THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

EUROPEAN FOREIGN POLICY UNIT

European Foreign Policy Unit
Working Paper No. 2008/1

# THE EU IN THE WORLD: FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDAS

Karen E. Smith

February 2008

European Foreign Policy Unit
International Relations Department
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/intrel/EuroFPUnit.html

**European Foreign Policy Unit Working Paper 2008/1**

# The EU in the World: Future Research Agendas

Karen E Smith, London School of Economics[1]

Academic interest in studying various aspects of the EU in the world is growing apace. In the 1970s and 1980s, a few academics identified European Political Cooperation and European Community external relations as developments well worth investigating;[2] with the creation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy in the early 1990s, interest grew in the 'phenomenon' of European foreign and security policy;[3] and in the last few years we have seen even more attention paid to this field. The number of books on European foreign affairs is ever expanding and there is an academic journal specifically dedicated to the study of European foreign affairs (*European Foreign Affairs Review*); conferences such as those of the University Association of Contemporary European Studies (UACES), European Union Studies Association (EUSA), European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), and British International Studies Association (BISA) usually have several panels on EU foreign and security policy; courses on the European Union's foreign relations are

[1] This paper is an early version of a chapter that is to appear in Michelle Egan, Neill Nugent and William Paterson, eds, *Studying the European Union: Current and Future Agendas* (Palgrave, late 2008/early 2009). An initial version was presented to a Palgrave research symposium in March 2007, and then on the occasion of the Anna Lindh Award ceremony in Brussels, in October 2007. I am very grateful to all those participants on both occasions who offered useful comments and further questions to address.

[2] Classic works from this period include: David Allen, Reinhardt Rummel and Wolfgang Wessels, eds, *European Political Cooperation: Towards a Foreign Policy for Western Europe* (Butterworth Scientific, 1982); Philippe de Schoutheete, *La coopération politique européenne* (Brussels : Editions Labor, 1980); Roy Ginsberg, *The Foreign Policy Actions of the European Community* (Boulder: Lynn Rienner, 1989); Christopher Hill, ed., *National Foreign Policies and European Political Co-operation* (George Allen & Unwin, 1983); Panayiotis Ifestos, *European Political Cooperation: Towards a Framework of Supranational Diplomacy?* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1987); Alfred Pijpers, Elfriede Regelsberger, Wolfgang Wessels and Geoffrey Edwards, eds, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s: A Common Foreign Policy for Western Europe?* (Dordrecht: M. Nijhoff, 1988); Gunnar Sjöstedt, *The External Role of the European Community* (Saxon House, 1977).

[3] Books from the 1990s include: Christopher Hill, ed, *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge, 1996); Martin Holland, ed., *The Future of European Political Cooperation: Essays in Theory and Practice*, (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1991); Simon Nuttall, *European Political Co-operation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992); John Peterson and Helene Sjursen, eds, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP* (London: Routledge, 1998); Elfriede Regelsberger, Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wolfgang Wessels, eds, *Foreign Policy of the European Union: From EPC to CFSP and Beyond* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1997); Reinhardt Rummel, ed., *The Evolution of an International Actor: Western Europe's New Assertiveness* (Boulder: Westview, 1990).

now offered at numerous universities around Europe and the world; the activities of FORNET (an EU-funded network of research on European foreign policy coordinated by Professor Christopher Hill) are now continuing largely within the framework of the EU-CONSENT network of excellence (coordinated by Professor Wolfgang Wessels and funded by the EU); and the online bi-monthly journal *CFSP Forum* attracts contributions from scholars around Europe.[4] EU-funded networks have helped to strengthen links among researchers, while the European Foreign and Security Policy Studies Programme has generously supported research into European foreign and security policy and fostered an active network of younger researchers in particular.[5]

There are, however, quite fundamental questions about the EU in the world that we still need to address. Research may be increasing, but there is too little accumulation of knowledge (not enough attention is being paid to the large questions we face and to the answers that have already been suggested in the literature), and there is still a great need for more substantial empirical analysis, which has historical depth. This chapter first sets out the core questions which should guide research on the EU in the world; it then reviews the current 'state of the art' in this field; and finally it suggests agendas for further research to fill in the gaps currently apparent in the literature.

**Core questions for research on the EU in the world**

Studying the EU's relations with the rest of the world, including how it comes to agree policies towards outsiders, is inherently complex:

- it involves multiple levels of enquiry (international, EU, national and below the level of national governments), and multiple actors at those levels; and
- it involves a moving 'target', in that the EU foreign policy system continues to develop over time (with new institutions, new policy instruments, and so on, as well as enlargement to more member states).

[4] Available on the FORNET website (www.fornet.info) and the EU-CONSENT website (www.eu-consent.net).
[5] The EFSPS programme is sponsored by three foundations (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, Volkswagen Stiftung, and Compagnia di Sao Paolo) and run by the Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin (www.iep-berlin.de).

Three challenges for research thus arise:

- to understand and explain the evolution of the EU foreign policy system (the institutions, the formal rules, the informal norms, and so on);
- to understand and explain the policy-making process, including the output and implementation of policy; and
- to understand and explain the impact of common policies (or the failure to agree common policies) on the system itself, on EU member states, on the world.

The 'EU foreign policy system' is understood here to comprise the institutions and norms guiding the making and implementation of common foreign policies (in the name of the EU); the EU member states are the most important actors in the system, but institutional actors such as the European Commission and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy exercise influence in policy-making. The system stretches across the EU's pillars, encompassing the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP, which includes the European Security and Defence Policy), the European Community (EC), and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillars, insofar as the EC and JHA pillars deal with the outside world.[6] The term 'system' indicates that we are not investigating a more tightly integrated entity (a state, or a federation) – thus acknowledging that the construction is 'messy'[7] and may not necessarily produce collectively-agreed output – but rather that there are institutions and norms which have been specifically created, and are so used, to produce common policies towards and conduct relations with the rest of the world. That such a system exists at all, in a world of states usually trying to assert their sovereignty and freedom of action vis-à-vis each other, is an astonishing development – and more than merits serious and sustained academic attention.

The research challenges can be broken down into six core questions that we should be asking about the 'EU in the world'. The plea here, in other words, is for question-driven research and, moreover, for empirically-rich, question-driven research. I do not

[6] There are studies which concentrate just on the CFSP pillar (and its predecessor, European Political Cooperation), but such works are considered here to be a subset of the study of the broader EU foreign policy system.

