

**A normative power or a normative hegemon?
The EU and its European Neighbourhood Policy**

A paper prepared for EUSA 10th Biennial Conference in Montreal, Canada,
17–19 May 2007

Panel Session 9I: Normative Power Europe II: Global Perspectives

Work-in-progress – not to be cited without permission, thank you!

Mr. Hiski Haukkala

Researcher

The Finnish Institute of International Affairs

Mannerheimintie 15 A

FI-00260 Helsinki

FINLAND

Tel. +358 9 4342 0716

Fax +358 9 4342 0769

E-mail: hiski.haukkala@upi-fia.fi

Introduction*

In the case of European Union and its international actorness, norms and normative interpretations galore. Not only is the Union often seen as a “civilian” or “normative” power – in essence a force for good in the world – but also the work of the scholars studying the phenomenon itself is often riven with different normative assumptions and agendas. Normativity is of course something we can hardly escape or do without: as social beings normative assumptions are the equivalent of our biological DNA – it is the very fabric of our existence (for a discussion, see Frost, 2001). But unlike in the case of genes, which will affect our phenotype whether we like it or not, our normative assumptions we can reflect upon, scrutinise and debate.¹ As such, our normative ideas can be amended or rejected and the role given to them in building social scientific explanations can vary in terms of intensity and the degree of consciousness attached to utilising the concepts.

This is not the place to settle the role of norms and normativity in the study of International Relations (IR). Suffice it to say, that although always present in our accounts, the role given to them can vary significantly. As such, we do not have to depart from normative assumptions about the EU’s inherent goodness but we can, and indeed should, seek to address these issues as empirical questions to be examined in their own right. Having said this, treating the EU as an *a priori* qualitatively new, and better, international entity has a long pedigree. François Duchêne’s “civilian power Europe” was perhaps the first occasion when the special role of the then European Community in the world was sketched out (Duchêne, 1973). More recently, the most prominent expression of this normativity has been the work of Ian Manners – the topic of two especially dedicated panels in this Conference.

Manners’ ideas have proven to be highly influential but also equally controversial (for an earlier attempt at fully dissecting his ideas, see the special number of *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2006). I myself have found his work inspirational although it has spurred my own thinking into directions which Manners himself might not approve. The reason for this stems from the fact that for Manners, the normative power Europe (NPE) was never an analytical device but a normative one. It was not meant to portray the EU and its international role as it is (or was) but as it should be: “It was, and is, a statement of what is believed to be good about the EU; a statement which needed to be made in order to stimulate and reflect on what the EU *should* be (doing) in world politics.” (Manners, 2006b, p. 168, emphasis in the original).

If this indeed is the case (although it did not come across very clearly in the original statement which made the analytical case for “conceiving” the EU as a normative power,

* Previous drafts or ideas relating to this paper have been discussed in the Research Seminar, Department of Political Science, University of Turku, November 2005; the ERI Seminar at the University of Birmingham, March 2006; and the 4th CEEISA Convention in Tartu, June 2006. I want to thank all the participants on these previous occasions for challenging and consequently improving my ideas. The usual disclaimer applies.

¹ To be sure, genes we can – and often do – debate as well but always informed by a certain set of normative ideas and criteria.

see Manners, 2002, esp. p. 252), then it does not make sense to dissect his argument in terms of its realism – i.e. how well it captures its object. In fact, this is not even attempted on this occasion as it already has been done on others (see, for example, Diez, 2005; Sjursen, 2006 as well as the other contributions in the same Special Issue). Instead, and as was already mentioned, the paper takes the NPE argument as its starting point but seeks to develop it into three different directions. First, instead of making a claim concerning how the EU should be or act, the paper seeks to make a statement – or build a hypothetical model – about how it indeed is currently acting. Second, whereas Manners was largely interested in how the normative power Europe affected the wider global normative space, this paper adopts a more regional focus examining how the EU operates its normative power *in* Europe and how that power is in fact uniquely circumscribed by that very same regional context. Finally, and this is where the differences with Manners become perhaps most accentuated, whereas Manners emphasised the normative, this paper puts the onus on power.

Having said this, it is imperative to note at the outset that the paper does not seek to put forth a structural realist variant of the Union's normative reach (for such a treatment, see Hyde-Price, 2006). Instead, the paper seeks to develop a multi-causal model where both ideational and material forms of power come together in explaining the peculiarities of the EU's normative power in Europe. By doing so, the paper challenges the Mannersian notion of normative power by arguing that his scheme is based on too passive an understanding of the EU as a norm entrepreneur in international relations. Instead of relying on passive diffusion alone, the EU is taking more active measures in promoting its norms and values. This is so especially in Europe, where the Union's enlargement can be seen as the main instrument of its normative power. In fact, the EU can be envisaged as a regional normative hegemon that is using its economic and normative clout to build a set of highly asymmetrical bilateral relationships that help to facilitate an active transference of its norms and values. However, the Union's ability to project its normative power rests not (only) on coercion, but is crucially dependent on the perceived legitimacy of the Union's actions in the eyes of its partners. It is argued that the open-ended nature of the Union's membership is a key factor in promoting this legitimacy in Europe.

The paper is divided into three parts: First, the role of enlargement as the primary vehicle for the Union's normative power in Europe is discussed. Next, the prospects of ENP in alleviating some of the likely problems and shortcomings are briefly analysed. The emphasis is put on the Union's Eastern neighbourhood as it is the main forum on which the Union's claims for normative hegemony *in* Europe will be put to a test in the future. As such, Ukraine is selected as a case to be discussed, as it can – due to its size and location alone – be seen as the litmus test for the viability of the Union's new approach. The paper ends with some conclusions.

Enlargement and the EU's Normative Power in Europe

The successive rounds of enlargements are a factor shaping the European Union. The previous enlargements² have all resulted not only in an increase in quantity – member states, population, the size of economy, etc. – but they have also ushered in qualitative changes in the Union's agenda, institutions and decision-making, as well as shaping the ways in which the external world has perceived the European integration and its different manifestations, be they institutions or policies (Ginsberg, 1998; Ginsberg, 1989, pp. 151–152). There is dialectic at work, where the “shadow of enlargement” (Friis, 1999) compels the EU and its member states to adapt their own dynamic to meet the changing circumstances (Haukkala and Ojanen, 2002, p. 204; see also Vobruba, 2005). This adaptation – together with the geographic exposure to new neighbours – starts the dialectic anew by creating an opening and a demand for further enlargements.

This intricate interplay between the internal and external facets of European integration has meant that the Union's enlargement has been seen as one of its most effective foreign policy tools (Vachudova, 2005³). From the vantage of point of European foreign policy, enlargement can be seen as having basically two main functions. First, it acts as an instrument through which the Union can seek to enhance stability in its immediate neighbourhood. In its policies, the EU acts in a manner similar to any regional power that has a stake in preserving stability on its doorstep (Missiroli, 2004). The EU has often used enlargement as an instrument in locking its neighbours into stable and democratic transition. This was the case with Greece, Portugal and Spain, and the same logic applied in the recent Eastern enlargement as well. Especially in the post-Cold War era the Union has come to acknowledge the indivisibility of security in Europe: the EU cannot feel secure and continue to prosper if the rest of the continent is in a downward spiral towards increased insecurity and poverty. The European Security Strategy is based on this line of argument (European Council, 2003). It is also the starting point for the EU's new European Neighbourhood Policy, ENP (European Commission, 2003, p. 3).

Second, the enlargement process acts as a conduit through which the EU as a normative power Europe (as defined in Manners, 2002) can project its norms and values in a way that is both efficient and legitimate. It is only through the unique and rich combination of stick and carrots that are present in the accession process that the EU can exert the strongest normative influence on its partners. The key here is to appreciate the fact that the EU enlargement is not only about drawing geographical boundaries; it is also about establishing, or imposing, an EU order in Europe through the transference and diffusion of EU norms, values, rules, and regulations (Aalto, 2006; Christiansen *et al.*, 2000; Diez and Whitman, 2002; Friis and Murphy, 1999; Lavenex, 2004; Smith, 1996). It is true, as Christiansen *et al.* (2000) have argued, that this can result in certain “fuzziness” in the

² “The Original Six” (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) have been joined by Denmark, Ireland, and the United Kingdom (1973); Greece (1981); Portugal and Spain (1986); Austria, Finland, and Sweden (1995); Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia (2004); and Bulgaria and Romania (2007).

