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Abstract

The aim of this essay is to explain how IR theory relates to the European Union. This is motivated by the extensive use of empirical and descriptive studies on the EU. To generate knowledge on how theory relates to the EU, two seemingly different theories are compared. Neorealism and social constructivism are used to generate hypotheses, which are then tested on a quantitative study on the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. The study covers the years of 2003-2005 and uses a statistical method to present to empirical findings, which is supplemented by previous studies on EU’s foreign policy. The theoretical framework enables comparison of the two employed theories’ explanatory powers. The essay concludes that none of the theories provides satisfactory explanations of in regard to EU’s global power and/or influence. Nevertheless, they are able to explain different aspects of the developments of EU’s foreign policy. Further theoretical studies should be undertaken in order to highlight the issues of theory vis-à-vis the European Union.
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1 Introduction and Study Overview

Students of the academic discipline International Relations (IR) endeavor to explain the features of the international system. The 21st century has arguably presented challenges to IR theory, as conceptions of power and actors have proven to be outmoded. The European Union (EU) represents a new polity in the international system and its instruments for influencing other actors are forcing scholars to theorize on this new reality. This essay will conduct a quantitative study of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy; the data will then be used to compare the ability of two very different theoretical approaches of IR, in order to generate knowledge on their respective explanatory powers. This chapter will introduce the subject at hand, explain its purpose, and present the research questions and the outline of the study.

1.1 Introduction

The European Union\(^1\) constitutes a challenge to how we think about the international system and its actors. The EU has evolved from being an institution of checks and balances securing the European peace – to an advanced system of European diplomacy, economic cooperation, and regional integration. The EU is currently the world’s largest economy and trading block (Europa Online). Yet, without an army and doubts of its ability to influence international relations the European polity is contested (e.g., Kagan 2004).

The EU is an important actor in world politics and as the European Union’s influence in the world grows, it becomes vital to understand how the EU relates to the international system and its actors. Given EU’s increased influence, IR theory is

---

\(^1\) The European Union, the EU, the Union and Europe or European, will be used interchangeably when addressing the collective identity of the European community.
struggling to find a theoretical base to explain the behavior and actions of the Union. An interdisciplinary approach is often used to circumvent the difficulties of explaining the European polity, while still using ideas relating to traditional IR theory.

The aim of this essay is to quantify the European Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and compare the findings with neorealism and social constructivism. The research design is meant to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the respective theoretical approaches, and their ability to analyze the CFSP.

1.2 Study Overview

There is today no consensus on how to perceive, define or analyze the EU – neither among scholars nor policymakers. Yet, the hypotheses are many: economic power, intergovernmental organization, great power (Kagan 2004), civilian power (Whitman 1998), regional power (Khanna 2008) – to mention the most common ones. Given new amendments, new members, new treaties – and most recently – a new constitution, the Union’s ever changing shape becomes hard to describe in static wordings. While some issues are regarded as national, others are treated as supranational, while a third category consists of intergovernmental bargaining. The formulation of policy within the EU is extensively analyzed by the discipline of European studies (e.g., Rosamond 2000). However, theory relating to the EU as an international actor has not been as productive. State-centric theories are neglecting scholarships relating to the EU. And descriptive theories, such as constructivism, are often preoccupied with the gathering of empirical material rather than development of theory.

To understand the complexities of the international system, theory is used to structure observations and explain the behavior of states. However, as Rosamond explains, the EU is “just too complex to be captured by a single theoretical

---

Social constructivism will hereinafter be referred to as constructivism.
prospectus” (2000: 7). Neorealism is an a frequently used theory in IR studies, but has thus far not been attempted to analyze the behavior of the EU since it does not regard it as an actor (i.e. state) in international politics. National interest is, as the name suggest, believed to be just national. Thus, the EU has been largely ignored by neorealist, although exceptions exist (e.g., Grieco 1995) (Rosamond 2000: 132). Constructivism on the other hand has been very productive and there are numerous books and studies on EU’s external relations in the international system. It is argued that the EU has a European identity, which defines the behavior of the EU as a global actor (e.g., Bretherton and Vogler 2006).

Neorealism and constructivism have very different views on how to perceive the world, and how to gain knowledge. The former has a tendency to focus on the limitations of cooperation in the international system; and states as rational actors trying to balance toward competing powers. Surprisingly, constructivism has produced similar claim, namely that the EU is trying to balance American power in the international system (Bretherton and Vogler 2006; Manners 2002). Thus, while having two very different perceptions of international relations, constructivism concludes that realism’s balance-of-power theory is applicable on the EU.

Given the overt nature of CFSP statements, this study will quantify the data from the CFSP statements during 2003-2005; and analyze these findings using the two different IR-theories, thus enabling comparison of their explanatory powers.

1.3 Purpose and Contribution

The EU as a security alliance would be rejected by mainstream IR theory. Instead, recent studies on the EU and its security context have found a sanctuary in constructivism (Howorth 2005: 181). These studies are often empirical in character rather than theoretical, where data on actual foreign policy being executed and implemented are analyzed in order to say something about EU’s actorness (i.e. ability to engage in international relations) (Smith 2008; Whitman 1998). These scholars choose a number of policy areas which they then present using a historical timeline,
often leading them to the conclusion that EU foreign policy is steadily evolving to encompass more and more areas. However, there have been few attempts to explain why the Union’s foreign policy is evolving using IR theory. Thus, this essay’s purpose is to bridge the gap between empirical and descriptive studies with IR theory. Bridging this gap is a very ambitious project and given the space and time, this essay does not intend to solve the issue. However, it will be a worthwhile exercise and produce a study that highlights some of the shortcomings of contemporary IR theory’s perception of the EU as a global actor.

1.4 Research Questions

The general theme for this essay is, as explained above, to gain understanding about the EU in relation to IR theory. Although there are many theories explaining the developments of EU’s institutions and its members’ cooperation, explaining EU’s external relations have proven to be a more complicated task. Thus, how can IR theory be apply to the study of the EU’s foreign and security policy? The study will obviously not be as broad as the general theme is, but will attempt to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of two common approaches, namely constructivism and neorealism. While the general theme should now be known to the reader, the two following research questions will be at the core of this study:  

1. During the years of 2003-2005, how has the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy developed?
2. Using the hypotheses generated by constructivism and neorealism, how do they explain the developments of EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy?

---

3 Issues concerning the first question are addressed in Chapter 2 and Section 2.3 in particular – while issues concerning the second question will be dealt with in Chapter 3.
1.5 Outline

The essay will begin with describing the different concepts relating to the study of the European Union. Given the complex nature of the entity, this section is meant to clarify the many issues concerning theory and the EU, making the subsequent arguments more comprehensible. Chapter 2 will also explain the method used for this study.

Chapter 3 presents the two theories that are to be compared. Social constructivism and neorealism denote two very different perspectives of IR, and the chapter will describe how they explain the EU and European behavior. The two sections presenting each theory will conclude with the hypothesis generated by the respective theory.

The empirical findings of codifying the CFSP statements during 2003-2005 will be disclosed in Chapter 4. The data is present in a narrative, by tables, and by charts. Empirical findings from secondary sources will also be put forth in this section.

Chapter 5 brings the two previous chapters together. The empirical findings will be subjected to the two theories. Their explanatory powers will be tested and compared. The chapter ends with concluding remarks on the exercise related to the second research question, and a discussion with reference to the first research question. Chapter 6 will present the conclusions and give the final remarks.
2 Method and Concepts

The aim of this study is to explain how IR theory relates to the European Union. This is motivated by the extensive use of empirical and descriptive studies on the EU. This essay regards theory as vital to the study of international relations, and it should not be neglected. As constructivism has produced various studies on the EU, neorealism has not given the European polity much attention. The essay will use the empirics gathered on the EU’s CFSP during 2003-2005 and analyze the findings according to the hypotheses generated by the respective theory. The subsequent analysis intends to highlight their respective strengths and weaknesses. As traditional IR theory is compared with the novel usage of constructivism, the aim is to understand why neorealism has so rarely been used to analyze the EU, and why constructivism has become the preferred approach.

2.1 Comparing Theory

The essay’s research design presents issues relating to the possibility of comparing two different IR theories since they have very different understandings of the nature of reality and the nature of knowledge (Moses and Knutsen 2007: 8-9, 10-11). Furthermore, constructivism contests the neorealist notion of the ‘state’ and an anarchic world system – saying that they are not absolute truths about the world, but rather social constructions (Rosamond 2000: 171-3).

As explained in the next chapter, constructivism argues that the EU is trying to balance toward the most influential actor in the international system, a feature relating to the EU’s identity. While this might be a social construction, it sounds very similar to the balance-of-power theory, which is central to neorealism. How can seemingly two different theories come up with similar hypotheses? Thus, the aim of
the study is to construct comparison, a method used to “challenge the notion of rigid explanatory structures” (Moses and Knutsen 2007: 237). However, this study does not regard neorealism or constructivism to have authority on explaining the EU. In fact, whereas neorealism has been used to analyze the power seeking feature of states, it has neglected the EU since it is not a conventional state. In addition, constructivism has become the chief alternative to traditional IR theory on EU’s role in the international system. But without explaining the origins of its theory and hypotheses, constructivism makes dangerous presumptions about the actions of the EU. Thus, the aim of the method of comparing the two theoretical perspectives is to demonstrate their respective insufficiencies, revealing how they relate to an empirical ‘reality’ in order to highlight the issues arising from applying theory to the EU as a global actor.

To make this method possible, a theoretical framework is used in order to explain the basics of each theory. This general description is then supplemented by either stipulated hypothesis generated by others, or a hypothesis generated by the arguments put forth in this essay. The theoretical framework and hypotheses are presented in Chapter 3.