[7] Following Christopher Hill, there may be 'a cohesive European impact on international relations despite the messy way in which it is produced'. Hill, 'The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, 3, 1993, p. 309.

stake out preferences for a particular methodology or theoretical approach to answering those questions. Different theories (from and within different disciplines) can give us different answers to these questions, thus sparking a healthy debate.[8] Likewise, different methodologies may give us different – and richer – answers as well. The questions are deliberately broad, and answering them will also enable European foreign policy analysts to speak to larger debates within the disciplines of International Relations, European integration studies, and political science in particular.

The six questions which should guide our research are:

1) Why do the EU member states agree to act collectively in international relations?

This question derives from the larger question of why states cooperate in the international system, and the competing answers in the International Relations literature that have been offered to that larger question could be of use here, though answers have to take into consideration the specific context of the EU foreign policy system. Building on constructivist arguments regarding collective identity formation, we could hypothesise that through an intense process of foreign policy cooperation and institutionalisation (the process by which shared standards of behaviour are developed) EU member states are developing a common identity and are thus more inclined to act collectively.[9] A liberal institutionalist approach would emphasise the extent to which international interdependence encourages or creates space for collective action. An intergovernmentalist would focus on the roles that the shared or overlapping interests of member states and what Roy Ginsberg calls the 'politics of scale' (the benefits of collective over unilateral action) play.[10] Realists would instead

[8] Walter Carlsnaes, however, has cautioned that a wide variety of different conclusions and approaches is not a sign of health in the literature on European foreign policy, but rather a 'cacophony of dissonant voices'. Carlsnaes, 'Where the Analysis of European Foreign Policy Going?', *European Union Politics*, 5, 4, 2004, p. 495. The contention here is that as long as there is debate regarding different conclusions and approaches (which requires analysts to be aware of, and consciously engage with, the variety out there), then the scope of our understanding should increase. Right now it is more important to conduct careful empirical research than to seek one dominant approach explaining the evolution and workings of the system (if indeed such an approach could ever be found).

[9] See Alexander Wendt, 'Collective Identity Formation and the International State', *American Political Science Review*, 88, 2, 1994, pp. 389-90.

[10] Ginsberg, *The Foreign Policy Actions of the European Community*, p. 3.

consider how external threats or configurations of power might prompt collective action, as they do in prompting alliance formation, for example.

Moving away from the broad International Relations literature, pressures for collective EU action could conceivably come from 'below' the international or state levels, from domestic public opinion, interest groups and national parliaments; and/or it could be fostered by EU-level actors namely the EU institutions (above all, the European Commission). Demands from outsiders could also build pressure for collective action.

Understanding whether and to what extent such pressures explain why the member states act collectively in specific cases (as well as generally) would be a fruitful avenue of research. In particular cases (such as EU policy towards Iran, or towards the Western Balkans, or the Middle East conflict), researchers could investigate the roles that internal and external actors – such as a directoire of powerful member states, small groups of other states, the European Commission, the European 'public', outsiders such as the US – have played in prompting or encouraging such action. Comparative studies of specific cases of EU collective foreign policy action could illuminate any persistent patterns in terms of which factors, or actors, tend to be most important in prompting collective action. Comparison of EU foreign policy cooperation with any similar efforts in other regions could also yield potential explanations for cooperation within the EU.[11]

2) How are policies made?

This question brings us further down into the details of policy-making: who are the major actors and how do they take decisions (only lowest common denominator bargaining, or in a 'problem-solving' style?), who (among member states and various actors within them, EU institutions) 'wins' in policy-making debates, what is the

[11] The contention here is that the EU is obviously a unique international actor, in that no other collectivity can match the institutionalisation and output of its foreign policy system, but that this should not preclude comparison with any attempts at collective foreign policy making elsewhere (including comparison of explanations for such attempts). Ben Tonra identifies a divide in the literature on EU foreign policy between scholars who consider the EU *sui generis* and those who take a comparative perspective. Ben Tonra, 'Mapping EU Foreign Policy Studies', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 1, 2000.

substance of any policies on which the actors can agree? Investigations would undoubtedly need to focus on actors at the EU level (in Brussels-based institutions) and national level (in various ministries, for example), but the role that interest groups or epistemic communities may be of interest too. How are policies then implemented, and with which policy instruments? This is classic foreign policy analysis (FPA), which may, or may not, require modification to be applied in the European context.[12]

3) Why have the institutions and decision-making procedures for making EU foreign policies evolved in the way that they have, and what impact do these have on the substance of any common policies agreed?

This question leads us into explaining the dynamics of institutional development in this field. Why are we seeing 'institutionalisation' in foreign and security policy cooperation?[13] Is it the result of neo-functionalist spillover, or incremental intergovernmentalism, or intra-EU balancing or even balancing behaviour by the EU as a whole?[14] And to what extent, and how, do the member states seek to protect their sovereignty at the same time as they agree to further institutional development? How do considerations of sovereign prerogatives in the foreign policy field affect institutionalisation? After all, a strong intergovernmentalist argument would dismiss the possibility that much progress can be made in creating potentially sovereignty-threatening institutions and norms; Philip Gordon, for example, argued that EU member states 'will only take the difficult and self-denying decision to share their foreign policy sovereignty if the gains of common action are seen to be so great that

[12] A very traditionalist interpretation of FPA would preclude its use with respect to EU-level foreign policy, because the EU is not a state and therefore cannot produce foreign policy. However, several analysts have argued that EU foreign policy can be likened to national foreign policy and hence analysed using similar tools. Hazel Smith argues that 'the European Union does indeed have a foreign policy and that it can be analysed in pretty much the same way we can analyse that of any nation-state'. H. Smith, *European Union Foreign Policy: What it Is and What it Does* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), p. 1. Taking this argument even further, Brian White explicitly aims to show how FPA can be used to analyse European foreign policy. White, *Understanding European Foreign Policy* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001). Walter Carlsnaes pleads for a more synthetic FPA which could then also be used to analyse European foreign policy. Carlsnaes, 'Where is the Analysis of European Foreign Policy Going?', pp. 505-7.

[13] Michael E. Smith, *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[14] Barry Posen argues that balancing US power is the motivation behind the development of the ESDP. EU member states fear abandonment (because the US has the capacity to ignore them), and want to have a greater influence in international relations. Posen, 'European Union Security and Defence Policy: Response to Unipolarity?', *Security Studies*, 15, 2, 2006.

sacrificing sovereignty is worth it, or if their interests converge to the point that little loss of sovereignty is entailed.' And he maintained that 'these conditions have not held in the past, do not currently hold, and are not likely to hold in the future.'[15] Is this the case, and if not, why have such constraints been loosened?