³ Also the Union acknowledges this. For example, the communication on neighbourhood policy states, that the enlargement has “unarguably” been the Union's most successful foreign policy instrument (European Commission, 2003, p. 5). For the current enlargement commissioner's view, see Rehn, 2006.

composition of the EU, as important parts of the Union, such as the Community legislation, the Single Market, or the Schengen *acquis* are through the pre-accession instruments and the European Economic Area (EEA) mechanism extended beyond its borders. This ties in well with Ole Wæver's "imperial analogy," according to which the "EU Empire" can establish its rule in a radial manner through differing zones of order (Wæver, 1997, p. 64). The imperial analogy is useful in highlighting the fact that the EU perhaps need not have to accept new members perpetually in order to be able to impose its normative order on others. Or, to use Michael Smith's terminology, the EU can modify its transactional boundary in order to accommodate its new neighbours whilst seeking to preserve the integrity of its institutional/legal boundary at the same time (Smith, 1996, pp. 13–17; see also Friis and Murphy, 1999). As such, the EU is seeking to use the creation of new "grey zones" in Europe in order to control the problems that stem from neighbouring areas without having to grant them full membership and European identity (Palosaari, 2001).

But the issue is not as straightforward as the debate above would seem to suggest. The previous experience has already shown that the EU has not in fact been very successful in projecting its normative power in cases where full membership has not been on the cards. This is due to the internal constraints inherent in the Union's own actorness and especially the key role played by enlargement as the main instrument of the Union's normative power in Europe: The EU's expectations of normative convergence and harmonisation in Europe are seen as legitimate and warranted mainly only when the golden carrot of accession is on the cards. Once it is not, the situation is radically altered, and the EU's possibility to act as an anchor for reforms has proven to be severely limited (Bretherton and Vogler, 2006, p. 137). This has been equally true in the East, as exemplified by the cases of Russia (Haukkala, 2007) and Ukraine (Wolczuk, 2004), as well as in the Union's Southern periphery in the Mediterranean (Holden, 2005; Tovias and Ugur, 2004).

The EU as an active norm entrepreneur

In his seminal article, Ian Manners suggested that the EU's normative power is diffused through contagion and transference (Manners, 2002, pp. 244–45; see also Manners, 2006a; 2006b). To be fair, for Manners the notion of normative power *has* to remain free of any forms of coercion; it is a conceptual move necessitated by his own normative agenda (for a discussion, see Manners, 2006b). But when taken on its own terms, Manners's scheme betrays too static and passive an understanding of the EU's role as an actual norm entrepreneur in international relations. Instead of relying on passive diffusion alone, the EU has in fact actively sought to project and promote its norms and values internationally. This is true especially in Europe where enlargement and more specifically the highly institutionalised and structured accession process has been the main instrument of the Union's normative power. Vachudova (2005, p. 63) has made a useful distinction between passive and active leverage that the EU enjoys over its credible future members: passive by the overall attraction of EU membership, and active from the deliberate conditionality exercised by the Union during the pre-accession process. It is, however, important to take note that it is the active component that is the key to understanding the

Union's leverage, as previous studies have shown that it is only through clear (material) incentives and the concrete prospect of a full membership and European identity that the EU can effect substantial economic and societal change in its European partners. Other forms of leverage, such as social influence and transnational mobilization have proven largely ineffective (Vachudova, 2005; Schimmelfennig *et al.*, 2003).

When viewed from the viewpoint of prospective members, a credible offer of membership is crucial in three respects: First, it lends the Union's demands of accepting its normative agenda legitimacy in the eyes of the candidates. It is only by offering a full stake in European institutions and identity that the Union can expect others to subscribe in full to its norms and values. Second, it offers politicians in the candidate countries the political cover under which they can make the at times difficult and even painful domestic reforms while claiming that the steps are necessary, as indeed they often are, in order to be able to enjoy the fruits of European integration in full. And finally, the accession process gives not only political but also economic and technical support and aid to the transformation of the candidates. This support is on an entirely different scale compared to the other external assistance schemes of the Union.

From the vantage point of EU's normative power, the accession process is also beneficial. The Union in effect uses its economic and normative clout to create a set of highly asymmetrical bilateral relationships between itself and the candidates where the projection of norms and values is entirely one-sided: The candidates are supposed to internalise not only the approximately 80,000 pages of *acquis communautaire* but also the value-basis of the Union, as exemplified in the Copenhagen criteria of 1993 which sets out the other prerequisites for European belonging and full accession.

In fact, this approach to enlargement reveals that Manners's assumptions about the crucially different character of EU's actorness have to be clarified with some further remarks. The crux of the issue is indeed to be found from what Manners has described as the Union's "ability to shape conceptions of 'normal' in international relations" (Manners, 2002, p. 239). In Europe, this ability is augmented by the fact that the EU has not only power to set the parameters over the legitimate aspects of international (and also domestic) life in general, but that it also has the recourse of being able to claim almost a sole monopoly on what can be called "Europeanness." The Union seems to enjoy the authority of pronouncing what it means, and perhaps more importantly what it takes, to be "European." But this is a mixed blessing for the Union. On one hand it has given the Union almost unprecedented (normative) power over societies in Europe. But on the other hand, this monopoly has manifested itself in the continued pull of membership that the Union attracts over its neighbours that is now beginning to make the Union itself ill at ease. Therefore, at least in the case of the European Union there is more to the enlargement of regional integration than negative externalities and rational calculus (cf. Mattli, 1999): The current state of affairs implies that the enlargement of the EU deals not only with the material side of European integration but also with more profound questions of belonging and identity. As a consequence, in Europe the Union has great difficulties in unbundling its normative power from the notion of Europeanness and consequently questions of (full) membership. This is why it is facing such a hard time

when hoping to relinquish enlargement without inflicting serious damage to its (self)image as “The European Project.” In this respect, the President of the Commission Romano Prodi’s remark about the EU’s willingness to share “everything but institutions” (Prodi, 2002, see more below) with its neighbours is both disingenious and misses the point: As an identity project the Union has a hard time sharing what is perhaps its most essential characteristic, Europeanness, with its neighbours without also sharing its insitutions and membership in full.

In a sense, the EU can be seen as a regional normative hegemon (see also Diez, 2005, p. 616; Hyde-Price, 2006, pp. 226–227). Interestingly, this claim ties in with the work of a well-known offensive realist John Mearsheimer, who has argued that one reading of the last three centuries of international politics is to envisage it as a continuous struggle between Great Powers for regional – as opposed to global, which is in essence impossible – hegemony (Mearsheimer, 2001, pp. 40–42). To a degree, the EU can be seen as playing the same game, although it is doing so in a different way and perhaps for different reasons as well (for an eloquent semi-official exposition, see Cooper, 2003). In this respect, the label of regional normative hegemon would seem to be an apt one: Normative, as its foreign policy agenda is laden with norms and values, and a hegemon, as it seeks and seems to enjoy a monopoly on defining what those norms are and entail and thus create the boundaries of normality and Europeanness.

It is not, however, entirely clear why the EU has decided to marry its normative agenda and “foreign policy” so tightly. For Manners, the answer stems from the Union’s own character: from what it is rather than what it does (Manners, 2002). Indeed, part of the reason undoubtedly stems from the Union’s own historical experience and identity as “a European civilising process” (Linklater 2005) that is seen as entailing that the Union itself must act as a qualitatively different entity in international relations as well (Diez and Whitman, 2002; Smith, 2001⁴). But other reasons can be found as well. The Union is a complex legal animal (although not yet an entity), and one that seems to have problems in interacting with other international actors that do not work on the basis of the same norms, standards and procedures. Granting third countries access to the highly legalised and institutionalised Single Market is no simple matter but it requires a large degree of normative approximation, even harmonisation, on the part of those seeking that access (Cremona, 1998). The EU’s emphasis is not, however, unique, as it can be seen as part and parcel of the global processes of creating multilateral rules of the game as exemplified by the WTO processes as well as the wider post-Cold War debates about “good governance” and second wave of conditionality (Haukkala, 2007).