2.2 Statistical Method as a Mean for Comparison

This essay codifies CFSP statements made by the Council of the European Union and the EU Presidency – which all relates to EU’s foreign policy. The statements have been codified using text analysis of the CFSP statements, and the codified data have then been quantified. This method of content analysis is meant to enable the researcher to detect change over time (Bergström and Boréus 2005: 18-19). Thus, a statistical method is used to explain how the CFSP have changed during the studied period. In addition, the data will be compared to previous studies on the CFSP – whereas Strømvik (2005) is the main source, complemented by Smith (2008). The exact method for doing the quantitative study will be presented in Chapter 4 since this will make the subsequent material more legible.
The intention of the particular statistical method is to create as little distortion as possible in order to give a better foundation for further analysis of the data. However, one should be aware that the statements have been interpreted in some way in order to codify them – “the first casualties of quantification are interpretation and context” (Moses and Knutsen 2007: 250). Meaning that it will be impossible for a researcher to be objective when gathering data, causing the gathering itself to be interpreted although the researcher perceives himself/herself as neutral.

The primary material in this study has been analyzed using statistical methods, which normally implies a naturalistic approach to science (Ibid: 70). It is however possible for constructivists to employ statistical method to their science, using Bayesian Statistics (Ibid: 260-1). As previously discussed, this essay will try to find any changes in EU’s CFSP, and then analyze this findings using two opposing theories in order to evaluate their respective explanatory powers. With that in mind, the primary material will not serve as a statistical proof, but to give an indication how recent empirics contrast to previous studies. However, the essence of Bayes’s argument is explained by Moses and Knutsen as: “by mixing experience with prior expectations we are able to produce better predictions and the probability of future events occurring.” (2007: 261). According to this argument, it would be possible to use the findings of this study, and combining that with prior knowledge making it possible to say something about future developments. However, this study will not attempt to predict how CFSP will develop, but rather explain the past developments in relation to EU’s alleged will to balance toward the US and other global powers. The gathered data should show an increase in EU’s policy areas important to balance toward the US – in theory.

2.3 Delimitation

The EU engages in a large variety of proceedings that could be regarded as external relations, meaning events or policies relating to issues outside EU’s borders. One could argue that domestic issues are separated from the external nature of foreign
relations, thus claiming that they have little correlation. Such a claim would however be wrong; all units in the international system are affected by their domestic traits, by other actors, and by the system itself. The CFSP is only a small part of all the activities that could be regarded as EU’s foreign relations. Why then is this study delimited to this narrow definition of EU foreign policy? First, the overt nature of the CFSP statements makes it suitable for empirical taxonomy, making it possible to explain possible patterns in its development. Second, currently being the largest economy and trade block in the world, its economic activities (domestic and foreign) will have international effects. While some are meant as political instruments (e.g. the WTO negotiations), others are merely economic policies, although global in reach. The CFSP is the instrument for Europe’s common foreign and security policy. Individual actions of EU member states are not included in this essay’s conception of EU foreign policy. Consequently, when the United Kingdom (UK) and France joined Russia in diplomatic negotiations with Iran, this does not constitute a common EU policy, but individual actions of member states – thus not included in this study.

2.4 The Importance of 2003 and the ESS

The primary material gathered in this study covers the years 2003 to 2005. The timeframe is motivated by two factors: a) events and b) research method. The events are represented by the American coalition’s invasion of Iraq, and the creation of the European Security Strategy (ESS) (EU 2003). However, the intention is not to present a case study of the transatlantic relationship concerning the Iraq war in 2003. Instead, both theories chosen for this study claims that EU wishes to balance toward either American values or American power. The perceived clash between the US and EU, both in regard to interest and values (Brimmer 2007) – motivates the chosen timeframe. It is also necessary to stress the disagreements between the European states supporting the war (e.g., UK, Spain, Italy, and Poland) and those opposing it (e.g., Germany, France, Sweden). Thus, Iraq became an event that meant a lot of turmoil in the EU, which should generate measurable change in CFSP statement.
The second event is the formalization of the ESS (2003), which is an unprecedented policy document in EU’s history, stating its views on European and global security. While not providing many surprises or novel policy areas of European foreign and security policy, the ESS itself should generate some change to CFSP statements. Considering the fact that the EU went from not having a common position on security issues, to having an official framework – stating key threats and security issues – the implementation of the ESS should generate change to the CFSP statements. The document guides EU’s institutions and its members, thus creating a structure of action and coherence.

The timeframe chosen for this study is a selective one, which is meant to serve as an indicator for change but also assist the research method. This is motivated by Strömvik’s argument that the EU is reactive rather than preventive in its policies (2005: 58) – hence showing little change prior to the Iraq war and ESS, but much afterwards. However, this context generate an analytical problem since it will become hard to distinguish between increases (or decreases) due to either the US or ESS. This will present a challenge when analyzing the empirical findings and making the final conclusions. Areas covered by the ESS are not openly formulated as opposites to American interest and values. Still, the document stresses that the US has military supremacy, but that “no single country is able to tackle today’s complex problems on its own.” (EU 2003: 1). Beside this remark on unilateral behavior, the document emphasizes EU’s strong support to international law and respect of the United Nations Charter. This essay does not regard the ESS document to neither oppose nor support the US – instead it becomes a policy ‘map’ of the Union’s security interests and values.

2.4 Material and Sources

Concerning the empirical findings, the essay is based on both secondary and primary sources. Using secondary sources will enable comparison with the empirical findings of the primary sources from this study. The works of Maria Strömvik (2005) and
Karen E. Smith (2008) cover longer periods than this essay has the opportunity of doing. The former focuses on 1979-1999 and the latter 1993-2007, combined they will present a credible secondary material.

The primary material is gathered through accessing the European Council’s online database of CFSP statements. These are official statements published either by the Council or by the EU Presidency and are highly credible given their official nature. The 435 documents covering 2003 to 2005 have then been codified in chronological order, covering 25 different policy areas.

2.5 Choosing the Analytical Level

A state’s foreign policy is embodied by several different aspects. Interests are not created in a vacuum, but formulated by domestic prerequisites and further shaped by the interaction with other actors in the international system (Finnemore 1996: 2; Rosamond 2000: 172-3; Waltz 1979: 65). Theoretical perspectives diverge on the importance of agency vis-à-vis structure. That is, if the actors in the international system is able to influence the system itself, or if the system is effecting the behavior of its actors. Whether a unit or system level should be at the center of analysis is a matter of academic debate, where both constructivist and neorealist scholars have internal differences.⁴

The discipline of European studies on the other hand tries to explain European integration, intergovernmental bargaining, and the development of EU’s supranational institutions. Rather than analyzing the international context, EU studies is mainly concerned with the internal processes of the Union. However, separating the two levels of domestic and international becomes complicated, especially when analyzing the EU. Putnam’s two-level game theory has been used to describe this particular dynamic (Rosamond 2000: 136).

⁴ See Chapter 3.
IR students are early on confronted with the fact of competing theories, all claiming the authority to explain the ‘Real World’ (Moses and Knutsen 2007: 6, 9). The study of the EU challenges traditional IR theory, and few of their respective advocates have made any serious attempts to explain EU’s global influence. Nor has the EU been properly conceptualized as a complement, opposite or equivalent to the nation state.

Traditional IR theory, notably realism, tends to ignore domestic structures when describing a state’s interest (Ibid: 135). Realism justifies this by claiming that all states main concern will always be about security and balancing its power toward other states in an anarchic system – thus making shifts in domestic structures obsolete. However, EU’s member states do tradeoffs between national and supranational interest every day – sometimes by choice, while other times being forced when obliging to supranational institutions such as the Court of Justice of the European Union, or the European Central Bank. There are thus many challenges and issues arising from studying the EU, hopefully this chapter will clarify the constraints related to the study in hand.

2.5.1 Studying the Common Foreign and Security Policy
A state’s external relations are the sum of many different activities such as foreign policy, political economy, diplomacy, military operations, and so forth – the instruments available to states when engaging in external relations are many. Although the EU is not what could be defined in the traditional sense of a ‘state’, it still engages in external relations. However, to engage in realpolitik is not possible for the EU – which would mean “secrecy and activity by a small group of people who are protected from public scrutiny” (Smith quoted in Bretherton and Vogler 2006: 45). This would imply that a researcher could use the many open-sources and official documents when gathering empirics related the Union’s foreign policy, given its overt nature.

To study the EU has been described by Bretherton and Vogler as “[…] a moving target that can frustrate the best efforts of the analyst.” (2006: 215). If a researcher would focus solely on EU policy development, it would become a very complicated
task of entangling a web of the previous three pillar polity, national interests and intergovernmental bargaining. Cross-pillar competition, decisions, policy work and non-public bargaining processes – all severely limits the researcher’s ability to access information of the diverse processes that shape internal EU-policy development. EU’s external relations encompass a great variety of policy areas. The CFSP is merely one of those areas.

However, since the Union is not able to engage in *realpolitik* the way nation states are – official CFSP declarations are a very useful tool to understand the developments of the Union’s foreign policy. Hence, the study of official CFSP statements is motivated by its overt nature, as well as accessibility via the European Council’s website.
3 Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction to Social Constructivism

To explain the complexities of the EU many scholars have found a sanctuary in social constructivism with its ability to move beyond established conceptions of the state and international organizations. As the EU evolved beyond interstate cooperation and economic interdependency, traditional IR theory became inadequate to analyze the developments of the EU (Rosamond 2000: 157-8). Constructivism avoids traditional conceptions of the state, power, and anarchic order; it contrasts ontologically from traditional theories claiming that the prerequisites of the international system are socially constructed rather than fixed. Within this socially constructed international system the actor has the ability to alter its structural environment, while at the same time being effected by it (Ibid: 172; Reus-Smit 2005: 188). System theorizing excludes the unit-level (e.g., states, IOs, NGOs) and most constructivist scholars (aside from Alexander Wendt) engage in a more holistic approach (Reus-Smit 2005: 202-3). The actor’s identity is constructed in relation to material and normative structures; moreover, its identity will guide its political actions (Ibid: 188).