Furthermore, we should look at which actors are driving the evolution of the institutions and decision-making procedures: the most powerful member states, the European Commission, or other actors? And analysts could also explore whether, how and why what David Allen first called 'Brusselisation' may be leading to more common policies.[16]

A related issue is the perceived legitimacy of the EU foreign policy system, and therefore also of the output of that system. The 'democratic deficit' in the EU has attracted much scholarly attention, which has begun to spill over into the study of EU foreign policy as well. Questions for further research include: how legitimate is the system? Have concerns about legitimacy (and what sort of legitimacy: input, ouput, and so on) been at play in the development of the EU foreign policy system? What role do public opinion or the European Parliament or national parliaments play in the system?[17]

4) What are the limits to EU collective action?

[15] Philip Gordon, 'Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy', *International Security*, 22, 3, 1997-98, p. 81.
[16] Brusselisation is usually understood as the shift in the composition of officials involved in CFSP/ESDP from those based in national capitals to those based in Brussels: a growing number of CFSP/ESDP institutions and policy-makers are now located in Brussels. David Allen, '"Who speaks for Europe?" The search for an effective and coherent external policy', in John Peterson and Helene Sjursen, eds, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?* (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 56-8. Gisela Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet argues that Brusselisation is leading to a new form of governance in CFSP, in 'The New CFSP and ESDP Decision-Making System of the European Union', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 7, 3, 2002.
[17] See Esther Barbé and Anna Herranz, eds, *The Role of Parliaments in European Foreign Policy* (Barcelona: Observatory of European Foreign Policy, 2005); the special issue on the Democratic Accountability of the EU and the Role of the European Parliament, *The International Spectator*, 39, 2, 2004; Kai Oppermann and Alexander Höse, 'Public Opinion and the Development of the European Security and Defence Policy', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 12, 2, 2007; Donatella Viola, *European Foreign Policy and the European Parliament in the 1990s: An Investigation into the Role and Voting Behaviour of the European Parliament's Political Groups* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); Wolfgang Wagner, 'The Democratic Control of Military Europe', *Journal of European Foreign Policy*, 13, 2, March 2006.

Again, there are numerous ways to address this question, one of which is essentially to pose the opposite question to that asked right at the start: why might the member states *not* act collectively in international relations? To what extent, and why, is there a 'capabilities-expectations gap', a gap between expectations of collective EU action and the EU's capacity to deliver it? [18] How important is the 'logic of diversity' (as termed by Stanley Hoffmann four decades ago[19])? Do the member states have diverging interests that the processes referred to above cannot reconcile, even over a long period of time?

Limits might also be posed by bureaucratic politics, or 'turf wars' between institutions in Brussels (and/or in national capitals). How is this limiting EU collective action? Do the 'pillars' obstruct and complicate common policy-making, and how, exactly?[20]

Analysis could also focus on the extent to which the absence of a unified community or common identity hinders collective action (the opposite of the constructivist hypothesis mentioned above). Several observers have argued that foreign policy is the expression of the identity and interests of a particular community, and until the Union becomes such a community, it will never be able to formulate and implement effective, legitimate foreign policy. David Allen maintains that foreign policy is intrinsically linked to the 'idea of a state with a set of interests identified by a government.'[21] Jean-Marie Guehenno argues that 'a European foreign policy requires a European polity, which will produce European interests.'[22]

Other possible answers might focus on the limits of the foreign policy instruments available to the EU, and/or the restricted room for manoeuvre in the international system for the EU: realists, for example, would note that the EU does not and cannot

---

[18] See Hill, 'The Capability-Expectations Gap'. See also Jan Zielonka, *Explaining Euro-Paralysis* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998).
[19] Stanley Hoffmann, 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The fate of the nation state and the case of Western Europe', *Daedalus* 95, 1966, pp. 881-2.
[20] There has been some initial work done on this; see for example: Federico Santopinto, 'Why the EU Needs an Institutional Reform of its External Relations', GRIP Note d'Analyse, 19 June 2007 (available at www.grip.org); Ursula C. Schroeder, 'Converging Problems – Compartmentalised Solutions: The Security-Development Interface in EU Crisis Management', *CFSP Forum*, 4, 3, 2006 (www.fornet.info).
[21] David Allen, 'The European Rescue of National Foreign Policy?', in Hill, ed., *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*, p. 303.
[22] Jean-Marie Guehenno, 'A Foreign Policy in Search of a Polity', in Jan Zielonka, ed., *Pardoxes of European Foreign Policy* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), p. 30.

really use military force coercively (because the member states will not agree to go that far), and that this constitutes a serious limit to EU foreign policy aspirations – especially because the international system is more Hobbesian than Kantian.[23]

5) What impact do the EU foreign policy institutions, decision-making procedures and common policies have on the member states?

Given their centrality in decision-making, the role that the member states play in the EU foreign policy system is obviously important for the study of EU foreign policy.[24] In turn, what effect does the system have on the member states? The concept of 'Europeanisation' has recently been imported from general EU studies, to see if it can be of use in the field of foreign policy. Europeanisation is quite a flexible term, with numerous interpretations debated in the literature. Rueben Wong groups the different usages in five categories: national adaptation to EU processes and requirements (the EU acts as a constraint on member states); national projection (member states use the EU to achieve their own objectives); elite socialisation (elites learn to think 'European' rather than just 'national'); modernisation (countries in Europe's periphery modernise to fit in with the EU); and policy isophormism (convergence of policies across Europe).[25] The question for scholars is whether any (or all) of these forms of Europeanisation is identifiable in the field of foreign and defence policy: do we see evidence of changes in national institutions, policy-making processes, policy substance, perhaps even foreign policy identity that can be attributed to Europeanisation?

A related issue for enquiry is whether national foreign policy has been so transformed by the EU foreign policy system that it no longer makes sense to analyse the national context without taking into consideration the EU context. Even if there may be pockets of purely 'national' foreign policy, the argument has been made that the

[23] This is, broadly speaking, the argument of both Robert Kagan (*Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, London: Atlantic Books, 2003) and Robert Cooper (*The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Atlantic Books, 2003)
[24] Though, oddly, there are only a few book-length treatments of this subject. See, for example, Hill, ed., *National Foreign Policies* and *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*; Ian Manners and Richard Whitman, eds, *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000);
[25] Rueben Wong, 'The Europeanization of Foreign Policy', in Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, eds, *International Relations and the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 136-40.

analysis of member states' foreign policy requires modifying traditional foreign policy analysis to capture the unique context in which the member states operate.[26]

6) What impact does the EU have on outsiders, and international relations in general?