In a sense, the Union’s normative power in Europe is reminiscent of the Lukesian third dimension of power:

To put the matter sharply, *A* may exercise power over *B* by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants. Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of

⁴ Also the *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe* makes references to this (Title V, Chapter I, Article III-292).

power to get another or others to have the desires you want them to have – that is, to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires? (Lukes, 1974/2005, p. 27)

In essence, the accession process can be seen as perhaps the most complete operationalisation of the Lukesian third dimension of power or the attempt at normative hegemony, to use the parlance of this paper. Having said this, the fact that the accession process is based on this logic does not entail that the actual accession process and especially the negotiation phase would be free of power and coercion. In fact, the reverse is the case with the EU and its member states often bargaining very hard and forcing the applicants to conform to a process that entails deep-ranging societal reforms, partial erosion – or at least pooling – of sovereignty, and accepting accession treaties that do not necessarily meet their short-term economic interests. Crucially, however, it is the expectation of future benefits associated with the full membership and the possibility to have a voice in the EU and its institutions that makes this process legitimate, or at least bearable, for the applicants (Ellison, 2006; see also Zielonka, 2006, Ch. Two).

But the Union's claim at hegemony is only regional in its scope as it is most specifically confined to Europe where the prospect of EU membership acts as both the source of attraction and legitimacy to the Union's normative power. This is not to say that the Union does not try to apply the same principles outside of Europe as well. In fact, the Union's approach is not confined to Europe alone, as in general the Union prefers bilateral relationships with third parties that enable it to enjoy the asymmetric leverage often afforded by its economic and normative power (Bretherton and Vogler, 2006, pp. 78–79). Aggarwal and Fogarty (2004, p. 231) have suggested that this is in fact a fairly shrewd strategy on the part of the Union: the Union is “playing to its strengths” and applying its commercial power and attraction to promote its normative power in the international system.

But these remarks fail to distinguish between the Union's normative power globally and regionally in Europe. Although the EU is seeking to build highly asymmetrical relationships with its partners in Europe, it is crucial to understand that they are not based on coercion and domination alone. The gist of the issue has been captured fairly well by Mark Leonard. According to him, Europe's “transformative power” is “broad and deep: once sucked into its sphere, countries are changed forever... Europe doesn't change countries by threatening to invade them: its biggest threat is to cut off contact with them.” (Leonard, 2005, p. 110). Leonard's remarks show how the Union's normative power resides in a delicate nexus of attraction, coercion and legitimacy. As such, it is reminiscent of Antonio Gramsci's hegemonic discourse where an actor seeks to define its own “interests as general interests and in using this concept to formulate general ideas on the order and development of society” (Brand, 2005, p. 171). In this perspective, a successful hegemony actually results in a situation where the relationship is largely void of the naked exercise of power with the ideas, values and institutions of the hegemon being seen as both natural and legitimate instead (Gill and Law, 1988, p. 78). But herein lays the catch for the Union: The EU might have, as Manners has argued, the power to set the parameters of normality and it might have some means of projecting its vision also

internationally but the limits of the Union's influence are conditioned by the need for this exercise to be seen as legitimate. The experience so far has shown that the only way the Union can legitimately project its normative power in Europe is by offering a full stake in European institutions and identity, i.e. membership in the European Union itself.

To be sure, to argue that the Union's normative power is dependent on the perceived legitimacy of its actions and policies in the eyes of its partners is hardly a groundbreaking finding. The same of course applies to any international actor where the attraction of their "soft power," or "the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments" (Nye, 2004, p. x, see also p. 5) is conditioned by the perceived external legitimacy of the policies the given actor itself undertakes. But it is worth emphasising that at least in Europe the EU has an additional structural constraint compared to, for example, the United States: The Union is not a state actor that can apply its "soft power" at will, but it is a regional integration process to which the 'objects' of that power can, and often do, aspire to join before accepting its norms and values as entirely legitimate.

This tendency has been fuelled by the Union's own rhetoric. Since its inception it has been committed to keeping its membership open to "any European state" that respects the founding values and principles of the Union.⁵ As a consequence, a large part of the EU's legitimacy in the eyes of third parties stems from the fact that at least until recently European integration has been a geographically open-ended "European project" and enlarging the Union has been the best way of countering the oft-voiced concerns of a "Fortress Europe" and thus ensuring the legitimacy as well as stability in the EU's own immediate environment.

The difficulties in ceasing to enlarge

Now, in the aftermath of the latest rounds of enlargement in May 2004 and January 2007, the Union's willingness and ability to enlarge further seems to be increasingly in doubt. Some commentators have even rushed to speak about "the death of enlargement" (Rachman, 2006).⁶ Often the Union's reluctance to embrace ever new candidates is framed in terms of the Union's "absorption capacity" (for critical treatments concerning the idea, see Rehn, 2006; Emerson, 2006). When it comes to the limits of its enlargement, the stakes are high indeed for the Union. In the words of one British analyst: "Inclusion means bridging the old Cold War divide and uniting a continent, but could end up shredding the carefully woven fabric of the Union itself. Exclusion means isolating countries that can ill afford isolation, and making a mockery of the very term 'European union'." (Smith, 2005, p. 757) The EU officials seem to concur. In the words of former President of the European Commission Romano Prodi: "[w]e cannot go on enlarging forever. We cannot water down the European political project and turn the European Union into just a free trade area on a continental scale" (Prodi, 2002).

⁵ Treaty on European Union, Article 49. Also in the Constitutional Treaty the same commitment can be found (Title I, Article I-1.2).

⁶ For a dissenting view, see Whitman (2007). For a fascinating study which suggests that the EU in fact badly needs further and even radical enlargements in order to keep up with the global power transitions, see Yeşilada, Efird and Noordijk, 2006.

The Cold War and its bipolar overlay served the Western Europeans well, for they could take the concept of “Europe” as their own without having to think about where the final outer boundaries of European integration really lay (Wallace, 1992, p. 34). Rhetorically, the European Community portrayed a pan-European vocation; for example, the Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome accorded “any European state” the right to apply for membership (Schimmelfennig 2003, p. 266). This served of course also a useful propaganda purpose by highlighting the key differences between the Western and Soviet integration processes in Europe: One was based on voluntary functional integration and pooling of sovereignty while the other grew from the barrels of the Soviet guns. However, with the end of the Cold War the situation changed and the EU was flooded with membership applications from a host of Northern, Central and Eastern European countries. This incurred that riding on the European card and identity became a much more costly exercise. It also meant that the EU had to either start drawing the limits of “Europe” or be “shamed” by the rhetorical action of the aspirants into enlarging (about rhetorical action and shaming, see Schimmelfennig, 2001 and 2003). Now, nearly twenty years since the fall of the wall, the EU has still not been able to decide where its boundaries will eventually lie. Instead, the recent wrangling over Turkey’s accession negotiations and the growing uneasiness with which the Union has greeted Ukraine’s aspirations, seem to verify the point made by William Wallace already in the early 1990s that the EU does not really have any clear criteria for determining which countries can get in and when enlargement should ultimately stop (Wallace, 1992, p. 40).