Given these conditions, constructivism is able to conceptualize international relations beyond nation-states trying to either maximize or balance its military and economic resources toward third states. In contrast with neoliberalism and neorealism, which both sees interest as predefined, constructivists argue that interest is shaped by a state’s interaction in a social environment (e.g., the international system) (Ibid: 192; Bretherton and Vogler 2006: 38). Thus, according to constructivism, the construction of EU’s identity is essential when analyzing its political actions. Its identity will be shaped by the European context and interactions within the international system (see below), while at the same time being able to affect the international system. Making use of material resources and its normative
power the EU is able to influence and affect other actors within the system (Bretherton and Vogler 2006).

3.1.1 Constructivism and the European Union

The international system is socially constructed, an actor’s identity is shaped by its social interactions with others and by the system it operates in (Bretherton and Vogler 2006: 38). In the case of the EU, member states and prospect members are “internalized” into the European identity – gradually adapting the “social beliefs and practices” of the Union (Ibid: 39). Bretherton and Vogler introduce two contrasting arguments when explaining the creation of the European identity: On one hand, the EU is based on an inclusive identity with the intention to promote European values to third states, emphasizing EU’s “singularity” (Ibid: 41). European experiences and practices are seen to constitute something positive, worth promoting globally. On the other hand, the EU is based on an exclusive identity with the intention to exclude ‘non-European’ countries and/or values (Ibid: 37-8). The dichotomy of ‘us’ and ‘them’ create a negative image of the other. This type of rhetoric is found in immigration and asylum policies; but is also present when the Turkish membership is discussed, or as when Morocco received a prompt rejection of its membership application to the EU (Edwards 2005: 48). Although these two arguments appear to stand in stark contrast to one another, they are typical for EU’s ambiguous character.

To explain the notion of promoting ‘good’ values Karen E. Smith argues that Europe’s foreign policy objectives are shaped by a profound belief of “altruism” (2008: 233). According to Smith, Europe’s long history of wars has been replaced by a Kantian perpetual peace. And together with the prevalence of democracy, human rights, and advanced economies, these variables constitute a cognitive framework when Europeans engage in external relations. Smith’s argument correlates with Bretherton and Vogler’s singularity, which also originates from Europe’s historical context. In a case study on EU’s endeavor to abolish the death penalty, Ian Manners (2002) shows the importance of norms as a base of the EU’s influence. Although economic and military instruments are important, the ability to shape conceptions of ‘normal’ has not been given enough attention, i.e. Europe’s normative power (Ibid:
EU’s identity “comes from its historical context, hybrid polity and political-legal constitution” (Ibid: 241-2). Manners concludes that the EU is able to politicize normative issues, such as the death penalty, making it an international issue rather than national. The politicization makes it possible to use the international system as a catalyst for diffusion of norms (Ibid: 248), thus exercising normative power.

Moreover, Manners empirical findings show that the European norms of liberty and democracy derive from the 1950s with the original preambles of European cooperation. Whereas the norms of rule of law, respect for human rights, social solidarity, anti-discrimination, sustainable development and good governance were all formalized in treaties subsequent to the Cold War (Manners 2002: 242-4). There is little doubt that the Western world has been engaged in spreading these values in one way or another in the past. However, it is important to recognize the fact that these norms were formalized in a context where the EU found itself without an outer threat – the EU suddenly had the possibility to ‘profile’ itself in the international system.

### 3.1.2 The European Union Balancing the United States

Constructivism argues that the European identity, or actorness, is constructed through EU’s interaction with external actors in the international system and material and normative structures. The argument is supported by several studies, as discussed above. While it could be interpreted as the EU is influenced by external normative structures, the argument thus far has been that the EU is spreading and utilizing European norms in the international system; norms which are meant to influence the behavior of other actors, such as states. Robert Kagan (2004), although not being a constructivist, argues that Europe is reliant on norms and its ability to legitimize the actions of other actors (in this case the US), since its lacks conventional military power. Apparently, the EU finds norms to be a helpful tool in international politics; otherwise, it would make little sense using it.

Thus, why does the EU choose to promote peacebuilding or the abolition of the death penalty, but not the norm of pre-emptive war or limited use of torture? EU’s norms are based on its desire to achieve certain policy objectives, which are formulated in the collective environment of the Union – and formalized through the
ESS and CFSP agreements. Norms are used to support ‘good’ behavior, and to undermine ‘bad’ behavior. Moreover, compared to traditional nation-states, the EU works in a lucid way, being confined to overt communication rather than realpolitik (as discussed above), with the exception being its demarches. This presents the researcher with the task of analyzing what norms the EU is trying to promote, and how it tries to promote them. While several of the authors presented in this essay have argued that the EU is constructing its identity based on its historical context and ‘good’ values, Bretherton and Vogler claims that ‘normative-power-Europe’ represents an alternative to American power (2006: 43). Although this statement might be correct in the sense of constructing identity, is it true in the sense of foreign policy and external relations?

During the Cold War, the roles of Europe, the US, and the Soviet Union were quite clear – and most observers accepted the paradigm of bipolarity. The end of the Cold War made Europe’s dependency on American security obsolete, and a wish to construct an identity apart from the US commenced. Yet, the Balkans made Europe aware of its relative weakness and ineffectiveness compared to American military power (Smith and Steffenson 2005: 359). Thus, the EU was made aware that it lacked military power as an instrument of foreign policy. Manners (2002) claims that the European norms of democracy, human rights and so forth, were present even before the end of the Cold War when European states tried to counter the Soviet ideals in Eastern Europe. Yet, during the ideological struggle between communism and democracy, this would be expected. Contrasting Manners argument, Strömvik (2005) shows that changes in CFSP during the Cold War were not due to a perceived threat or the behavior of the Soviet Union. This essay will therefore see the formalization of such norms in treaties and foreign policy as the fundamental issue. Consequently, the end of the Cold War meant that the Union evolved, its position in the international system altered, and its relation to other powers changed.

The bond between the EU and United States is complex, the transatlantic relationship has a long history, and the two actors have close cultural ties. Many of
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5 Demarches are secretly delivered messages to foreign governments declaring the EU’s position or opinion on a certain matter. At grave disturbances, the EU makes these demarches public (e.g. see Council statement 11680/04, 27 July 2004.
their respective policies are quite similar as the represent Western ideas of market economy and democracy. Both actors claim to support the promotion of human rights and democratic values; they have supported a vast number of peacekeeping and peacebuilding initiatives, as well as peace negotiations between belligerent throughout the world. The possibility of a war between the two seem impossible, to not say absurd. However, they do diverge on many issues and there often seem to be opposing solutions to common problems. However, the national preferences within Europe differ greatly. Britain is seen to have ‘special relationship’ with the US and France often holds a rivaling position to American policy. While this division persists, the EU acts collectively as the case of several WTO disputes (Bache and George 2006: 491). This essay will treat the EU as a single polity rather than the individual member states’ national interest. While interstate bargaining is important for understanding the developments within the EU, the focal point will be the collective (common) foreign and security policy, as explained in the introduction. Thus, the CFSP is representing the EU as a single unit rather than individual member’s interest.

According to Bretherton and Vogler, the EU is trying to balance against the most influential actor in the international system. Moreover the construction of a European identity can be traced to a wish to appear as the ‘other’ compared to the US, being normative superior (Bretherton and Vogler 2006: 43). Yet, the general competition between the two powers is a complicated issue and cannot be covered by this essay. Moreover, while the CFSP can be criticized for being weak, or insignificant, it is the factual framework for European cooperation on foreign and security policy. Hence, the theory put forth by constructivists, and in particular Bretherton and Vogler (see above), will be tested against the empirical findings on the CFSP. Thus, the hypothesis is formulated as follows:

The EU constitutes a polity based on shared believes and norms. Its identity is constructed by its interactions with internal and external actors. The EU is able to influence actors using material and normative structures. Consequently, normative-power-Europe is trying to balance against the most
influential actors, in this case the US. This wish to balance should be shown in the CFSP statements.

3.2 Introduction to Neorealism

Neorealism – as the name suggests – originates from realism, which has been a dominating theory of International Relations for the past 50 years. While it has the ability to explain many phenomenon in the international system, it has received much criticism for its ontological position as well as inability to explain contemporary issues – the EU being one of those. Realism explains the international system as an anarchic environment where states are the primary actors, who seek to maximize its power in order to survive (Rosamond 2000: 131). While few scholars have remained classical realist, power politics can be a useful tool to understand state behavior when analyzing IR (Donnelly 2005: 54). This has meant that realism has been accused of being deterministic, that is being too occupied with issues of power maximizing and zero-sum games (Reus-Smit 2005: 192). EU’s member states has since the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) been surrendering their sovereignty to supranational institutions. The creation of the European Communities brought three European institutions together and facilitated economic and political cooperation. Power politics (i.e. classical realism) would find it hard to explain these developments. It rejects the idea of interstate cooperation, since states cannot put its security in the faith of others.