This question forces us to consider the effectiveness of any EU foreign policies that emerge from the EU foreign policy system, and also the EU's broader influence in the international system (as Christopher Hill and Michael Smith have recently enjoined us to do[27]). Considerations of effectiveness include whether the EU's policies had the effect *intended*, that is, whether and to what extent they achieved the results desired. This question also encompasses the *unintended* effects of EU policies – and not just the foreign policies agreed, but also 'internal' policies, such as the Common Fisheries and/or Agricultural Policies.

Measuring 'effectiveness' is inherently a difficult task – how can we attribute 'success' to the EU, rather than, say, to domestic actors or other international actors or beneficial international developments or just plain luck? But policy-makers – and perhaps more importantly, outsiders – do make judgments about the success or not of the implementation of policies. Of course, we academic observers may argue they may not be the appropriate judgments, and subsequent policy-making may not take such 'lessons' into account, but such judgments are still made, so for scholars this should be an important part of the investigation of the policy-making process. Is the EU able to influence other actors (third countries, non-governmental actors, international organisations, and so on) to do what it wants them to do?

But this question also raises the more general issue of what impact the EU may or may not be having on international relations in general – and again, approaches to this

[26] Ian Manners and Richard Whitman consider that national foreign policy has been so transformed through EU membership that 'transformational FPA' is a more appropriate approach; Henrik Larsen suggests that, depending on the extent to which a state conducts foreign policy in a particular issue area within the EU, traditional or transformational FPA will be more useful. See Ian Manners and Richard Whitman, 'Conclusion', in Manners and Whitman, eds, *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States*; Henrik Larsen, *Analysing the Foreign Policy of Small States in the EU: The Case of Denmark* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2005), especially pp. 209-21.

[27] See in particular Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, 'Acting for Europe: Reassessing the European Union's Place in International Relations', in Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, eds, *International Relations and the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 404-6.

question could go in many different directions. Does the EU serve as a model for other regions, such that processes of regionalisation around the world may be prompted or encouraged by the EU? Is the EU strengthening multilateralism and the rule of international law, and how?[28] Or does the development and enlargement of the EU prompt balancing behaviour (and therefore potentially raise tensions in international politics)?[29]

**State of the art**

To some extent, the current literature on the EU and the world addresses these questions, though some more than others. But there is a lot of 'compartmentalisation' in the literature – a focus on the details of quite contemporary developments in micro-studies of limited scope, or engagement only with particular scholars working within the same theoretical tradition. There is also currently a trend (not to say obsession) with theorising – and sometimes with not enough grounding in the empirical, historical record: in other words, grand claims are made about implications for theory, which may not necessarily be supported by adequate empirical evidence. Topics that currently seem to be popular in the literature are noted below, though for obvious reasons of space not everything that has been published in the field has been cited here![30]

[28] This is one question explored in Katie Verlin Laatikainen and Karen E Smith, eds, *The European Union at the United Nations: Intersecting Multilateralisms* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2006). See also Knud Erik Jörgensen, 'A Mulitlateralist Role for the EU?', in Ole Elgström and Michael Smith, eds, *The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis* (London: Routledge, 2006); Jan Wouters, Frank Hoffmeister, Tom Ruys, eds., *The United Nations and the European Union. An Ever Closer Partnership* (T.M.C. Asser Press, 2006).

[29] A decade ago, Richard Rosecrance argued that the EU was unique in international relations, because even as it became more powerful (larger, richer, with more capabilities), it did not repel other countries and spark balancing behaviour (as realists would predict), but instead it attracted them, as third countries sought to strengthen their relations with it. Richard Rosecrance, 'The European Union: A New Type of International Actor', in Jan Zielonka, ed., *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy* (Kluwer Law International, 1998). However, the EU's continued enlargement and the development of the European defence policy (aimed at providing the EU with greater capabilities for intervention) might change that dynamic; the question is at least worth taking into consideration.

[30] Books have been cited more often than articles, simply because books can provide a more in-depth treatment of the subject. Alas, English-language publications also dominate the footnotes here, a reflection primarily of my own linguistic limitations as well as of the increasing tendency for scholars to write and publish in English, regardless of whether their native language is English or not.

Regarding the development of institutions and their impact on policy-making

Somewhat surprisingly, we have not yet seen a book-length account (much less an explanation) of the evolution of the EU foreign policy system in the post-Cold War period. Simon Nuttall's history of the origins of the Common Foreign and Security Policy remains the best account we have of the transition from EPC to the CFSP, and while it may prove impossible to equal the very high quality of Nuttall's work, the lack of a book-length history of the diplomacy regarding the development of the EU foreign policy system since then is disappointing. Nor have we seen many attempts to formulate explanations (much less competing ones) of that development.[31] Instead, analysts have focused on tracking and explaining contemporary debates and developments, rather than taking a long-term view. Thus recently, for example, the origins and potential impact of the 'external relations' provisions in the constitutional treaty and now the Reform Treaty have been an area of considerable interest – particularly in the think tank world (for obvious reasons). Analysts have been especially interested in considering whether institutions such as the new-fangled High Representative (the Foreign Minister by another name) and the European External Action Service could make a difference in terms of the convergence of member state positions, efficiency of EU decision-making, and effectiveness of EU foreign policy output.[32]

The development and implementation of the European Security and Defence Policy has been an area of considerable scholarly activity – reflecting the (surprisingly rapid) development of the ESDP since 1999. Some studies have focused on the role that the Franco-British-German trio have played in that development; others have analysed problems of coherence across institutions and pillars in particular instances; some work has considered whether a common strategic culture is developing within the EU

[31] Simon Nuttall, *European Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Michael E Smith's *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) deals primarily with the evolution of the system up to the creation of CFSP. Key EU foreign policy documents from the 1990s (and some commentary) are included in Christopher Hill and Karen E Smith, eds, *European Foreign Policy: Key Documents* (London: Routledge, 2000).

[32] Steven Everts and Dan Keohane, 'The European Convention and EU Foreign Policy: Learning from Failure', *Survival*, 45, 3, 2003; several short pieces on the constititonal/reform treaty foreign policy provisions have appeared in *CFSP Forum* (www.fornet.info).