As such, the recent “Big Bang” enlargement is only the latest, although a major, step in the drawing of the EU’s outer boundaries in a piecemeal fashion. To date the process has not reflected any serious pre-meditated strategy on the part of the Union. Instead, it has been part and parcel of the dialectical process mentioned at the beginning of this paper where it seems that at times the Union has been haplessly caught in the middle of its own pan-European rhetoric, internal economic and political success and dynamism, and the external pressures and calls for belonging. This has led Wallace more recently to suggest that the Union should seek to detach the issue of its membership from more existential questions of “cultural – let alone ethnic – limits of Europe.” Instead, the EU should approach the issue in a more practical manner, answering the “policy question” of “where should the EU end?” (Wallace, 2003, p. 13). Also Karen Smith has argued that the current ambiguity concerning the EU’s limits is counterproductive and not boosting its leverage. Instead, the reverse is the case, as the Union is repeatedly forced into a “reactive and defensive” mode and eventually further enlargements (Smith, 2005, p. 769). In order to escape from this entrapment, also Smith urges the Union soon to decide where its final outer boundaries will eventually lie (*Ibid.*, p. 773).

But things might not be as straightforward as Wallace and Smith both argue. What makes the case of the EU interesting, is that as a *sui generis* entity of regional integration it has to take into consideration not only the issue of how best to project its power in order to ensure stability and security in its immediate neighbourhood, but also how to project its normative power in Europe and elsewhere. Obviously, the point of contact where these pressures are felt most urgently is at the outer boundaries of the EU. Previously the

countries emerging at the outskirts of the enlarging Union (the “new neighbours”) have often also been potential future members. The logic of an empire is partly at work here (Zielonka, 2006). But the EU is a reluctant empire, ever aware of the dangers posed by the entry of newcomers into the club. Moreover, the EU has not become an empire by the traditional means of conquest, but, and to paraphrase Geir Lundestad, rather by means of invitation (Lundestad, 1998). Nevertheless, the EU can be seen as having some empire-like qualities, as each successive enlargement creates new borderlines beyond which the EU normative order has to be imposed if the Union is to be secure and able to do business with its new neighbours.⁷

The factors limiting the expansion of previous empires in world history apply to the “EU Empire” as well (for recent treatments about the role of empires in international relations, see, for example, Ferguson, 2003 and 2005; and Lieven, 2003). But due to its *sui generis* nature, the Union has some unique concerns as well. Perhaps the most pressing one is the internal imperative and the question of the future viability of the EU’s own institutions and structures. Already the recent two rounds of twelve new members have spurred alarmist tones warning of a possible meltdown of EU’s structures in the post-enlargement situation. The words of Romano Prodi quoted above are a case in point. Therefore, it seems clear that the EU wants the enlargement soon to stop. But it is at a loss on how to go about it. The current Treaty on European Union and the so-called Copenhagen criteria do not offer any clear guidance in the matter. The same goes for the Constitutional Treaty, which might still be abandoned entirely. Consequently, it seems that it is the Luxembourg 1997 decision on an added criteria, that of the readiness of the Union itself to accept new members, that is coming to the forefront.⁸ In the end of the day it seems that instead of “imperial overstretch” it is the danger of an “institutional overstretch” that will set the limits of EU enlargement (for more about imperial overstretch, see Kennedy, 1989, esp. p. 666).

From the vantage point of the Union’s normative power the problem is that this is not a very moral argument. It rings of double standards and reinforces the image of the EU as a “Fortress Europe” shielding its precious *acquis* behind the Schengen border. As a consequence, by relinquishing enlargement, the EU is in danger of not only losing its capacity for effectively stabilizing its nearest neighbours, but it is also in danger of losing its legitimacy and justification in the eyes of them (see also Hansen, 2006, p. 130; and Nicolaïdis and Howse, 2002, p. 782). The EU is thus in a genuine bind: By playing with the idea of relinquishing enlargement, the previously open “European project” is increasingly perceived from the part of especially EU’s Eastern neighbours as a form of exclusion. For them it is about extending a normative and highly institutionalized wall, which will isolate them from the rest of Europe (Sherr, 2002, p. 167; Neumann, 1998). Therefore it is clear that the EU needs a third way; something to ease it out of the bind of

⁷ The EU’s zeal for the use of empire-like (normative) power is nothing new, of course. For example, also the Roman and the British empires were keen to and adept in exporting their norms, values and modes of governance (see Ferguson, 2003 and Holland, 2003, respectively). The crucial difference, however, is, that the Union is seeking to project its normative power well *beyond* the reach of its pilums and maxim guns.

⁸ This has been highlighted in the Commission’s most recent enlargement strategy (European Commission, 2006a, see especially the Annex 1).

having to choose between the “ins” and “outs.” Since 2003 the Union has been developing a European Neighbourhood Policy that can for all means and purposes be seen as an attempt at devising new avenues through which the Union could preserve the legitimacy of its normative power and the consequent ability to project stability in its neighbourhood while also protecting its institutions, and budget, from an unacceptable overload. Next we will examine what are the ENP’s prospects for success in this respect.

The European Neighbourhood Policy as a Substitute for Enlargement

As was already mentioned, the application of the EU’s normative hegemony in Europe is by no means confined to its future members alone. During the post-Cold War period the Union has built an extensive web of bilateral relationships in Eastern Europe that are based on the same set of norms and values as the accession process. For example, the EU has negotiated eleven Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCAs) with the so-called new independent states of the former Soviet Union. Here as well the Union has sought the asymmetric bilateral approach but with a crucial difference, as accession has not been on the cards (but to be precise, not all of the post-Soviet states have aspired for membership, either). As a consequence, the key component of the Union’s active leverage, political conditionality, has been weak and inefficient (see Smith, 1998; Youngs, 2001; Zanger, 2000). The Union’s own half-hearted attempts at applying conditionality in practice seem to suggest that it, too, has been aware of this. The EU’s discouraging track record in conditioning Russia’s policy in Chechnya is a case in point (see Haukkala, 2001, esp. pp. 51–62; and Forsberg and Herd, 2005), and Ukraine especially during the reign of the president Leonid Kuchma is another (Wolczuk, 2004).

The European Neighbourhood Policy can be seen as having a dual function: On the one hand it is an attempt to devise an alternative to further enlargements of the Union. On the other hand it is an attempt at (re)injecting the Union’s normative agenda and the application of conditionality more strongly also to the relations with non-candidate countries (see Kelley, 2006; Dannreuther, 2006). As such, it is a conscious attempt at squaring the circle of relinquishing enlargement while retaining the Union’s normative power in Europe. These aims were present already in the Commission’s first blueprint concerning the policy, presented in March 2003 (European Commission, 2003). The communication clearly stated that the new policy was meant for countries that did not enjoy the perspective of EU membership. However, the document took great pains to make the case that the Eastern enlargement was not about exclusion and new dividing lines in Europe but that it would bring tangible benefits also to the new neighbours. At the heart of the initiative was the EU’s offer of enhanced relations and closer integration based on shared values between the Union and its neighbours. The mechanism is simple: in return for effective implementation of reforms (including aligning national legislation with the EU *acquis*), the EU will grant closer economic integration with its partners. The approach is twofold, as the EU wanted first to tap the full potential of the already existing PCAs, namely the gradual harmonization of legal norms with the EU *acquis* and the creation of a free trade area, and only then move beyond with the prospect of realizing the so-called four freedoms (persons, goods, services, and capital) within the “Wider

Europe” that would have included the Southern shores of the Mediterranean, Russia, and everything in between.⁹

The concept was further developed in the Commission’s strategy paper in May 2004 (European Commission, 2004). The paper largely reiterated the points of departure of the earlier communication but it went further by identifying better the priorities and how to inscribe them into the neighbourhood action plans to be jointly adopted with the neighbours. The paper also envisaged a process based on clear differentiation between countries and regular monitoring of progress. It is, however, here that the Union’s attempt at normative hegemony also in its neighbourhood becomes clearly visible, as the process is built on a set of bilateral relationships between the individual neighbours and the EU. Scholars seem to be in agreement that this is a deliberate choice on the part of the Union to maximize its leverage over the neighbours (Smith, 2005, pp. 762–63; Joenniemi and Browning, 2005; and Vahl, 2005). Moreover, according to the strategy the Union does not give any meaningful say to the neighbours in setting the normative agenda: The objectives and the means are non-negotiable and the only place where the partners would be consulted is when the individual action plans with clear benchmarks and timetables are being agreed upon. As such, the Union is offering (or withholding) economic benefits depending on the neighbours’ ability and willingness to implement the Union’s normative agenda and the EU is willing to give its neighbours influence only over *when* they want to implement the Union’s demands and not *how* that is to be done (see also Bicchi, 2006).¹⁰ In sum, it seems evident that the neighbours are not likely to have a large say in matters that will have a profound effect on their future development and place in Europe. If this stance is accompanied by a persistent neglect of the neighbours’ calls for belonging and their claims of Europeaness, the application of the Union’s normative hegemony through the ENP can be seen as resting on a fairly dubious legitimacy.