Kenneth Waltz’s (1979) important work *Theory of International Politics* have provided neorealism with an extensive systemic theory of international relations. Waltz, in contrast to Hobbesian (i.e. classical) realism, does not compare states with humans. Accordingly, Waltz argues that states are shaped by domestic factors and their capabilities (1979: 65, 105). While these aspects define the features of the state, it will still obliged to the same rules as other states – namely the anarchic world system, thus making state characteristics irrelevant. The world system is shaped by structure, and structure is created by the most influential actors in the system (Ibid:
The theory of polarity is evident in neorealist scholarship, and theorizing on the world structure, such as bipolarity or unipolarity, has been evident during the past decades (Donnelly 2005: 38-9). To conclude Waltz (1979): survival is the main concern of states; states seek to balance their relative power toward other states; the most influential actors will define the structure of the system; while states might find in their interest to at times cooperate, this will only be a temporary solution. Albeit the imperfections of neorealism, such as its focus on power and disregard of international cooperation, it has the advantage of being a full-grown theory. Rather than describing a certain phenomena, neorealist theory explains events and features of the international system (Hyde-Price 2006: 219).

3.2.1 Neorealism and the European Union
Waltz has made the most extensive attempt to explain the systemic level of international relations. However, what is gained in breadth is often lost in depth. While some constructivists have utilized Wendt’s theory of the systemic level, many have incorporated a more holistic approach when analyzing international relations. In the same way as Wendt, Waltz’s systemic theory has not gone without criticism or modifications. As Waltz stays true to the prerequisites of anarchy and power-balancing – neorealists differ in their definition of interstate cooperation, the importance of structures, and the concept of power. Unfortunately, Waltz has never attempted to explain the EU, but has argued that the inequalities from cooperation will prevent states from joining close partnerships. By inequalities Waltz refer to the different gains the states will acquire from cooperation, meaning that state A will not do something that would solely benefit state B based on an agreement to cooperate – states are seeking relative gains rather than absolute (1979: 105-6).

Yet, the major challenge would of course be on how to use neorealist theory when analyzing the EU, when its polity that is not a traditional state, and does not have a conventional army. Kenneth Glarbo identifies two types of realist studies on the EU (1999: 634-5). First, studies that emphasize a strict interpretation of intergovernmentalism and the CFSP, meaning that nation states are the main actors, rather than seeing the EU as a whole. Second, studies that explain the success of joint
actions as exceptions, where nation states are coincidental cooperating on policy matters in relation to their national interest. These joint actions, according to realists, will merely produce “demarches or declaratory diplomacy” (Ibid: 635) – contrasting to physical actions, such as sanctions or the use of force. Thus, realist analysis often have a ‘negative’ bias when analyzing the EU, setting out to prove that the EU is not a cohesive actor, not global in reach, and not successful in achieving its goals.

While few scholars have used neorealist theory in a productive fashion when analyzing EU’s external relations – Andrew Moravcsik and Joseph Grieco have made great efforts to explain European integration using neorealist theory (Rosamond 2000: 133, 136). They have been able to show, using different case studies (Grieco 1995; Moravcsik and Nicolaidis 1999), that European integration are at times being formulated through interstate bargaining rather than the effects of functional spill-over. In the words of Ian Bache and Stephen George: “there is evidence that each [theory] makes a contribution in relation to different issues and on different levels of analysis” (2006: 532). Thus, whereas neofunctionalism has been able to explain the developments within some policy areas, intergovernmentalism has proven successful in others. Moreover, this is the very reason why so many scholars and observers are struggling to explain the developments of the EU. The empirics will support different theories from time to time, making any general conclusion hard to make.

Given the above mentioned constraints: is neorealist theory able to analyze the developments of EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy? A state will act rationally according to neorealist theory, meaning that it will act in its self-interest to achieve power or security. Offensive realism claims that states will aggressively seek to maximize its power, whereas defensive realism emphasizes the pursuit of power to obtain security (Collard-Wexler 2006: 399-400). The Union have a framework for foreign and security cooperation (CFSP), it has a security strategy (ESS), it has obliged to help any of its members being attacked by a foreign state, and it is currently involved in military and policing operations (Howorth 2005: 180, 192, 197). However, neorealists like Bull and Moravcsik have strongly rejected the idea of the EU in terms of a security or defense alliance (cited in Howorth 2005: 181). Howorth (2005) is however able to show that the EU is indeed a security community with a
possibility to become a defense community. The European polity is an eclectic system of intergovernmental and supranational institutions, as well as the member states themselves. Their cooperation is formalized through a number of treaties as well as unwritten rules. The CFSP was set up through the Treaty of the European Union (TEU) in 1992, and later amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999. These treaties declare that the CFSP is an intergovernmental pillar, meaning that its member states, and not supranational institutions, have authority within the area of foreign and security policy (Bache and George 2006: 522-3). Consequently, the CFSP is a framework where the members of the EU\(^6\) have jointly formulated the terms of cooperation within the area of foreign, security and defense policy. This could be interpreted as its members have formed a security community, at the least – and a defense community, at the most. The two treaties have indeed led to a more cohesive framework in terms of foreign and security policy (Bache and George 2006: 523).

The differences within neorealism should of course not be regarded as a weakness, but as an intellectual diversity. Failing to explain the high level of European integration, neorealism is still struggling to explain the developments of the post-Cold War international system – a system, which thus far seem to be neither unipolar nor multipolar. While the bipolar system was restricted by a stalemate and zero-sum games, a multipolar system will be dependent on states’ ability to form alliances to thwart the influence of the other power (Waltz 1979: 165-6). As the issue of polarity remains unsolved, the balance-of power thesis is still valid and holds explanatory power when analyzing IR. Neorealism can be read in various ways and do have the possibility to explain the EU, as we shall see below.

3.2.2 European Power-Balancing
Whereas “decisions are shaped by the very presence of other states as well as by interactions with them” – “it is not possible to understand world politics simply by looking inside of states” (Waltz 1979: 65). Waltz’s aim is to show a consistency of the prerequisites in the international systems and the laws regulating state behavior. The anarchic nature of the international system forces its units to seek security in a

\(^6\) With the exception of Denmark who has opt-out from the European Security and Defense Policy.
self-help system, thus balancing its relative power and/or competing over relative gains with other states (Ibid: 105, 107). Although unable to change the static prerequisites of the international system, the most powerful actors are able to set the characteristics of the system in the sense of polarity (Ibid: 72). While the system is restricted by anarchy and power-balancing, a unipolar system will be very different from a multi or bipolar one. For example, a multipolar system will consist of a scattered mosaic of different interests and alliances – while a bipolar one will be restricted to a zero-sum game, where one’s lost will be the other’s gain (Ibid: 169, 171).

The theory of power-balancing is central in the neorealist scholarship. Thus, an explanation of the concept of power is acquired to clarify this theory. When discussing neorealism, the conception of power is often mistaken for the Hobbesian notion of power, which of course relies on military capabilities. This essay will however use Waltz definition of power summarized as follows (1979: 194-5):

1) Power provides a mean to remain independent from others’ power;
2) increased power provides wider means for action, while still leaving the outcomes of those actions uncertain;
3) more power equals more security;
4) great power for a state means greater reasonability in the international system.

Thus, Waltz argues that although a state might enjoy great power, its actions will still be uncertain. Furthermore, power is not restricted to military capabilities, but the ability to influence other actors.

How then, can neorealist theory be applied on the case of EU’s CFSP? As argued in the above sections, the CFSP is a framework for inter-state foreign and security cooperation. The EU is not a defense community yet, but it does have the possibility to evolve in that direction (Howorth 2005: 197). The member states of the EU are cooperating within the field of foreign and security policy, they are trying to project their power externally, combining their individual power will raise their collective power. While counterarguments can be raised, concerning EU’s effectiveness and the surrender of sovereignty, its members are still pursuing this policy objective – and thus become more effective as time passes. This essay does not measure policy
objectives by its success, but by its purpose. Thus far, neorealists have not successfully defined the contemporary world system according the theory of polarity. Due to recent developments and claims of the rising of new powers (e.g. China, India, and Brazil)\textsuperscript{7}, scholars seem hesitant to label our current polarity. This essay shall not attempt to define the world system but will not regard the system to be unipolar, but rather a premature version of multipolarity. Thus, the hypothesis is formulated as follows:

The EU is a polity whereby sovereign states are cooperating in order to gain political and economic power, which in the light of neorealism and this essay will be perceived as an alliance. Further, the CFSP is an attempt by EU’s member states to cooperate and thus combine their powers in order to balance an external threat and/or power. Given the overt nature of CFSP statements, this should give us an indication on what or whom the EU wishes to balance against.

3.3 Summary

The theoretical framework presented here will be used to analyze the empirical findings of the next chapter, the analysis of the two theories’ hypotheses are presented in Chapter 5. While neorealism and constructivism diverge on many issues, they both tend to say that the EU will use its power to balance toward external power/powers. Constructivist scholars have been keen to emphasize the EU’s will to balance American influence in the international system using its normative power. The neorealist argument used in this essay says that the EU could be analyzed as a strategic alliance, thus trying to balance other powers in a multipolar world. While being an unorthodox argument to make, the idea is to challenge the authority of constructivism relating to EU as a global actor, while at the same time highlight the

\textsuperscript{7} For a discussion on rising powers, see Khanna 2008.
shortcomings of neorealist theory in relation to the European polity in the international system.
4 CFSP Developments 2003-2005

This chapter will disclose the empirical findings from codifying the official CFSP statements between 2003 and 2005. All statements have been retrieved from the Council of the European Union’s website. In total, this study has codified 435 statements, covering over 25 different topics, 97 sovereign states, 7 nations, as well as regional and international organizations. The findings presented here is the analysis of the data gathered rather than the raw data. It is presented both in a narrative as well as by tables and charts.