(given both ESDP developments and the promulgation of the 2003 European Security Strategy); but only a few studies have appeared about particular ESDP missions.[33]

The impact of enlargement on the EU's foreign policy-making system has also attracted interest, though it is still early days for such studies.[34]

Scholars – particularly younger scholars – have been quite interested in exploring the intersection between the CFSP and Justice and Home affairs pillars (or rather, since the latter pillar is fast disappearing, the inclusion of issues that were part of the original JHA pillar - immigration, terrorism, organized crime, and so on – on the EU foreign policy agenda). This is a growing area of EU foreign relations, particularly since the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, so it is not surprising that research has followed empirical developments here. Yet recent research has tended to concentrate on immigration policy rather than – oddly – terrorism or other JHA issues such as organised crime, though this is also beginning to change.[35]

[33] See, for example, Sven Biscop, *The European Security Strategy: A Global Agenda for Positive Power* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Paul Cornish and Geoffrey Edwards, 'The Strategic Culture of the European Union: A Progress Report', *International Affairs*, 81, 4, 2005; Jolyon Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union* (Palgrave, 2007); Michael Merlingen and Rasa Ostrauskaite, *European Union Peacebuilding and Policing: Governance and the European Security and Defence Policy*, Routledge 2006; Christoph Meyer, *The Quest for a European Strategic Culture: Changing Norms on Security and Defence in the European Union* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).
[34] Geoffrey Edwards, 'The New Member States and the Making of EU Foreign Policy', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 11, 2, 2006; Gisela Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet, ed., *The Future of European Foreign, Security and Defence Policy After Enlargement* (Baden-Baden 2006); Elfriede Regelsberger, 'The Impact of EU Enlargement on the CFSP: Growing Homogeneity of Views among the Twenty-Five', *CFSP Forum*, 1, 3, 2004. The 1995 enlargement and its implications for institutional development attracted (brief) attention mostly from scholars based in the three new member states.
[35] Several EU-funded research networks and projects have been examining this intersection, including Challenge (www.libertysecurity.org) and the team on the external aspects of internal security working within the EU-Consent network. On the JHA-foreign policy interface in general, see Jorg Monar, 'The European Union as an International Actor in the Domain of Justice and Home Affairs', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 9, 3, 2004.; Wyn Rees, 'The External Face of Internal Security', in Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, eds, *International Relations and the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). On terrorism, see the special issue of *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46, 1, 2008, edited by Geoffrey Edwards and Christoph O. Meyer. On immigration, see Christina Boswell, 'The External Dimension of EU Immigration and Asylum Policy', *International Affairs*, 79, 3, 2003; Sandra Lavenex, 'Shifting Up and Out: The Foreign Policy of European Immigration Control', *West European Politics*, 29, 2 2006. In retrospect it is striking how little attention was paid to the overlap between the international crime-fighting agenda and foreign policy in the literature on European foreign policy before 9/11.

Regarding policy-making

Similar to the case of explaining the evolution of the EU foreign policy system, there have been few attempts to put forward a book-length argument about why the EU member states act collectively in international relations – though there have been several edited collections of case studies which to some extent seek to generate broader conclusions, and numerous texts which describe the EU's relations with a wide variety of third countries.[36] Most work has focused on describing and explaining the development and implementation of EU policies regarding particular third countries, regions and international organisations. Little work as yet has been done to try to link the various conclusions reached in this body of literature into a more general explanation of why the member states produce common foreign policies.[37]

Some areas seem to be more popular than others, which is partly a reflection of actual EU policy priorities. EU policies towards Africa, Asia and Latin America,[38] for example, do not attract nearly as much scholarly attention as the following areas:

1) Policies towards neighbouring countries and especially the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) has attracted increasing attention from scholars, some of whom have redirected their energies from analysing the enlargement process to the ENP.[39] Much work centres on the overlap between the

[36] Some of the works published just since 2000 include: Charlotte Bretherton and John Vogler, *The European Union as a Global Actor*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 2004); Walter Carlsnaes, Helene Sjursen, and Brian White, eds, *Contemporary European Foreign Policy* (Sage, 2004); Nicola Casarini, and Costanza Musu, eds, *European Foreign Policy in an Evolving System* (Palgrave, 2007); Martin Holland, ed., *Common Foreign and Security Policy: The First Ten Years* (Continuum, 2004); Stephan Keukeleire and Jennifer MacNaughtan, *The Foreign Policy of the European Union* (Palgrave, 2008); Dieter Mahncke, Alicia Ambos, and Christopher Reynolds, eds, *European Foreign Policy: From Rhetoric to Reality?* (Peter Lang, 2004); Hazel Smith, *European Union Foreign Policy: What it Is and What it Does* (Pluto, 2002); Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen, eds, *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy* (Manchester University Press, 2004).

[37] Mea culpa: as Ben Tonra noted ('Mapping EU Foreign Policy Studies', p. 165), my own work on the EU's policy towards Central and Eastern Europe argues that it is a unique case and not one from which we could necessarily draw general conclusions. K.E. Smith, *The Making of EU Foreign Policy: The Case of Eastern Europe* (2nd edition, Palgrave, 2004). This may or may not prove to be the case, but only a trawl through the literature and additional case studies will reveal this.

[38] Such areas are (cursorily) covered in the broad surveys of the EU's policies with the rest of the world, but there are only a few in-depth studies such as: Richard Balme and Brian Bridges, eds, *Europe-Asia Relations: Building Multilateralisms* (Palgrave, 2008); Martin Holland, *The European Union and the Third World* (Palgrave, 2002); Hazel Smith, *European Union Foreign Policy in Central America* (London, Macmillan, 1995).

[39] Roberto Aliboni, 'The geopolitical implications of the European Neighbourhood Policy', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 10, 1, 2005; Roland Dannreuther, ed., *European Union Foreign and Security Policy: Towards a Neighbourhood Strategy* (London: Routledge, 2004); Judith Kelley, 'New Wine in

enlargement and neighbourhood policies, and on the extent to which the EU can influence its neighbourhood without offering countries the perspective of eventual EU membership.