In fact, and unlike in the case of enlargement, the ENP would seem to reveal the uglier face of the Union’s normative power as one based on domination. To quote Lukes, the exercise of power is understood as a form of domination when it “is the ability to constrain the choices of others, coercing them or securing their compliance, by impeding them from living as their own nature and judgment dictate” (Lukes, 1974/2005, p. 85). By denying its neighbours’ calls for belonging and demanding that they nevertheless conform to its norms and values, the Union can be seen as acting precisely in this way. This does not *necessarily* have to entail that the EU is somehow evil, however. The reverse can be the case, as the exercise of domination can be done with the best and kindest of intentions, with the well-being of the dominated in mind (*Ibid.*, p. 83). In fact, this seems to be the Union’s own line of reasoning with its representatives repeatedly stating how the very ENP process is beneficial for the neighbours themselves regardless whether their wishes for accession are eventually heeded or not (see Ferrero-Waldner, 2006a; 2006b; Landaburu, 2006; and Wissels,

⁹ Since 2003 the Commission’s blueprint has gone through several substantive transformations: Its name was changed from “Wider Europe” to “European Neighbourhood Policy.” Also the list of countries has changed, as Russia – due to its own insistence – was dropped from the initiative, whereas the countries of Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia) have been added to the list of “neighbours.”

¹⁰ Or, in the words of Metallica: “You can do it your own way, if it’s done just how I say.”

2006). But despite the rhetoric, the ENP amounts to little else than what Hettne and Söderbaum (2005, p. 539) have called “soft imperialism,” i.e. to soft (or normative) power being applied in a hard (or hegemonic) way through an asymmetric relationship that advocates a one-sided reading of norms and values without engaging the receiving end in a genuine dialogue about the content and meaning of those terms.

But the crux of the issue lies elsewhere; it lies in the fact that the EU has been trying to apply its normative hegemony in Europe along the lines of accession process without the legitimising effect of enlargement. It should be clear from the discussion above that this is a recipe for failure, unless the ENP is made on the material side of incentives enticing enough for the neighbours. Thus far this has not been the case and it is unlikely that the economic side of ENP can be robust enough to act as a sufficient incentive for the neighbours in the future, either (Milcher and Slay, 2005, p. 7). Despite the grand total of €12 billion devoted to the neighbourhood in the current budgetary period in the EU (2007–13) it is clear that the sum is in no proportion to the scale of challenges the Union is facing in its combined neighbourhoods in the South and the East. In addition, the long term overall malaise in European economic performance will be reflected in the future allocation of resources. The euro zone’s economy has been stalling for several years, and the EU is no longer generating the kind of resources that it could use to throw its substantial economic weight around – at least beyond its own borders. It is equally dubious whether the Union is able to provide its neighbours with the kind of market access that would be required, especially in the East. The French and Dutch rejections of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005 reflected the rise of anti-liberalism and neo-protectionism in the EU. It is unlikely that the vested interests within the Union will allow the Commission to open the Union’s internal market to the products from the East that would be most competitive there. For example, Ukraine’s and Moldova’s main exports are steel and agricultural products, both commodities that the liberalisation of which would face staunch opposition from within the Union (Grabbe, 2001, p. 8; Milcher and Slay, 2005, p. 9). As a consequence, it could well be that neither aid nor trade will be forthcoming from the EU in the coming years. What is more, an article written in an unofficial capacity by two members of the Commission unwittingly reveals how most of the expected economic benefits of the ENP would actually flow towards the Union with significant potential risks of over-regulation and market shocks in the offing for the neighbours themselves (see Dodini and Fantini, 2006).

Therefore, it can be doubted whether the ENP in its current form is the answer the European Union has been hoping for. A case in point is Ukraine, a country that since early 1990s has been oscillating between the two main vectors of its foreign policy: the European Union and the Russian Federation. Leonid Kuchma’s presidency (1994–2004) saw the schizophrenic situation of continued professions of Ukraine’s European calling without a commensurate display of its vocation in terms of actual economic and societal reforms that would have facilitated the country’s claim of being a suitable candidate for accession (for a fascinating account of Europe as a vocation and a calling, see Medvedev, 1998). Thus when the ENP process was launched in earnest in 2004, the Union had an

easy time in putting Ukraine to the same basket together with other laggards in its Eastern periphery, Belarus and Moldova.¹¹

Ukraine's initial reaction to the ENP was that of indignation for being put in the same basket with clearly non-European countries of Northern Africa and the Middle East (Gromadzki and Sushko, 2005, p. 6). But Kyiv decided to pursue a pragmatic stance, preferring to view the ENP as a short-term solution and seeking to push towards closer forms of association and even membership (Solonenko 2006, p. 44). Keeping this background in mind, it is hardly surprising that the negotiations for the neighbourhood action plan with Ukraine in 2004 were protracted and difficult. Kuchma's government was clearly dissatisfied with the Union's offer. The EU, for its part, however, was equally adamant that the package was as good as it would get (Solonenko, 2006, p. 46). However, after the dramatic presidential elections in November–December 2004, the domestic situation changed in Ukraine: The new President Victor Yushenko has not only continued the pro-EU rhetoric of Kuchma but has augmented it with a series of reforms that, if implemented, could lead the country to a path towards EU membership (Gromadzki *et al.*, 2005). But even under the most promising of circumstances Ukraine's path to Europe would be far from linear. The biggest obstacle on Ukraine's road to modernisation and europeanisation lies in country's weak institutional framework: as in Russia, state institutions have become hostage and tools of economic interest groups which hinder and obstruct reforms that threaten their power and prosperity (Deutsche Bank, 2005, pp. 4 and 7). The situation has not changed much for the better under Yushenko whose reformist drive has become the hostage of the inertia of the corrupt bureaucrats and oligarchs. Arguably, for the current elites to relinquish their crony capitalism for good it would take a significant incentive structure on the part of the Union (Larrabee, 2006, pp. 94, 97; Wolczuk, 2006, pp. 8–9).

But the original action plan negotiated with Kuchma was thin on such incentives: no significant trade liberalisation, visa facilitation or market economy status for Ukraine – things the Union has been willing to consider and implement, for example, vis-à-vis Russia. Instead, the action plan contained an exhaustive list of priorities and objectives the Union expected Ukraine to implement (for longer discussions, see Gromadzki and Sushko, 2005; and Smith, 2005). In the aftermath of the Orange Revolution the EU has not been forthcoming with new initiatives, either. After his victory, Yushenko sought to challenge the Union to embrace the new democratic Ukraine – rhetoric that has been sustained to this day (Kuzio, 2006, p. 89; for the President's own recent views, see Yushenko, 2007). But already in early 2005 he was brought from the election euphoria to the ground by the Union's take-it-or-leave-it approach: There was no room for renegotiation of the action plan which was subsequently adopted on 21 February 2005 (Gromadzki *et al.*, 2005, p. 7). Ukraine's European aspirations were not met with an unequivocal nod of confirmation from the EU, either. As if to sweeten the bitter pill, on the day of its adoption, the High Representative Javier Solana and the External Relations Commissioner Benita Ferrero-Waldner did publish a 10-point letter specifying additional measures to further strengthen the action plan. But a team of analysts have deemed the

¹¹ To be precise, although mentioned in the ENP documents, the Union has decided to exclude Belarus from the process due to the policies of the country's authoritarian president Alexander Lukashenko.

letter of being little else than a list of unilateral demands on Ukraine with little and vague or non-binding substance on the Union (Gromadzki *et al.*, 2005, pp. 18–9). In short, the burden for the future development of the relations has been put squarely on Ukraine's shoulders while the incentives for doing so remain fairly limited, at least for the time being. What is more, Ukraine's newly-found democratic credentials together with its European vocation have basically been ignored (Kuzio, 2006).