4.1 Codifying the CFSP

The CFSP statements were accessed through the Council’s website and read in chronological order. After reading each statement the content were interpreted and transferred to a table where the statement’s number, addressee, areas, and additional comments were taken down. Rather than having predefined areas when codifying the data, the study utilized the explicit language found in the official statements to create areas (i.e. subjects/topics). For example: if a statement refers to the electoral proceedings in Togo, while at the same time questioning the freedom of the press, but also accredited the government for constructive developments within the area of rule of law – it would be codified as shown in Figure 4.1. Thus, as more CFSP statements were codified, new areas were identified. The names of the areas are in all cases, except one (see below), the exact formulations found in the documents. The employed method was possible due to the existing language consistency.
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8 URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/>
The area exempted from method of language consistency is the area of “Diplomacy”. While at times the CFSP statements refer to diplomatic actions, it also treats actions related to diplomatic activity without mentioning the exact phrase of diplomacy. An example of this would be if the EU were trying to encourage dialogue or cooperation between two belligerents or states. Such cases (which are relatively few), the statement have been interpreted before codified. This means that the researcher’s subjective perception of diplomacy is included in the raw data. To make this process as lucid as possible, the following definition of diplomacy has been incorporated when making such subjective judgments:

“[T]he established method of influencing the decisions and behaviour of foreign governments and peoples through dialogue, negotiation, and other measures short of war or violence.”

(Britannica Online Encyclopedia)

Several of the CFSP statements are meant to condemn what the EU perceives as wrongdoings, while others are meant to encourage positive developments. Worth noting is that the positive or negative nature of each statement has not been taken into account. To explain this argument we can use the example of when the EU uses its economic power as a foreign policy instrument. Economic incentives and sanctions are used interchangeably when the EU tries to change the behavior of states (Smith 2005: 58). Hence, considering the positive or negative nature of a statement makes
little sense when analyzing CFSP, instead the focal point is the particular policy area and addressee.

4.2 Systematizing the Data

While employing a quantitative method for this study, the data is to be regarded as an indication rather than a statistical ‘proof’. The statements are decoded into a number of markers, each marker representing the area addressed. In total, over a thousand such markers have been taken down. To make sense of these markers one needs to organize the data according to a framework enabling analysis and simplifying comparison. Since the study set out to explain the changes of the CFSP during 2003-2005, the data needs to be organized based on annual developments, geographical scope, actors, and areas of policy. The following section will explain how the framework is justified and address its weaknesses and strengths.

4.2.1 The CFSP Areas

As explained in the introductory part of this chapter, the CFSP statements have been codified in regard to the particular areas the document address. Table 4.1 shows the 25 areas identified by this study. The areas are presented in an ascending numbering beginning with “Good Governance/Democratization”, which the most frequently addressed area, while “Natural Disasters” is the least frequent one, within the period 2003 to 2005.

Table 4.1 serves as a benchmark for EU’s CFSP because it gives an indication of the different areas of interest. While one could be tempted to rank or grade the areas, it would generate little meaning without understanding the particular context of each category and addressee. Analyzing the data in detail would mean that the study would become qualitative rather than quantitative. Whilst this might be the preferred method in some cases, this essay does not have the resources to do so; nor is it desirable since the study looks at change over time.
Table 4.1 CFSP Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Areas*</th>
<th>Geographical Areas*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Democratization</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Prevention</td>
<td>Russia and former Soviet republics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights/Rule of Law</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateralism/Cooperation</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>The Middle East + Arab World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Penalty</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Untied States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Proliferation/WMD</td>
<td>International Organizations/Tribunals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War on Drugs/Organized Crime</td>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Areas that are also explicitly mentioned in the ESS 2003

4.2.2 Systemizing the Data

As mentioned earlier, given the amount of data gathered it becomes hard to conduct an analysis without some kind of systemization or simplification. This means that the raw data will be subjected to its second diffusion (as mentioned in Chapter 2). Systemizing the data is however necessary in order to make the miscellaneous data comprehensible. The first two steps of this process is to categorize the areas found in the statements, and divide the addressees according to different geographical areas – the results from this process is shown in Table 4.2.
As revealed by Table 4.2, the 25 CFSP areas are fused into 10 “Policy Areas”. This does not mean that data is lost, since its original value is kept fixed. It does however mean that the forthcoming presentation of the data will be simplified and now included into one of the ten policy areas. This is possible since many of the areas relates to one another. For example, the areas of Peacebuilding/keeping/making, Armed Conflict/Violence, Kidnapping/Murders, Humanitarian Crisis, Refugees, Cope d'état/Armed Revolt, and Natural Disaster, are now combined into the Policy Area of “Conflict Prevention”. While it could be questioned that murders have little to do with Conflict Prevention, these types of unfortunate events relate to the overall situation in the country addressed (in the context of CFSP statements). Out of the 25 areas found in Table 4.1 – which are all the explicit language found in the CFSP statements – 15 can be found in the European Security Strategy (ESS 2003). If one would make the same comparison with Table 4.2 – where the areas have been categorized – the result would be that 9 out of 10 are covered in the ESS (the exception being the death penalty). This observation is important to bear in mind when the empirical findings will be analyzed in Chapter 5.

4.2.3 Geography
Creating geographical regions is a complex matter; the process of systemization could create an anomalous effect on the analysis. In this study of the CFSP, it is possible to say that Africa, as a ‘region’, annually attracts the most number of statements. However, without understanding the delimitation of that particular geographical region, as well as the implications are from doing such a division, this statement makes little sense. One needs to ask what the benefits and constraints are, when addressing regions rather than individual states. The benefits relates to the process of analyzing clusters of information from the quantitative data. It enables the researcher to understand patterns connected to geographical regions. Not only concerning the data itself, but it also reveals EU’s field of interest in each region.

To claim that the states in South America belong to the region of South America seems straightforward. Albeit South America serves as an example where the process of geographical definition seems simple – issues arises when trying to decide the
‘borders’ of a region such as the Middle East. This region often refers to a Western political presumption, rather than states actually having a regional cooperation scheme or any equivalent. The easiest way to go about this issue would of course be to adopt a European framework for classifying these regions. Unfortunately, there is no such framework. This becomes an issue since the implication would be that a particular region appears to either attract more attention from the EU; is subjected to more conflict; or receives less economic sanctions. Geographical generalizations raise the potential of neglecting the particular variables. Thus, the ambiguity of the general conclusions concerning geographical areas should be kept in mind when reading the analysis.

The CFSP does not address regions in particular. Thus, the issue of the regional systematization should not be exaggerated; it is merely a way to highlight the different characteristics between different geographical and political areas. Given that this study will use the same geographical regions as Strønvik (2005), enhances the possibility for comparison. It could be argued that a more exhaustive geographical division could generate a more precise analysis. However, the purpose of this study is not to define geographical regions. The benefits from enabling comparison with Strønvik exceed the benefits from having a more exhaustive geographical division.

4.3 CFSP – General Findings

The general findings of this essay correlate with many other empirical studies on the EU (e.g., Smith 2008; Strønvik 2005). The main areas of interest are good governance and democratization, conflict prevention, human rights and rule of law, as shown in Figure 4.2. Furthermore, the statements often emphasize the use of international organizations, regional cooperation, or multilateral efforts. As Smith notes, however, the EU refrains from addressing influential organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) or Organization of American States (OAS). This is explained by EU’s reluctance to support regional groupings with a present hegemon (Smith 2008: 82). This study has found several cases where the EU
supports regional initiatives, as in the case of the Great Lakes region in Africa, or the Central American states – however, organizations such as ASEAN are not mentioned within the studied period.

Figure 4.2 shows the different policy areas; in general, they indicate no particular pattern. There is no consistency between the areas’ declines or increases when comparing the three years. However, it is worth noting that good governance and the promotion of democratic institutions increased with over 50 percent between 2003 and 2005. The gradual decrease in the area of Conflict Prevention correlates with the actual decrease of major armed conflicts in the world reported in the SIPRI Yearbooks (Dwan and Gustavsson 2004; Dwan and Holmqvist 2005; Holmqvist 2006). This study is not able to show a casual relationship between the increase of good governance statements and the decline of conflict prevention statements. However, as states move from conflict to a post-conflict setting – reasonably, the focus shifts from conflict prevention to the statements concerning good governance and democracy. While it might not be possible to establish a causal relationship between the two, it is a possible explanation.
In 2004, a new policy area emerged, namely development and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The EU stressed the importance of *sustainable development* for Africa (as a region) and importance of the African Union (AU) to implement the new framework. This particular policy area rose from zero statements in 2003, to twelve in 2005. Another interesting sign is the apparent disability to produce diplomatic statements/actions in 2003, a year signified by the European clash over the American-led invasions of Iraq and implementation of ESS. The subsequent year, 2004, appear to be a counter-reaction to the previous year with 28 statements, an increase of almost two-hundred percent.

Compared to the other regions, Africa attracted twice as many statements. In general, these statements are confined to the areas of conflict prevention and good governance. The distribution of statements between the different regions is shown in Table 4.3.
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While statements addressing Africa together with Russia and the Former Soviet republics peaked in 2004 – both showing a similar pattern over time – no other region demonstrates this consistency. In 2004, the Middle East shows quite a large decrease in statements. One might be inclined to think that the decrease is a reaction to the
invasion of Iraq; an attempt by the EU to appear as the opposite to the US – consistent with the constructivist hypothesis. Or, it could be related to European disagreements on how to approach the region. However, when analyzing the actual data on the Middle East, it is revealed that half of the statements made in the previous year related to the Israel/Palestine conflict. As the 2004 Israeli offensive began in Gaza, the EU apparently decided to restrain from public statements. There is of course the possibility that the public statements were replaced by demarches. Furthermore, because of the demarches secretive nature they cannot be subjected to any quantitative analysis. According to Smith, however, the EU submitted 606 demarches in 2003, and 292 in 2005 – a remarkable decrease (2008: 64).