2) Policy towards the Mediterranean in general has for some time attracted considerable attention – understandably, given that one of the first attempts at policy coordination within European Political Cooperation centred on policy towards the Middle East.[40] Scholarly attention is directed to the process of policy formulation within the EU (including the influence that the US may have on that process), and, to some extent, on the EU's impact on domestic and foreign policies in the Mediterranean region. Some parts of the Mediterranean are still not well covered, however – such as Libya, isolated by the EU until recently.
3) With a few exceptions,[41] the Western Balkans has been given less scholarly attention than it merits, given the fundamental significance of that region in the EU's foreign relations since the early 1990s. Work has centred on the EU's current policies (stabilisation and association policy, ESDP missions),[42] while the EU's roles in the various wars in the region have attracted less interest.
4) EU policy *towards* the US is less of a focus than transatlantic relations as a whole (long of interest to scholars of EU foreign policy), primarily because there is little formal 'EU foreign policy' regarding the US *per se*. Thus the scholarly emphasis has tended to fall on the evolution of the relationship (and particularly on that relationship in economic areas, above all trade) as well as on the impact that the US may have on processes of European integration,

---

Old Wineskins: Promoting Political Reform through the European Neighbourhood Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44, 1, 2006; Katja Weber, Michael E. Smith, Michael Baun, eds, *Governing Europe's Neighbourhood: Partners or Periphery?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

[40] Older works include David Allen and Alfred Pijpers, eds, *European Foreign Policy-Making and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984), and Avi Shlaim and G. N. Yannopoulos, eds, *The EEC and the Mediterranean Countries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). More recent work includes: Federica Bicchi, *European Foreign Policy Making toward the Mediterranean* (New York: Palgrave, 2007); Annette Jünemann, *Euro-Mediterranean Relations After September 11. International, Regional and Domestic Dynamics* (London: Frank Cass, 2004); Richard Youngs, *Europe and the Middle East: In the Shadow of September 11* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2006).

[41] Richard Caplan, *Europe and the Recognition of New States in Yugoslavia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Sonia Lucarelli, *Europe and the Breakup of Yugoslavia* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000); Brendan Simms, *Unfinest Hour: Britain and the Destruction of Yugoslavia* (Allen Lane, 2001).

[42] Most of this work is in the form of journal articles or book chapters; one exception is John O'Brennan, *The EU and the Western Balkans* (London: Routledge, 2007).

rather than on the actual impact the US may have on the process of EU foreign policy cooperation or on EU foreign policies towards other countries, regions or issues.[43]

5) The EU's policies and relations towards other regional groupings is a growing area of interest, as 'regionalism' appears to have gathered strength in areas around the world. Topics debated in this literature include: the extent to which the EU may be fostering regionalism (and regional cooperation in specific geographical areas), or that 'inter-regionalism' may be altering the international system, or that inter-regionalism may be contributing to greater EU actorness and a sense of EU distinctiveness (as compared to other international actors).[44]
6) The EU and 'multilateralism' has attracted more interest quite recently. The EU's relations with, and roles in, various international organisations, as well as its general attitude towards multilateralism have all been the subject of recent work.[45]

The role of values and norms in the EU's foreign relations is also generating considerable interest.[46] Such investigations are often combined with 'area studies' – for example, the promotion of human rights in particular areas.[47] A related research

[43] But see Catherine Gegout, 'The Quint: Acknowledging the Existence of a Big Four-US Directoire at the Heart of the European Union's Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 2, 2002. A sample of the literature on transatlantic relations includes: Philip Gordon and J. Shapiro, *Allies at War: America, Europe and the Crisis over Iraq* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2004); Geir Lundestad, *Empire' by Integration: The United States and European Integration, 1945-1997* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); S. McGuire and Michael Smith, *The European Union and the United States: Competition and Convergence in the Global Arena* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2005); John Peterson and Mark Pollack, eds, *Europe, America, Bush: Transatlantic Relations in the Twenty-First Century* (London: Routledge, 2003).

[44] See the special issue of *Journal of European Integration* (27, 3, 2005) on the EU as a Global Actor and the Role of Inter-regionalism, edited by Fredrik Söderbaum, Patrik Stålgren and Luk Van Langenhove; Mario Telò, ed., *European Union and New Regionalism: Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post-hegemonic Era*, 2nd edition (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Jean B. Grugel, 'New Regionalism and Modes of Governance – Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America', *European Journal of International Relations*, 10, 4 (2004). For a previous discussion, see Geoffrey Edwards and Elfriede Regelsberger, eds, *Europe's Global Links: The European Community and Inter-Regional Cooperation* (London: Pinter, 1990).

[45] See footnote 28 above.

[46] Sonia Lucarelli and Ian Manners, eds, *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge, 2006).

[47] Karin Arts, *Integrating Human Rights into Development Cooperation: The Case of the Lomé Convention* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000); Aylin Güney and Aslihan Çelenk, 'The European Union's Democracy Promotion Policies in Algeria: Success or Failure?', *The Journal of North African Studies*, 12, 1, 2007; Alexander Warkotsch, 'The Rhetoric-Reality Gap in the EU's Democracy Promotion in Central Asia', *CFSP Forum*, 5, 1, 2007 (www.fornet.info); Richard Youngs,

area is the use (and effectiveness) of political conditionality, both to prompt political reform and to try to resolve conflicts, usually in the EU's neighbourhood.[48]

Regarding the impact of the EU foreign policy system on member states

Research here has recently centred on 'the Europeanisation of national foreign policy'. The concept of Europeanisation, however, can be quite problematic to use in the foreign policy realm: the procedures, rules, norms, policies at the EU level are largely decided on 'intergovernmentally', EU institutions play a relatively minor role in the process compared to the member states themselves, and there are few real constraints on member states to conform to EU policies and rules (the public disarray over the Iraq invasion of 2003 illustrating clearly how member states can ignore norms of cooperation, agreed declarations, and so on, when their interests diverge from each other). But the extent to which the member states' foreign policy interests, positions, institutions, and even identity, may be changing as a result of the development of EU-level foreign policy cooperation (norms, institutions and the *acquis politique*) is nonetheless a significant area for scholarly investigation.[49]

The EU's impact on international relations

Finally, the EU and the broader international system receives some scholarly attention, but a rather large body of work has focused on how to categorise the EU's

---

*The European Union and the Promotion of Democracy: Europe's Mediterranean and Asian Policies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[48] Judith Kelley, *Ethnic Politics in Europe: The Power of Norms and* Incentives (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); Frank Schimmelfennig, Stefan Engert, and Heiko Knobel, *International Socialization in Europe: European Organizations, Political Conditionality and Democratic Change* (Palgrave, 2006); Nathalie Tocci, *The EU and Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard*, Routledge, 2007; Milada Anna Vachudova, *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage and Integration after Communism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[49] See Eva Gross, *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy? The Role of the EU CFSP/ESDP in Crisis Decision-making in Macedonia and Afghanistan*, London School of Economics, PhD thesis, 2007; Henrik Larsen, *Analysing the Foreign Policy of Small States in the EU: The Case of Denmark* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2005); Michael E. Smith, 'Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 4, 2000; Ben Tonra, *The Europeanisation of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign policy in the European Union* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001); Rueben Wong, *The Europeanisation of French Foreign Policy: France and the EU in East Asia* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2006); Jordi Vaquer i Fanes, *Spanish Policy Towards Morocco (1986-2002): The Impact of EC/EU Membership*, London School of Economics, PhD thesis, 2005.