In sum, it is unlikely that the package put forward by the Union – no European perspective and only limited material incentives – would prod Ukraine along the road of convergence and integration with the EU; i.e. help the Union to realise its normative agenda in the case of one of its largest neighbours. Once again, a clear membership perspective would be the best anchor for Ukraine (Deutsche Bank, 2005, p. 9; Gromadzki *et al.*, 2005; and Wolczuk 2004; 2006). What is more, it seems clear that the Union's current ambiguity and vacillation only manages to undercut the pro-European reformist forces in Ukraine (Kuzio, 2006, p. 105). As a consequence, it is likely that with its current ENP the Union's normative power is set to remain under-utilised and its normative agenda largely unrealized.

These same trends can be detected also in the Union's wider neighbourhood with neighbours themselves showing signs of frustration with the ENP (Vahl, 2005, p. 57; Harpaz, 2007). But there are some signs that indicate that there is growing awareness concerning the inherent constraints faced by the ENP also in the Union. For example, Kelley (2006) has traced the dilution of conditionality attached to the policy from the initial rigid application of benchmarks and monitoring akin to accession process to the more recent "intentional ambiguity" where the Union hopes to spur a modicum of reforms whilst acknowledging the relatively thin set of incentives at the ENP's disposal currently. This change is to be detected in the Commission's most recent communication on the topic from December 2006, which – while re-iterating the main characteristics of the ENP discussed above – acknowledges that the EU itself must be forthcoming with a more "robust" ENP in terms of actual incentives while simultaneously enhancing dialogue with its partners enabling their views to be heard as well (European Commission, 2006b). Recently, the Union has indeed adopted a slightly more accommodating stance when it comes to the actual incentives. An interesting case is Ukraine, where the EU has taken some practical steps that can be seen as meeting some of the long-standing Ukrainian demands. For example, the 10th EU–Ukraine in Helsinki in October 2006 initialled a draft agreement on visa facilitation that Ukraine was denied in the original ENP action plan a year earlier. But despite this apparent concession, a group of commentators have seen it as a "questionable achievement" at best as it does not meet the Ukrainian hopes for closer integration in full (Boratyński *et al.*, 2006). This brings us back to the gist of the argument: by severing the link with enlargement in the ENP, the Union is facing severe obstacles in its continued attempts at regional normative hegemony in Europe.

Conclusions

In the aftermath of the “Big Bang” enlargement, the geographical limits of the European project seem to be approaching, and the EU is increasingly threatening with the idea of ceasing to enlarge. As a consequence, in the external relations of the Union, the exclusionary aspects of European integration are coming to the fore, while the question of how to alleviate the negative impact of relinquishing the most effective foreign policy tool at EU’s disposal is emerging. At stake is the Union’s ability to act as a normative power – or hegemon – *in* Europe, which is crucially dependent on the EU’s perceived legitimacy in the eyes of its partners.

It has been argued in this paper that the open-ended nature of the Union’s membership is a key factor in promoting this legitimacy. As such, the Union’s attempts at divorcing its normative power from the accession process in Europe can be seen as being counterproductive. Yet the Union has several reasons for ceasing – or at least pausing – to enlarge. The recent accessions of twelve new members have resulted in a need for a gestation period. Also the new Eastern neighbours, at least in their present form, are anything but easily integrated.

For the Union, the new European Neighbourhood Policy thus represents both the avoidance and continuation of enlargement by other means. Avoidance, as it is hoped that it would enable the Union to avoid for the foreseeable future answering their demands for belonging; continuation, as the Union has built the ENP on the same logic of normative hegemony as the accession process. It is hoped that this would facilitate the emergence of an increasingly democratic and prosperous “ring of friends” around the Union with which it would be willing to share “everything but institutions.”

Although the offer sounds generous, the current format is far from a panacea. As has been argued in this paper, the ambiguity concerning the limits of Europe is not working. Instead, it is eroding the legitimacy on which the Union’s normative hegemony crucially rests. Moreover, one could argue that after a rather disastrous decade in the 1990s in the EU’s new Eastern neighbours, they might not opt for increased “fuzziness” in their immediate surroundings. In fact, the opposite could be true, as after all the recent turbulence they might prefer clear institutional ties and mechanisms (including, of course, the financial support) that a full membership would provide them.

By demanding reforms right now and offering only vague and amorphous incentives somewhere down the line, the ENP puts the veritable cart before its neighbours’ horses with no tangible carrot in sight.¹² The material benefits are not strong enough to entice the elites in the new Eastern neighbours to change the current system that is skewed in their favour. But even if the ENP was made financially robust enough to act as an economic carrot, it does not answer their calls for belonging in full. A case in point is Ukraine, which has to no avail repeatedly voiced her hopes of becoming a full EU member as soon as possible.

¹² This is not unique in the Union’s external policies, however. Tovias and Ugur (2000, p. 412) have shown how the “Euro-Med Partnership” in the South has been based on exactly the same logic.

One can envisage two ways forward for the Union. The first is the continuation of enlargement(s). After all, it seems to be the only avenue through which the Union can project its normative power in a legitimate and efficient manner in Europe. This would also tie in with the ENP's own paradoxical logic. As Hillion has pointed out, the better the ENP works the less sustainable it actually becomes (Hillion, 2005, p. 23). With the neighbours becoming increasingly EU compatible, also the shadow of enlargement looms larger. This does not need to be a problem, however. But it reinforces the main point in this article: it is the enlargement that is the key to the Union's normative power in Europe and any neighbourhood policy that fails to take this issue into account is doomed to be sub-optimal one. If this road was pursued then Ukraine's European aspiration should be deemed as legitimate and a gradual step-by-step association and integration process should begin (this is in fact exactly what a group of experts advocate in Gromadzki *et al.*, 2005). Therefore Turkey's long winding road to Europe could also be Ukraine's. The EU should expect Moldova, Georgia and other countries of Southern Caucasus to follow suit as well.

The second is that the EU should perhaps reconsider its normative hegemony in the post-enlargement Europe. The paradox of the EU's own pan-European rhetoric is that its application of the third dimension of power has resulted in its neighbours wanting the wrong thing: they want the membership when the EU would want them to have the same norms and values that the Union has. To be fair, the EU has tried to find a way out of this conundrum by repeatedly emphasising the inclusive aspects of the ENP without however realising that in Europe the legitimacy of its attempts is linked with the accession perspective. In this respect, the ENP is not a powerful enough a tool for the Union to allow it to turn the issue of membership into a "non-decision" (cf. Bachrach and Baratz, 1963; see also Lukes 1974/2005).

This would entail changing the neighbourhood policy, or at least the priorities within it. The current approach is not substantial enough to warrant the attempts at regional normative hegemony and the Union's insistence that the neighbours should engage themselves in adopting large parts of the *acquis* without the full European perspective. Instead, the Union should consider a neighbourhood policy that is based less on heavy normative convergence and harmonization and more on tangible cooperation with more modest rhetoric and clearer material incentives. After all, what is the point of insisting on a high level of conformity with the EU *acquis* if these countries are not to become full members in the foreseeable future? One should also keep in mind that often even within the Union it is the case that even if common rules and regulations are formally adopted they are in practice implemented in a rather slow and haphazard manner (Zielonka, 2001, p. 513). If the EU can deal with this internal messiness, maybe it could let the thousand flowers bloom in its neighbourhood and instead of detailed normative convergence to concentrate on fostering the overall values and norms that matter as prerequisites for good governance: democracy, rule of law, and basic human rights. This would ease the burden of the Union's normative hegemony and would give the Union added and badly needed legitimacy, as it could tie its agenda to the wider normative geography in Europe that already consists of other institutions, such as the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

In essence, this would require the toning down of the Union's pan-European rhetoric and the embracing of the plurality of overlapping institutionalised Europes.