Out of the top ten countries, eight are situated in Africa as shown in Figure 4.4. Belarus and Nepal are the only non-African states, both struggling with issues ranging over the whole spectrum of EU’s policy areas. However, this is not a unique feature of Belarus and Nepal. All states in the top-ten represent areas experiencing violent conflict or post-conflict situations. Besides Liberia, all of the states at hand were at the time governed by non-democratic institutions or autocratic leaders.

Figure 4.4 Most frequent addressees
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4.3.1 Conclusions – General Findings
The general conclusions of this study are exemplified by the three charts presented in this section. The European focal point is related to the promotion of good governance and the prevention of violent conflict. It is apparent that the EU believes that this is done through the usage of international and regional cooperation, based on the rule of law and human rights. In 2004, a new policy area emerges, putting development and the MDGs on EU’s agenda. While diplomatic statements lagged behind in 2003, the following year compensates for this shortage. One might be inclined to draw presumptuous conclusions, correlating with the employed theories in this essay – but the changes in the CFSP have been explain by other variables thus far.

4.4 CFSP – Specific Findings
Whereas the previous section presented the general finding of the CFSP 2003-2005, the forthcoming section intends to highlight data related to the research questions and the generated hypotheses. The section starts with a comparison with the findings of Strömvik (2005), followed by the specific findings in relation to particular addressees and the two theories employed.

4.4.1 Detecting Change
Without access to the raw data analyzed by Strömvik, it becomes hard to make a fair comparison between the two studies. Yet, the analysis of the respective studies can be compared to see if there are any indications of similar patterns or detectable change. Strömvik’s (2005) study covers 30 years compared to this study’s 3 years. Until now, the general findings of this study have displayed rather inconsistent patterns of the CFSP. The extensive study of Strömvik, however, demonstrates how policy areas often fluctuate throughout the years (2008: 66). As policy areas fluctuate, it becomes
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9 Has the character of the CFSP statements changed when compared to previous years; is the EU trying to construct an identity opposite to the US when engaging in foreign relations; and is the EU trying to balance toward external threats or powers?
difficult to show change in this study, the three-year timeframe appears to be too limited for detecting major changes.

Strömvik argues that the CFSP statements analyzed during 1971-1999, are a reaction to crisis, rather than attempts to prevent them (2008: 58). Conversely, this study has found several cases where the EU shows a high adaptation to changed conditions. To illustrate this Zimbabwe serves as a good example: Zimbabwe has annually attracted six statements during 2003-2005. At first, it seems, as the situation in the country has remained unchanged given the constant ratio of statements. However, when studying the data carefully, it becomes clear that the statements have undertaken a considerable alteration. In table 4.3, the changes within each area are displayed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Governance/Democracy</th>
<th>Conflict Prevention</th>
<th>Human Rights/Rule of Law</th>
<th>Multilateralism/Cooperation</th>
<th>MDGs/ Development</th>
<th>Diplomacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When contrasted against a report by the International Crisis Group, it becomes apparent that the developments of the CFSP statements are consistent with the domestic developments in Zimbabwe (ICG 2010). Thus, the EU was closely monitoring the situation before the violent outbreaks and then reacted correspondingly with more direct actions through different diplomatic measures. The case of Zimbabwe is typical for several other states within the studied period of 2003-2005. Belarus, Burma, and Liberia, all show the same pattern of contextual change and a corresponding reaction from the EU. Whereas exceptions to this observation will persist – it is important to note that the EU does act preventively.
Strömvik identifies three periods showing a substantial change in the CFSP: 1981, 1991, and 1995-1996 (2005: 77). In addition, there are five more periods where some aspects of the CFSP have changed. Examples of this are changes in frequency, geographical coverage, and policy instruments used. This study has not found indications that a remarkable change in the CFSP has occurred during the period of 2003-2005. Each year has produced some 140 statements, and the number of states addressed is kept around 60. The general shifts indicate an altered global and domestic context rather than the implications of a new strategy or a large clash between EU’s member states.

4.4.2 CFSP – Identity and Normative Power
According to the constructivist theory used in this essay, the European Union tries to balance its power toward the most influential actor in the international system, namely the United States. The argument is supplemented by the theory of EU’s normative power, politicizing the abolition of the death penalty (Manners 2002). Will the data in this study support the constructivist arguments? There are of course various ways that the EU could try to balance toward the US – producing declarations within the CFSP framework is merely one way.

Manners’s argument of normative-power-Europe is partially supported by this study. The EU has produced two statements in relation to the US and the use of death penalty: one in 2003 and one in 2005. However, in 2003 alone, the US executed as many as 65 individuals (Death Penalty Information Center 2010). Thus, in relation to Manners’s argument, the European reaction seems very moderate. If the EU truly wished to appear as Americas opposite, it would be reasonable to say that the Union would have taken more advantage of the high number of executions in the US.

In total, the CFSP condemns 18 cases where the death penalty has been used. Besides Europe, all other regions are at some point addressed with an average of three statements per region. However, it could be argued that in order for the EU to condemn the usage of death penalty by autocratic governments, it also needs to criticize the US. Though, it must be stressed that the US on an average generates very few statements – making the critique of the death penalty a substantial part of the
statements addressing the US. In total, the US is addressed on six occasions in this study: besides the two related to the death penalty, one supports the American war on terror (in 2003); one expresses concern about the poor situation in Iraq (in 2004); and two express contempt for the American refusal to become a signatory of the International Criminal Court (ICC) (in 2004).

Without exaggerating the indications of the data, it is possible to say that the EU targets areas and issues that correlate with the objectives proclaimed in the ESS (2003). The usage of multilateral organizations and international law is clearly expressed in the ESS. It also comments on the importance to respect these prerequisites when engaging in international relations, regardless of how powerful the US might be. The data relating to constructivism are inconclusive. The theory can be partially supported, but it cannot be verified. When comparing the number of statements relating to the US with other states, it shares a 14th position together with Russia, Azerbaijan, Haiti, Ukraine and Bolivia – not the ordinary states associated with the United States.

4.4.3 CFSP – The Power-Balancing Alliance
Mainstream neorealists might find it hard to understand why the CFSP should be analyzed in the context of neorealist theory since it involves little use of military force. This is central to neorealist theory and the remark is duly noted. A security alliance such as the EU would try to balance its military power against external threats. However, as observed by the SIPRI Yearbook of 2005, none of the major conflicts were interstate conflicts (Dwan and Holmqvist 2005). Currently, a military invasion of Europe seems very unlikely, thus shaping the European perception of external threats. Therefore, the analysis of the CFSP is of importance since it gives an understanding of Europe’s perceived threats. Additionally, it reveals EU’s relationship with other powers in the international system.

If the EU is to be regarded as an alliance, it is a reaction toward external treats. As a result, the EU will try to balance its power against other powers, and try to gain influence in international relations. Powerful actors in the contemporary world system would be the old superpowers, such as the United States and Russia; and
rising powers, such as China, India, and Brazil. However, Brazil is never mentioned within the studied period; and India is addressed in the context of its relationship and conflict with Pakistan – placing the United States, Russia, and China in the limelight. China has a number of border disputes with neighboring countries – an issue resulting in several statements in the cases of Taiwan, Nepal, and Tibet. In addition, China is often criticized for its poor human rights record, and the usage of the death penalty. Russia shows a somewhat similar pattern when compared to China: The CFSP statements are regularly commenting on the domestic conditions in Russia, as well as armed conflicts relating to Russian interests. Its relationship with Georgia, Russia’s influence in Northern Caucasus, and the war in Chechnya are mentioned in several statements. The EU’s efforts to enhance the domestic conditions in Russia was further formalized through the initiation of ‘human rights consultations’ in 2005 (Smith 2008: 135). EU’s relationship with the US has already been discussed in the previous section. It should however be noted that the issues addressed by the EU correlates with the arguments made by Robert Kagan (2004). The EU urges the US to use multilateral institutions and respect international law (ESS 2003: 1, 9). While Kagan’s arguments are not subjected to a substantial empirical study, they correlate with what Kagan refers to as the different conceptions of power (2004: 10-11). Thus, the EU tries to use its non military instruments to balance American influence.

4.5 Conclusions

Making sense of data is a challenging task where it is hard to detect single causalities. The general finding of this study indicates a correlation with previous empirical studies, but it has also produced alternative explanations. Compared to Strömvik’s study, it is apparent that this study of the CFSP would have benefited from covering a more extensive period. However, the exercise has been productive in relation to the proclaimed hypotheses in three ways: First, the CFSP is an overt way for the EU to communicate its position on foreign policy matters. It gives an indication of the areas of interest, as regards to both policy and geography. This makes it possible to subject
a general description of the EU to theories of IR. Second, it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the many descriptive theories generated by constructivism. As seen in the cases of the death penalty, other states than the US are being criticized for its usage. The US attracts a rather small part of these statements, which could be explained as an attempt from the EU to act consistently, regardless of addressee. Third, the findings suggest that these types of studies are of importance since they reveal the development of EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. Rather than making qualified guesses, the data indicates policy areas and states that are of importance to the EU. It also shows that the ESS is an important framework for the CFSP given the high correlation between them.
5 Analysis

This section will address the two research questions posed in Chapter 1 and test the hypotheses generated in Chapter 3. Since the latter needs to be answered before the former, the chapter will begin with examining how the two hypotheses relate to the presented empirics.