'identity' as an international actor (is it a civilian power, military power, ethical power, normative power, superpower, and so on).[50]

**Agendas for future research**

What could be added to this already copious literature? There are still large gaps in our knowledge, and some of the most glaring ones have already been referred to above. There is a great need for detailed, empirical, and/or historical research - theoretically-informed but nonetheless careful empirical research, the kind of research that requires lots of digging around in archives, or interviewing, or wading through a wide variety of sources that are not necessarily available on the internet (especially because what is online can be very patchy: for example, following the reorganisation of the Enlargement Directorate-General's website, it is now quite difficult to find information about previous enlargements). It is suggested here that the following questions and issues merit further research:

*Policy-making process: cross-pillar issues, coordination*

The challenges of coordination between first and second pillar institutions are becoming well-known to us (and the implementation of the Reform Treaty provisions will give us more material to analyse), particular in areas such as 'civilian crisis management'. But there are other similar issues which also need more investigation:

- Research on the JHA-CFSP intersection is in its early days, and the implications of the disappearance of the JHA pillar for that intersection will need further analysis in particular. What, for example, is happening to the role

[50] See the special issue of *International Affairs*, 84, 1, 2008, edited by Lisbeth Aggestam on 'Ethical Power Europe?'; Ian Manners, 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 2, 2002; Parag Khanna, 'The Metrosexual Superpower', *Foreign Policy*, July/August 2004; John McCormick, *The European Superpower* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Andrew Moravcsik, 'The Quiet Superpower', *Newsweek*, 17 June 2002; Helene Sjursen, ed., *Civilian or Military Power? European Foreign Policy in Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2007); Stelios Stavridis, 'Why the "Militarising" of the European Union is Strengthening the Concept of a "*Civilian Power Europe*"', Robert Schuman Centre Working Paper no. 2001/17 (Florence: European University Institute, 2001); Mario Teló, *Europe: A Civilian Power?* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2005); Richard Whitman, 'Muscles from Brussels: The Demise of Civilian Power Europe?', in Ole Elgström and Michael Smith, eds. *The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis* (London: Routledge, 2006).

of interior/home affairs ministries and ministers in 'cross-pillar' policies such as the fight against terrorism?

- There is even an undeveloped area of research regarding first pillar – second pillar coordination, which is the links, or tensions, between foreign policy and development policy. This is a clear example of an area where European foreign policy analysts could reach out to foster more links with development policy analysts. For example, the links, or tensions, between security and development in EU policy in Africa deserve further examination.[51]

*Policy-making process: how and why are policies made?*

There is still much room here for detailed, empirical research – especially comparisons across policies. Why have the member states taken decisions to launch particular ESDP (European Security and Defence Policy) missions? A comparison across the cases (now almost twenty) would be quite useful, and could even give us clues about how the ESDP might develop, at least in the short term.

Taking an historical approach could also be highly illuminating. For example, many of the theories or explanations of why the EU enlarges, refer solely to the 2004/07 enlargements (and sometimes beyond). Rarely – if ever – do we use such contemporary explanations 'backwards', to see if they are helpful in explaining previous rounds of enlargement (and if not, why not).[52] There is then quite considerable scope for an historical, comparative approach to explaining why the EU enlarges.

Comparison with other regions is also needed: it is striking that in the UN context there appear to be blocs that are even more united than the EU (Africa Group, Organisation of the Islamic Conference, Arab Group, Non-Aligned Movement, and,

[51] See, for example, Marie Gibert, *Monitoring a Region in Crisis: The European Union in West Africa*, Chaillot Paper no. 96 (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies, January 2007); Richard Youngs, 'Fusing Security and Development: Just another Euro-platitude?', FRIDE Working Paper 43, Madrid, September 2007.

[52] For a wide-ranging discussion of theorising EU enlargement, see Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, eds, *The Politics of European Union Enlargement: Theoretical Approaches* (Routledge, 2005).

until the 1995 enlargement, the Nordic Group), and most of these blocs are often vigorous in their opposition to the EU. What is going on there (balancing behaviour against the EU?), and how does it compare to what is going on within the EU?

*Impact of the institutions on policy-making process*

To what extent has institutionalisation – and the related (or identical?) process of 'Brusselisation'– actually prompted foreign policy cooperation and the formulation and implementation of common foreign policies? Going further, can we really claim that 'socialisation' is occurring in Brussels? Of course, there are obvious difficulties facing researchers here: how can we identify and prove that socialisation occurs?[53] However, if we cannot 'operationalise' this concept, then perhaps we should direct our research energies elsewhere. But if we think that the concept is promising, then uncovering socialisation will require – at a minimum – a lot of interviewing and in-depth, detailed research. And its effects would also need to be explored: is it really leading to a convergence of views on interests, values, policies? what effect does it have on the substance of policies? How does enlargement affect institutionalisation, socialisation, cooperation? Is socialisation in Brussels offset by countervailing pressures from national officials?

The impact on institutions on policy-making processes is also an area where European foreign policy analysts could reach out to legal analysts: what impact is the 'legalisation'[54] of the CFSP having on the substance of policies agreed, and on the attitude of policy-makers towards the CFSP (do they see themselves as making 'law')?

[53] For a recent (and fairly solitary) attempt in this respect see Ana E. Juncos and Karolina Pomorska, 'Playing the Brussels Game: Strategic Socialisation in the CFSP Council Working Groups', *European integration online papers*, vol. 10 (September 2006). They argue that 'internalisation' of behavioural rules has not occurred, but that diplomats abide by them to obtain desired outcomes (strategic calculation). They also note that research still needs to be done on whether socialisation has an impact on the policy process and outcomes.

[54] Michael E. Smith, 'The Legalization of EU Foreign Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39, 1, 2001.

