (Jordan, Morocco and Yemen). Support of economic growth and job creation in countries in transition aims at promoting economic reforms and the development of a more favourable business environment, on the one hand, and job creation, on the other. The DAPP increasingly combines bilateral support with cooperation with other international development partners through multilateral organisations such as the ILO, the African Development Bank and the World Bank Group.
- 3) **Secondment** of experts to international organisations in the MENA region and to EU representations in the MENA region and Brussels. In addition to general support for the EU’s reform efforts in the MENA region, Danish secondments contrib-

¹¹⁴ *Review of the Danish Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP). Final Report.* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Technical Advisory Services (2014). Unpublished.

ute to transferring Danish experience and lessons learned in the area. Through active multilateral engagement Denmark aims at supporting this policy and at enhancing synergies and coordination between Denmark and the EU, both in the political and technical fields.