References

Aalto, Pami (2006) *European Union and the Making of a Wider Northern Europe* (London and New York, NY: Routledge).

Aggarwal, V. and Fogarty E. A. (2004) 'Explaining Trends in EU Interregionalism'. In Aggarwal, V. and Fogarty, E. A. (eds) *EU Trade Strategies: Between Regionalism and Globalism* (Basingstoke and New York, N. Y.: Palgrave Macmillan).

Bachrach, Peter and Baratz, Morton S. (1963) 'Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework'. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 632–642.

Bicchi, Federica (2006) "'Our size fits all": normative power Europe and the Mediterranean'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 286–303.

Boratyński, Jakub, Gromadzki, Grzegorz, Sushko, Oleksandr and Szymborska, Anita (2006) *Questionable Achievement: EC–Ukraine Visa Facilitation Agreement* (Warsaw and Kyiv: Stefan Batory Foundation).

Brand, U. (2005) 'Order and regulation: Global Governance as a hegemonic discourse of international politics?' *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 155–76.

Bretherton, Charlotte and Vogler, John (2006) *The European Union as a Global Actor*, 2nd edition (London and New York: Routledge).

Christiansen, T., Petite, F. and Tonra, B. (2000) 'Fuzzy Politics Around Fuzzy Borders: The European Union's "Near Abroad"'. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 389–415.

Cooper, Robert (2003) *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century* (London: Atlantic Books).

Cremona, M. (1998) 'The European Union as an International Actor: The Issues of Flexibility and Linkage'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 67–94.

Dannreuther, Roland (2006) 'Developing the Alternative to Enlargement: The European Neighbourhood Policy'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 183–201.

Deutsche Bank (2005) *Ukraine: The long road West*. Deutsche Bank Research, Current Issues, May 27, 2005.

Diez, Thomas (2005) 'Constructing the Self and Changing Others: Reconsidering "Normative Power Europe"'. *Millennium*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 613–636.

Diez, Thomas and Whitman, Richard (2002) 'Analysing European Integration: Reflecting on the English School – Scenarios for an Encounter'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 43–67.

Dodini, Michaela and Fantini, Marco (2006) 'The EU Neighbourhood Policy: Implications for Economic Growth and Stability'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 507–532.

Duchêne, F. (1973) 'The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence'. In Kohnstamm, M. and Hager, W. (eds) *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems Before the European Community* (London: Macmillan).

Ellison, Davil L. (2006) 'Divide and Conquer: The European Union Enlargement's Successful Conclusion?' *International Studies Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 150–165.

Emerson, Michael (2006) 'Just what is this "absorption capacity" of the European Union?' *CEPS Policy Brief*, No. 113, September 2006 (Brussels, Centre for European Policy Studies).

European Commission (2003) *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours*. COM(2003) 104 final, 11 March 2003, available at http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com03_104_en.pdf, last accessed 7 May 2007.

European Commission (2004) *European Neighbourhood Policy: Strategy Paper*. COM(2004) 373 final, 12 May 2004, available at http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/strategy/strategy_paper_en.pdf, last accessed 7 May 2007.

European Commission (2006a) *Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2006–2007. Including annexed special report on the EU's capacity to integrate new members*. COM(2006) 649, 8 November 2006, available at http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2006/nov/com_649_strategy_paper_en.pdf, last accessed 8 May 2007.

European Commission (2006b) *On Strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy*. COM(2006) 726 final, 4 December 2006, available at http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com06_726_en.pdf, last accessed 7 May 2007.

European Council (2003) *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*. Brussels, 12 December 2003. Available at <http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>, accessed 5 August 2005.

Ferguson, N. (2003) *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* (London: Penguin Books).

Ferguson, N. (2005) *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of The American Empire* (London: Penguin Books).

Ferrero-Waldner, Benita (2006a) 'The European Neighbourhood Policy: The EU's Newest Foreign Policy Instrument'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 139–142.

Ferrero-Waldner, Benita (2006b) *Strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy – Speaking Points*. Press Conference, Brussels, 4 December 2006.

Forsberg, Tuomas & Herd, Graeme (2005) 'The EU, Human Rights, and the Russo-Chechen Conflict'. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 120, No. 3, pp. 455–478.

Friis, L. (1999) *An Ever Larger Union? EU Enlargement and European Integration* (Copenhagen: The Danish Institute of International Affairs).

Friis, L., and Murphy, A. (1999) 'The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Governance and Boundaries'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 211–32.

Frost, Mervyn (2001) 'The ethics of humanitarian intervention: protecting civilians to make democratic citizenship possible'. In K. E. Smith and M. Light (eds) *Ethics and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).

Ginsberg, Roy (1989): *Foreign Policy Actions of the European Community. The Politics of Scale*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner and Adamantine Press.

Ginsberg, Roy (1998): 'The Impact of Enlargement on the Role of the European Union in the World'. In Redmond, J. and Rosenthal, G. G. (eds) *The Expanding European Union: Past, Present, Future* (Boulder, CO and London: Lynne Rienner).

Gill, Stephen and Law, David (1988) *The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems, and Policies* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Grabbe, H. (2001) 'The effects of EU enlargement on the countries left outside'. In *Economies in transition: Regional overview*. EIU Country Forecast, June 2001 (The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited).

Gromadzki, Grzegorz and Sushko, Oleksandr (2005) *Between contentment and disillusionment: EU-Ukraine relations a year after the Orange Revolution* (Warsaw: Stefan Batory Foundation).

Gromadzki, G., Sushko, O., Vahl, M., Wolczuk, K. and Wolczuk, R. (2005) *Will the Orange Revolution bear fruit? EU-Ukraine relations in 2005 and the beginning of 2006* (Warsaw: Stefan Batory Foundation, May 2005).

Hansen, Flemming Splidsboel (2006) 'The EU and Ukraine: Rhetorical Entrapment?' *European Security*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 115–135.

Harpaz, Guy (2007) 'Normative Power Europe and the Problem of a Legitimacy Deficit: An Israeli Perspective'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 89–109.

Haukkala, H. (2001) 'The Making of the European Union's Common Strategy on Russia'. In Haukkala, H. and Medvedev, S. (eds) *The EU Common Strategy on Russia: Learning the Grammar of the CFSP*. Programme on the Northern Dimension of the CFSP No. 11. (Helsinki and Berlin: The Finnish Institute of International Affairs and Institut für Europäische Politik).

Haukkala, Hiski (2007) 'The Role of Norms and Values in the European Union's Russia Policy'. In Timmins, G. and Gower, J. (eds) *Russia and Europe in the Twenty-First Century: An Uneasy Partnership* (London: Anthem Press).

Haukkala, H. and Ojanen, H. (2002) 'Ulko- ja turvallisuuspolitiikan haasteet'. In Raunio, T. and Tiilikainen T. (eds) *Euroopan rajat: Laajentuva Euroopan unioni* (Helsinki: Gaudeamus).

Hettne, Björn and Söderbaum, Fredrik (2005) 'Civilian Power of Soft Imperialism? The EU as a Global Actor and the Role of Interregionalism'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 535–552.

Hillion, Christophe (2005) "'Thou shalt love thy neighbour": the draft European Neighbourhood Policy Action Plan between the EU and Ukraine'. In A. Mayhew and N. Copey (eds) *Ukraine and European Neighbourhood Policy* (Brighton: Sussex European Institute).

Holden, Patrick (2005) 'Hybrids on the Rim? The European Union's Mediterranean Aid Policy'. *Democratization*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 461–480.

Holland, T. (2003) *Rubicon: The Triumph and Tragedy of the Roman Republic* (London: Abacus).

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2006) "'Normative" power Europe: a realist critique'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 217–234.

Joenniemi, P. and Browning, C. (2005) "'Ystävien piiri" Euroopan rajana – uuden naapurisuuspolitiikan vaikutukset pohjoisessa'. *Kosmopolis*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 6–19.