*Impact of the EU foreign policy system on the member states*

Further detailed research is also needed on the impact of the EU on national foreign policy-making. This can build on research on 'Europeanisation', or foreign policy analysis, or constructivist insights about socialisation. Large-scale comparative studies would be of great interest here – and should obviously include the new member states.

We need a much better idea of what is going on in national capitals, the 'depth' of involvement of national officials in EU foreign policy processes, the proportion of national officials that must deal with the EU, and their attitudes towards EU cooperation. It may in fact be that most national officials deal rarely with EU affairs: for example, national officials involved with the 'greater Middle East' may not necessarily be informed of or interested in what the EU is doing in that respect. Can national foreign policy officials build successful careers while avoiding 'all things European' (as anecdotal evidence from the UK suggests)? By interviewing only officials involved in EU processes, we may miss the larger picture: we may think the EU is more important in national processes than it is. Of course we may also discover that in fact, in some (or all) states the EU actually is quite a significant factor (and the reasons for variations across countries and over time would merit exploration). But we do not yet have enough information to be able to state this either way.

Such research should then link into studies on what is happening in Brussels: we should connect what is happening in national capitals to the questions posed at the start of this lecture: why do the member states act collectively, what are the limits to collective action, how are EU foreign policies made.

We should take a longer perspective as well. It would be interesting, for example, to know whether policy-makers are aware of the history of EU cooperation, and how or whether it affects how they interact within the system. I have heard a Council secretariat official state that the CFSP began in 1999: her point was that we shouldn't judge the member states harshly if CFSP doesn't work perfectly, the system was still new, everyone was still learning to cooperate. Yet six member states have had 37 years (and another three almost as many) of cooperation within a formal framework

for foreign policy cooperation. Surely this is long enough for there to have been some impact on member states, for 'socialisation' to occur, for 'identity change' to be evident (as constructivists might argue). If – as many argue – the UK is 'not really European' or not 'Europeanised' after 34 years inside the EU (and constructive and active participation in EPC/CFSP/ESDP), then maybe there are limits to socialisation: but then the more serious question arises as to why this is the case.

The UK is not the only 'difficult' case here – we should ask the same questions of other countries. And we could gain insights from comparing 'problem cases', member states with 'adjustment problems' in the European foreign policy system such as Greece in the 1980s , perhaps Denmark in the 1990s and Cyprus now. Are there similarities in these cases? How and why do they eventually adjust (are there any broad lessons there?)? How do other member states deal with them?

*The EU's impact on the world*

*Much* more research needs to be done on the EU's influence in the wider world (especially beyond the EU's immediate neighbourhood), and particularly on the EU's impact on the international system (are we, as some realists have argued, even seeing 'soft balancing' now? Is the EU a model for other regions, for international relations? Is it a 'power'?), and its actual impact on outsiders, compared to that of local and other international actors (does the EU influence them and how?).

Too often, we lapse into assertions that the EU has either considerable or little influence, without the backing of clear, substantial evidence for such influence. 'Proving' the EU has influence (or not, and what sort and why) requires considerable empirical research (and particularly a lot of interviewing, and reading materials not in an EU language) – outside the EU, and necessarily involving non-EU based scholars. The view from Delhi, Moscow, Beijing, Tokyo, Cape Town, Accra, Jerusalem, Tehran, Caracas or Washington, DC (and so on) is bound to be different from the view from Brussels and EU national capitals – and might lead to considerable revision

of our views on EU power and influence.[55] This sort of research could go from investigating the effectiveness of EU aid policies (in particular countries, sectors, regions), to analysing the EU's influence in international diplomatic processes, to gauging the extent to which major powers consider the EU to be an actor, or even a power, worth listening to (and so on). This means separating out EU influence from that of other domestic and international actors – an inherently difficult task – but unless we try to get to the bottom of this, we are left with unsubstantiated assertions about the EU's place/role/influence in the world.[56]

Doing research on these themes should entail 'us' physically leaving the EU and venturing into other countries, and should entail the involvement of researchers from outside the EU in joint research projects with those based inside the EU.

This suggestion also means that I think that we should turn our attention to analysing what kind of power the EU wields and with what effect, rather than debating what kind of power the EU *is*. Debates about whether the EU is or is not a civilian power, a normative power, a superpower and so on, are not really leading us anywhere right now – certainly not to firm answers to the core questions listed at the start of this chapter. In fact, as Michael Smith has warned, the normative power debate is relegating external impact to a residual status in the literature.[57] We should instead engage in a debate about what the EU does, why it does it, and with what effect, rather than about what it is.

---

[55] There has been some work done recently on what outsiders think of the EU. See the special issue of *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 12, 3, 2007; Sonia Lucarelli, 'European Political Identity and the Others' Images of the EU: Reflections on an Under-explored Relationship', *CFSP Forum*, 5, 6, 2007; Ole Elgström, 'Outsiders' Perceptions of the European Union in International Trade Negotiations', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45, 4, 2007; Natalia Chaban, Ole Elgstöm and Martin Holland, 'The European Union as Others See It', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 11, 2, 2006; and Martin Ortega, ed., *Global Views on the European Union*, Chaillot Paper no. 72 (Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies, November 2004). Yet Elgström has argued that much empirical work still needs to be done on 'if, or to what extent, outsiders' perceptions actually have an influence on the EU's chance to achieve its goals' (Elgström, 'Outsiders' Perceptions', p. 964).

[56] One exception to this tendency is Nathalie Tocci's, *The EU and Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard* (London: Routledge, 2007), in which she analyses specifically the EU's influence in several different conflicts (frozen or otherwise) on the EU's periphery. Another is the wide-ranging work by Roy Ginsberg (*The European Union in International Politics: Baptism by Fire*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), in which he argues that the EU has considerable 'political impact' on international actors and issues.

[57] Michael Smith, 'Comment: Crossroads or cul-de-sac? Reassessing European Foreign Policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13, 2, 2006.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the field of study on the EU's foreign and security policy system offers up numerous research challenges but also numerous interesting questions to pursue. Much research is ongoing, but there are still many gaps to fill. We need more in-depth empirical research. We could also do more to make our work relevant to other disciplines and areas of study. We should be able to speak to a wider audience of academics and analysts, and draw in a wider circle of scholars from other disciplines. We must speak to scholars outside the EU and involve them in joint research endeavours. Finally, there is still work to do to 'accumulate knowledge': to summarise important findings, and to stimulate research to contribute further findings to build up our collective knowledge.