5.1 Explaining the CFSP – A Constructivist Approach

Constructivist theory diverges from mainstream IR since it does not regard the prerequisites for the international system to be static. Instead, the rules of the game are socially constructed by the actors themselves. The European Union is seen as a *sui generis* polity, constantly evolving through new amendments to its treaties resulting in further integration and coherence. Bretherton, Vogler and Reus-Smit argue that the identity of an actor will guide its political decisions. Thus, the CFSP statements presented in the previous chapter are a product of EU’s identity – according to constructivism. Kagan argues that the EU uses its non-conventional power (in Kagan’s case, legitimacy) to influence American behavior. While the two theories at first appear related, constructivists would argue that EU’s use of non-conventional power is not because it lacks military power, but the result of an increased importance of non-material structures. Voicing European norms and positions through the CFSP therefore is an instrumental tool for the EU when engaging in foreign relations.

Since the beginning of the European Communities, there have been several different schemes on political cooperation. While these remains important for an understanding of European integration, i.e. European studies – Strömvik (2005) has been able to show how advances in the CFSP are the result from changes in the
international system. Of these changes, the end of the Cold War is the most important catalyst. In the light of the events of 2003, the aim of this essay is to find out if the transatlantic clash, and division between ‘old and new’ Europe produced any changes in the EU’s CFSP. The second invasion in Iraq led to a decline of American soft power internationally, according to Joseph Nye (2004: xii). Furthermore, the EU as an alternative power to the US became more obvious than ever (Ibid: 78). Given the large shifts of international power, legitimacy and influence in the aftermath of 2003 – the period of 2003-2005 should reveal changes in the CFSP. This section will examine the explanatory power of constructivism according to the hypothesis generated in Chapter 3 and the overall description of the EU, hence:

- Do the CFSP statements support the hypothesis that the EU tries to balance American influence?

5.1.1 Assessing Constructivism
The general findings disclosed in the previous chapter stated several observable changes, although not as large as those detected in Strömvik’s study. According to constructivist theory, the EU acts as an opposing power to the US, utilizing its normative power and resources. Thus, the changes in the CFSP should be a result of the European identity and the will to counter American influence. The years of 2003-2005 were not chosen because of a probability of a great leap, but for the possibility of change in relation to the US. This could cause a stagnation or a decrease of statements (due to the internal clashes), or an increase (seizing to opportunity to appear as the ‘other’).

The analysis of the data gather by this study remains inconclusive. Whereas the US is addressed on six occasions, two relating to the use of death penalty and two on the ICC, it remains difficult to claim the EU is actually trying to balance the US based on these six statements. The limited occurrence of statements relating to the US is troubling for maintaining the argument that the EU is in fact balancing American influence. To make such a claim possible, it would be necessary to identify what
Europeans believes to be American values. Unfortunately, this essay does not have the resources to do such a comparison.

While this study has no intention to prove Manners wrong, the claim that the death penalty is used as a source of normative power is questionable; at least concerning EU’s behavior and influence in the international system. However, as mentioned earlier, EU’s foreign relations are not confined to the CFSP statements. And compared with Strömvik’s (2005) study, statements addressing the US have risen.

The CFSP remained almost unchanged in frequency and addresses during the three years covered by this study. Many of the observed changes can be related to the changes in context, relating to each individual case. However, what did change was EU’s promotion of good governance/democracy, which displayed a fifty-percent increase between 2003 and 2005. This particular policy area includes the subcategories of good governance, democratization, electoral procedures, and freedom of speech/media. Is the increase in these areas explained by EU’s will to appear as an American opposite then? As mentioned above, this would imply that the US does not support such values, or at least does not try to promote them in the international system. However, the areas relating to good governance and democracy are at the center of any developed democracy. Furthermore, they are not exclusively European values, but fundamental to Western liberal democracy. What is remarkable though, is the apparent increase in statements. As the American-led invasion of Iraq commenced and US legitimacy declined, the EU intensified its effort to promote its liberal values. While one cannot talk about a causal relationship, there is at least an interesting connection between the two.

5.2 Explaining the CFSP – A Neorealist Approach

Neorealism has a long tradition of analyzing international relations. This essay has employed the theory according to neorealist arguments, but in a somewhat unorthodox way. It has been argued that the EU is a single entity, which according to
neorealism and neorealists (e.g., Grieco 1995; Moravcsik 1999) would be a great overstatement. These scholars describe the cooperation between EU’s member states, as a product of sovereign nation-states’ bargaining processes. At times, the members will find it in their interest to cooperate, they will however always be guided by their national interest – rather than having a collective identity. This essay does not necessarily say otherwise, but it does diverge on how to perceive the European Union in the international system. The issue is connected to the level of analysis. While Grieco and Moravcsik use intergovernmentalism to explain the European cooperation – this essay analyses the EU in an international context.

Hitherto, it cannot be established whether the international system is unipolar, multipolar, or in a state of ambivalence. In a multipolar system, Waltz makes it very clear that states will conform to strategic alliances. To think of the EU as a defense community is not new, and ideas of such nature dates back to the 1950s. Still, it is impossible to predict the potential outcomes of the European Union. While it is not suitable to speculate, it is a worthwhile exercise to analyze the EU as an alliance. The recent appointment of Catherine Ashton as the high representative of foreign affairs and security policy shows that EU’s endeavor to become more coherent, speaking with one voice, is progressing.

While scholars find it appropriate to circumvent state-centric theories, the aim of this essay is to see if neorealism essentially can be applied to the EU. Although the above argument can be subjected to critique, it is important to stress the fact that the EU could be regarded as an alliance in what is likely to become a multipolar world. Pursuing this argument led to the hypothesis that the EU, as an alliance, tries to balance toward external powers and/or threats, hence:

- Do the CFSP statements support the hypothesis that the EU tries to balance against external powers and/or threats?

### 5.2.1 Assessing Neorealism

Neorealism, in general, is preoccupied with the conception of power as the use of military assets. Yet, in the absence of war, neorealism argues that economic power is
used as a mean to influence other states and maintain relative gains. Since most neorealist scholarships focus on physical events and actions, the concept of actions vis-à-vis rhetoric needs to be discussed. Although not covered by this particular essay, the EU has launched several military and policing missions. When engaging in military interventions, the EU tends to oblige to the United Nation’s charter. Thus, the EU is building its capacity to engage in military operations. Furthermore, attempts to streamline the European defense industry are being made. Moreover, the EU has been very eager to challenge the US in a number of trade disputes in the WTO. These tangible actions and events should be exposed to empirical studies, which they also have been. But the overt nature of EU’s CFSP statements, as explained in Chapter 2, should generate an indication of EU’s perceived threats or its wish to balance against other states.

In the previous chapter, five states were discussed as possible adversaries to the EU: Brazil, India, China, Russia, and the US. India and Brazil are not yet capable to compete with the EU, but are often referred to as the rising powers in the new world order. Yet, the analyzed data on the CFSP never mentions Brazil. References to India relates to its relationship with Pakistan. This could have a number of explanations: the EU does not think it is important to balance against these two states; the EU does not engage in power-balancing; or the CFSP statements are inappropriate as a source to support the hypothesis. China, Russia and the US are all present in the data gathered on the CFSP statements. It is apparent that the EU disapproves of the treatment of the free media in Russia and the human rights violations in China. Both countries are criticized for its relations with neighboring states and fueling local conflicts. As far as the ESS is concerned, the Sino-European relationship is mentioned in terms of a strategic economic partnership; while Russia is seen as a cumbersome partner for regional security (EU 2003: 8, 14).

As an old superpowers, Russia is trying to regain (or reclaim) some of its lost power. Attempts to influence Europe and Russian display of power are revealed each winter in Europe when the supply of natural gas is turned off. Whereas energy dependence has attracted a lot of attention in recent years, the issue was raised in the ESS (EU 2003: 3). The strategy refers to Russia as one of Europe’s three main energy
suppliers (the other two being the Gulf [sic] and North Africa). Yet, the paragraph on energy dependence in the ESS is vague stating that it is of “special concern for Europe”, and that the EU will be more dependent on the imports of energy in the future (2003: 3). It should also be noted that energy dependence is presented in the section of “global challenges”, rather than in the section on “key threats”. While Russia is not referred to as a ‘threat’, there are several indications that the EU is trying to balance against Russian power. The Union is aware of its energy dependence on Russian supplies. The CFSP data revealed that the EU is concerned over Russia’s relations with the former Soviet republics. And the EU is trying to influence Russian behavior.
6 Conclusions

6.1 Analyzing the EU

The EU or the “moving target”, to paraphrase Bretherton and Vogler, is certainly testing the limitations of IR studies. There is a myriad of sources relating to the nature and actions of EU’s external activities. EU’s Common Agricultural Policy can be explored to theorize on dependency theory or ambiguous trade policies. The ESDP provides a framework for military and policing missions. The angles are almost unlimited, and the theories explaining EU’s actions overlap and complement each other. Moreover, the ESDP has showed a European proficiency in peacekeeping and post-conflict operations, creating stability in war-torn regions. Some observers might argue that the EU has not done enough, or should do less, or cannot to what it wants to do. These arguments will always be ideological in character, and it makes little sense to prove them right or wrong. This study’s ambition has been to use accessible data, together with a quantitive method to systemize these findings, in order to produce an empirical basis for theorizing. Two of the main theoretical perspectives in the field of International Relations have been employed to explain changes in EU’s CFSP. The exercise’s aim has been to compare two very different IR-theories’ explanatory power and to analyzing recent developments of the CFSP.