Kelley, Judith (2006) 'New Wine in Old Wineskins: Promoting Political Reforms through the New European Neighbourhood Policy'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 29–55.

- Kennedy, P. (1989) *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (London: Fontana Press).
- Kuzio, Taras (2006) 'Is Ukraine Part of Europe's Future?' *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 89–108.
- Landaburu, Eneko (2006) *From Neighbourhood to Integration Policy: Are there concrete alternatives to enlargement?* CEPS Policy Brief, No. 95, March 2006 (Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies).
- Larrabee, F. Stephen (2006) 'Ukraine and the West'. *Survival*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 93–110.
- Lavenex, Sandra (2004) 'EU external governance in "wider Europe"'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 680–700.
- Leonard, M. (2005) 'Europe's Transformative Power'. *EuroFuture*, Summer 2005, June/July/August, pp. 110–111.
- Lieven, D. (2003) *Empire: The Russian Empire and Its Rivals from the Sixteenth Century to the Present* (London: Pimlico).
- Linklater, Andrew (2005) 'A European Civilising Process?' In C. Hill and M. Smith (eds) *International Relations and the European Union* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- Lukes, Steven (1974/2005) *Power – A Radical View*, 2nd edition (Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Lundestad, G. (1998) *Empire by "Integration": The United States and European Integration 1945–1997* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- Manners, I. (2002) 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 235–58.
- Manners, Ian (2006a) 'Normative power Europe reconsidered: beyond the crossroads'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 182–199.
- Manners, Ian (2006b) 'The European Union as a Normative Power: A Response to Thomas Diez'. *Millennium*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 167–180.
- Mattli, W. (1999) *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York and London: W. W. Norton).
- Medvedev, S. (1998) 'Catholic Europe, Marginal Russia, and Postmodern North'. In *Northern Dimensions 1998 – The Yearbook of Finnish Foreign Policy* (Helsinki: The Finnish Institute of International Affairs).
- Milcher, S. And Slay, B. (2005) *The Economics of the "European Neighbourhood Policy": An Initial Assessment*. A paper prepared for the conference "Europe after the Enlargement," organized by CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research, Warsaw, April 8–9 2005.
- Missiroli, A. (2004) 'The EU and Its Changing Neighbourhood: Stabilization, Integration and Partnership'. In Dannreuther, R. (ed.) *European Union Foreign and Security Policy: Towards a Neighbourhood Strategy* (London and New York: Routledge).

- Neumann, I. B. (1998) 'European Identity, EU Expansion, and the Integration/Exclusion Nexus'. *Alternatives*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 397–416.
- Nicolaïdis Kalypso and Howse, Robert (2002) "'This is my EUtopia...': Narrative as Power'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 767–792.
- Nye, Joseph S., Jr. (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: PublicAffairs).
- Palosaari, T. (2001) 'Comment: Northern Dimension as a Tool for Building Grey Zones between Membership and Non-Membership'. In Ojanen, H. (ed.) *The Northern Dimension: Fuel for the EU? Programme on the Northern Dimension of the CFSP No. 12*. (Helsinki and Berlin: The Finnish Institute of International Affairs and Institut für Europäische Politik).
- Prodi, R. (2002) *A Wider Europe – A Proximity Policy as the key to stability*. A speech at the "Peace, Security and Stability – International Dialogue and the Role of the EU", Sixth ECSA World Conference, Brussels, 5–6 December 2002.
- Rachman, Gideon (2006) 'The Death of Enlargement'. *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 51–56.
- Rehn, Olli (2006) *Europe's Next Frontiers* (Baden-Baden, Nomos).
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2001) 'The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union'. *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 47–80.
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2003) *The EU, NATO and the Integration of Europe. Rules and Rhetoric* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Schimmelfennig, F., Engert, S. and Knobel, H. (2003) 'Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 495–518.
- Sherr, J. (2002) 'Russia and Ukraine: A Geopolitical Turn?' In Lewis, A. (ed.) *The EU & Ukraine: Neighbours, Friends, Partners?* (London: Federal Trust).
- Sjursen, Helene (2006) 'The EU as a "normative" power: how can this be?' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 235–251.
- Smith, K. E. (1998) 'The Use of Political Conditionality in the EU's Relations with Third Countries: How Effective?' *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 253–74.
- Smith, K. E. (2001) 'The EU, Human Rights and Relations with Third Countries: Foreign Policy with an Ethical Dimension?' In Smith, K. and Light, M. (eds) *Ethics and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Smith, K. E. (2005) 'The outsiders: The European neighbourhood policy'. *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 4, pp. 757–73.
- Smith, M. (1996) 'The European Union and a Changing Europe: Establishing the Boundaries of Order'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 5–28.
- Solonenko, Iryna (2006) 'European Neighbourhood Policy – The Perspective of Ukraine'. In M. Overhaus, H. W. Maull and S. Harnisch (eds) *The New Neighbourhood Policy of the European Union: Perspectives from the European Commission, France, Germany, Ukraine and Moldova. Foreign Policy in Dialogue*, Vol. 6, Issue 19.

- Tovias, A. and Ugur, M. (2004) 'Can the EU Anchor Policy Reform in Third Countries? An Analysis of the Euro-Med Partnership'. *European Union Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 395–418.
- Vachudova, M. A. (2005) *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage, and Integration After Communism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- Vahl, Marius (2005) 'Lessons from the North for the EU's "Near Abroad"'. In Browning, C. S. (ed.) *Remaking Europe in the Margins: Northern Europe after the Enlargements* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Vobruba, G. (2005) 'Europe Reaches Its Limits: From Dynamic Expansion to Differentiated Integration'. *Osteuropa 2005: Sketches of Europe*, pp. 223-45.
- Wallace, W. (1992) 'From Twelve to Twenty-Four? The Challenges to the EC Posed by the Revolutions in Eastern Europe'. In Crouch, C. and Marquand, D. (eds) *Towards Greater Europe? A Continent without an Iron Curtain* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).
- Wallace, W. (2003) 'Where Should EU Enlargement Stop?' In Lindahl, R. (ed.) *Whither Europe? Borders, Boundaries, Frontiers in a Changing World* (Gothenburg: Göteborg University).
- Whitman, Richard (2007) 'Supersize Me'. *World Today*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 15–16.
- Wissels, Rutger (2006) 'The Development of the European Neighbourhood Policy'. In M. Overhaus, H. W. Maull and S. Harnisch (eds) *The New Neighbourhood Policy of the European Union: Perspectives from the European Commission, France, Germany, Ukraine and Moldova. Foreign Policy in Dialogue*, Vol. 6, Issue 19.
- Wolczuk, K. (2004) *Integration without Europeanisation: Ukraine and its Policy towards the European Union*. EUI Working Papers, RSCAS No. 2004/15.
- Wolczuk, Katarzyna (2006) 'Domestic Politics and European Integration in Ukraine'. *The International Spectator*, Vol. XLI, No. 4, pp. 7–23.
- Wæver, O. (1997) 'Imperial Metaphors: Emerging European Analogies to Pre-Nation-State Imperial Systems'. In Tunander, O., Baev, P. and Einagel, V. I. (eds) *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe: Security, Territory and Identity* (Oslo and London: PRIO & SAGE Publications).
- Yeşilada, Birol, Efir, Brian and Noordijk, Peter (2006) 'Competition among Giants: A Look at how Future Enlargement of the European Union Could Affect Global Power Transition'. *International Studies Review*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 607–622.
- Youngs, R. (2001) 'European Union Democracy Promotion Policies: Ten Years On'. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 355–73.
- Yuschenko, Viktor (2007) 'Ukraine Has to Be Realistic'. *The Moscow Times*, 16 March 2007, p. 8.
- Zanger, S. C. (2000) 'Good Governance and European Aid: The Impact of Political Conditionality'. *European Union Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 293–317.
- Zielonka, J. (2001) 'How New Enlarged Borders will Reshape the European Union'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 507–36.
- Zielonka, Jan (2006) *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).