It is apparent that the EU will never be stronger than its members allow it to be, and it will always be weaker than the actual sum of its parts. Constituting the world’s largest economy and trading block, the EU cannot benefit from this position as a conventional nation state. The European Union depends on the collective will of its members. While some states are more influential than others are, it is impossible to generalize how European policy is formulated and implemented. Supranational institutions are able to effect European integration, and smaller states have shown ability to effect European policies. To quote Ian Bache and Stephen George: “there is
evidence that each [theory] makes a contribution in relation to different issues and on different levels of analysis” (2006: 532). Thus, the researcher needs to be very aware of the issues relating to the research at hand. Choosing between the different theoretical approaches is imperative to all academic study and will have profound effects on the end result. This is even more important when analyzing the EU, given its unconventional polity.

The level of analysis when studying the EU is, as Bache and George point out, crucial to European studies. In this essay, the EU has been regarded as a coherent actor, either as a security alliance or as a singular polity – both disregarding from the national-interest of individual member states. This has been a conscious decision since the CFSP is EU’s common framework for external relations. Rather than focusing on individual member states, the EU has been seen as an actor in the international system, equal to other powers.

6.2 Theory

Constructivist theory perceives the EU as an international actor, formulating policy in accordance with its European identity. Neorealism, conversely, sees the prerequisites for the international system as static. The anarchic environment in a self-help system forces the European states to form an alliance to balance external powers and threats – according to the arguments put forth by this essay. The two different approaches bring us to the interesting discussion on how theory relates to the European Union.

As mentioned earlier, mainstream neorealist will probably find it hard to accept the EU as a defense alliance, given its lack of military instruments. This argument is reasonable, given the centrality of military power in neorealist theory. However, besides the use of military force, Waltz extensively theorizes on the different aspects of power. Waltz’s argument on strategic alliances in a multipolar world is theoretically applicable to the European context. The idea of comparing neorealism and constructivism is not to praise one and reproach the other. There are benefits and
weaknesses regardless of what theory one chooses. The idea is to compare their respective explanatory powers in relation to the EU.

Social constructivism has found a sanctuary in the *sui generis* feature of the Union and has proven to be a very useful theoretical tool to circumvent state-centric ideas. While this might be convenient for constructivism, its theoretical claims need to be challenged and tested against empirics. The Union’s wish to appear as an opposite to American power is questionable. The idea itself is not very controversial, but the origin of the hypothesis is. Constructivism is unable to explain *why* the EU wants to balance the US. A state does not choose to balance the influence of another states based on altruistic motives. Weighing its resources and power against others would imply that the EU is a rational actor, an idea rejected by social constructivism. Unfortunately, this essay is insufficient to produce any answers concerning this complex issue. One needs to be aware of the newly developed theories and question their methodological basis; otherwise, the analysis of empirics will be misguided.

Realism is based on a positivistic methodology, using induction to generate laws about the Real World. Empirical observations are used to generate theory. The problem with this epistemology is that empirics not yet observed are of course not included in the theory. The extensive cooperation between the European states is unprecedented. Consequently, neorealism has been unable or unwilling to reflect on for these new prerequisites. Neorealism might not be ready to be applied to the EU. Its deterministic view of states in a constant battle over resources is also questionable. Still, theorizing on a EU, balancing its power against others in a multipolar world is rewarding. Neorealism is able to explain various elements of European behavior and actions. State-centric theories have reached stagnation as old concepts have yet to be revised in order to explain the contemporary international system (e.g., power, sovereignty, cooperation, and polarity).

It is important to stress that both hypotheses employed in this essay have flaws and their theoretical foundations need to be treated with respect. Whilst the method for collecting the data can be criticized, the analysis will be influenced by the theoretical approach. The field of IR has not produced an adequate theory explaining the behavior of the EU. More attention needs to be given to the development of
theory. Describing a particular context is useful, but not always helpful when trying to explain international relations. Why is the EU using norms in the international system? If it were meant to balance the influence of the US, this implies that the EU is seeking power in the international system. The argument of altruistic motives remains uncertain. Traditional theories sometimes become too theoretical, forgetting its purpose. It makes little sense using theory that is unable to explain contemporary changes. The American decline, the rising powers of Asia together with Brazil, the inability to explain European cooperation – all presents major challenges to the understanding of international politics. Without theory, the study of empirics makes very little sense, and produce narrative case studies unable to explain the overall development of the international system.

6.3 The Research Questions

This essay set out to answer two questions: a) when comparing the events of 2003 with previous years (1970-2002), have EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy in any way changed; and b) using the hypotheses generated by constructivism and neorealism to explain EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy, how do their respective explanatory power relate to one another?

The latter question has been discussed above. The conclusion of this discussion is that they both proven to inhibit strengths and weaknesses. Neorealism is helpful since it has the advantage of being a theory, rather than describing a phenomenon. Constructivism is able to move beyond old conceptions of power; military power is supplemented by normative power – expanding the tools available to IR students. Recent years have shown a decline in interstate wars, suggesting that military power as a tool in international relations indeed needs to be supplemented by other conceptions of power. The study of the CFSP has not shown undisputable facts when considering Europe as a security alliance trying to balance external threats; or the EU as a counterbalance to American values and influence. However, there are several indications that the Union thinks in strategic terms about its relationship with Russia.
and China. Hence, whereas they both are able to explain certain elements of the CFSP, neither theory is able to explain the diversity of the CFSP.

As discussed in Chapter 4, there are several, but inconsistent, changes in the CFSP. This particular period was chosen since it was thought to show a change in EU’s behavior as an international actor. However, in relation to Strömvik’s study, no such change could be detected. This could imply that the clash between old and new Europe was not as severe as observers claimed; or that the American led invasion of Iraq was not as important as was claimed in the introduction; or implementing the ESS did not make the EU more coherent.

6.4 Final Remarks

This essay set out to compare two very different theories of International Relations. The past decade, constructivism has been successful to circumvent state-centric theories, thus enabling it to analyze the EU as an actor in the international system. While this is a positive thing, it is important to remain critical to all academic writings. Neorealism is criticized of being deterministic, seeing the prerequisites of the international system as static, and the world in a constant struggle over power. Neither theory should go without critique, but the aim of this essay is to highlight their strengths and weaknesses to highlight issues relating to the study of the EU. Comparing the two theories have been a worthwhile task, although the findings generated by the two hypotheses remain inconclusive. Constructivism as an analytical tool for IR students and EU scholarship is very helpful, and the described identity correlates with the policy areas identified in the quantification of the CFSP. However, the claim that the EU is trying to balance the US using its normative power is questionable. It is apparent that the EU is trying to influence other powers in the international system. But it is also apparent that it is trying to influence other actors, which from a neorealist perspective should not be as important to the EU.
## Appendix 1

### 1 Africa
- AU (African Union)
- Great Lakes Region
- Algeria
- Angola
- Botswana
- Burundi
- Cameroon
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Comoros
- Côte d’Ivoire
- DRC
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Ethiopia
- Gambia
- Ghana
- Guinea Bissau
- Liberia
- Malawi
- Mauritania
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Namibia
- Nigeria
- Rwanda
- São Tome & Principe
- Senegal
- Sierra Leone
- Somalia
- South Africa
- Sudan
- Tanzania
- Togo
- Tunisia
- Uganda
- Zimbabwe

### 2 Russia and former Soviet republics
- Adjara
- Chechnya
- South Ossetia
- Armenia
- Azerbaijan
- Belarus
- Georgia
- Kazakhstan
- Kyrgyzstan
- Russia
- Tajikistan
- Turkmenistan
- Ukraine
- Uzbekistan

### 3 Asia
- Hong Kong
- Taiwán
- Bangladesh
- Burma
- Cambodia
- China
- East Timor
- Egypt
- India
- Indonesia
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Nepal
- North Korea
- Philippine
- Samoa
- Solomon Islands
- Sri Lanka
- Tibet
- Vietnam

### 4 South Americas
- SAC (South Americas Cooperation)
- Central America
- Argentina
- Bolivia
- Colombia
- Cuba
- Dominican Rep
- Ecuador
- El Salvador
- Guatemala
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Mexico

### 5 The Middle East + Arab World
- Middle East
- Palestine
- Afghanistan
- Iran
- Iraq
- Israel
- Lebanon
- Libya
- Pakistan
- Saudi Arabia
- United Arab Emirates
- Yemen

### 6 Europe
- Western Balkans
- Kosovo
- Albania
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Cyprus
- FYROM
- Moldova
- Montenegro
- Serbia
- Turkey

### 7 United States

### 8 International Organization/Tribunal
- ICC
- ICTY
- UN

### 9 Other
- EU
- Memory of 9/11
- Individuals

If a region or regional organization is addressed in a CFSP, they are presented at the top of the list. Any area or a nation who is not a recognized state, or could be questioned on its statehood, is presented in italic.
Appendix 2

1 Governance/Democratization:  
Good Governance / Democratization  
Electoral Procedures  
Freedom of Speech / Media

2 Conflict Prevention:  
Peacebuilding / keeping / making  
Armed Conflict / Violence  
Kidnapping / Murders  
Humanitarian Crisis  
Refugees  
Coup d'état / Armed Revolt  
Natural Disaster

3 Human Rights/Rule of Law:  
Human Rights  
Rule of Law  
International Law

4 Multilateralism/Cooperation:  
Multilateralism / NGO / IGO  
Regionalism / Regional Stability  
Partnership Agreements/Cooperation

5 Terrorism

6 Death Penalty

7 Development

8 Non Proliferation/WMD

9 War on Drugs/Organized Crime

10 Diplomacy  
Diplomacy  
Sanctions  
Demarche

11 Other
References


Strömvik, Maria (2005), *To Act as a Union: Explaining the Development of the EU’s Collective Foreign Policy*, Lund: Lund University.


**Online Sources**
