European Foreign Policy as a Research Field: An Historical and Conceptual Overview

Michael E. Smith
School of International Relations
University of St Andrews
mesmith@st-andrews.ac.uk

Paper prepared for delivery at the
April 2009 EUSA Conference
Los Angeles, CA

Note: This is an extended version of a review essay due to appear in the ISA Compendium Project volume on Foreign Policy Analysis. I am grateful to the editors and anonymous reviewers associated with that project for comments on earlier drafts.

The emergence of European foreign policy (EFP) as a distinct field of inquiry presents a number of challenges and opportunities to political scientists. As an increasing number of foreign policy issues relevant to European states now involve European Union (EU) policies and institutions, EFP as a research field can be defined most broadly as the study of how certain European states (most of which are now EU members) manage their foreign policy responsibilities, whether individually, through coordinated national foreign policies, or through EU policies and institutions. Given this breadth, EFP effectively comprises at least three major research fields, each with its own assumptions, priorities, and theoretical implications. The first involves traditional foreign policy analysis (FPA) or comparative foreign policy (CFP), and focuses on foreign policy processes within, and variation among, nation-states. The second involves standard theories of international relations (IR) or international cooperation, focusing in particular on the relationship between national preference formation and strategic interaction. And the third involves the study of European integration, where strict assumptions about national preference formation may be relaxed to a considerable degree, and where distinctly "European" factors – history, culture, operational experience, and institutions for example – often exert a stronger, though possibly more subtle, influence than assumed by classic theories of FPA or IR (Carlsnaes & Smith 1994; Hill 1998; Ginsberg 1999; Soetendorp 1999; Nuttall 2000; Tonra 2000a; White 2001; Carlsnaes 2004; Hill & Smith 2005).

As noted above, the critical link between these fields involves the growing role of the EU as a major reference point for "Europe," so much so that it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish "EU foreign policy" from "European foreign policy."[1] Each EU enlargement since

[1]The 1957 Treaty of Rome linked the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Atomic Energy Community, and the European Economic Community. Following common usage, I favour the term "EU" throughout this essay and refer to these Communities collectively

the 1970s has been accompanied by an expansion of the so-called *acquis politique*, or the common procedures and policies that govern EFP activities under the rubrics of the EU's foreign economic policies, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), and other foreign policies devoted to specific issues (the environment and human rights, for example) or regions (such as European Neighborhood Policy, or ENP). All EU member states are expected to support the common positions and joint actions devised in these fields, which calls into question the existence of a true dividing line between "national" and "EU/European" FPA. In addition, the fact that non-EU member states are allowed to participate in some EFP institutions and operations means they can be included in an analysis of EFP. Consequently, this essay takes for granted that EFP nearly always involves some degree of EU involvement or influence, though that influence can vary widely – from virtually none to quite considerable - depending on the topic at hand. Since this implies a continuum, so too must we recast the question of whether EFP as a specific research field must be considered a *sui generis* phenomenon. The answer is: it depends on how one addresses the balance between national and EU-level factors, whether in terms of policies or processes/behaviors. At each end of the continuum, there might be nothing unusual in the claim that EU member states or the EU as a unit possess and pursue foreign policy goals; however, if one looks closely at the middle ground between these extremes it appears that EFP does involve a unique mix of elements not found in other political systems, although many concepts applied to the topic can be applied to, or derived

---

as the European Community ("EC") only when the narrative requires a formal distinction between EU and EC affairs. Similarly, although the term "EFP" does not appear as such in the literature until the 1990s, I use it as a generic term to cover the large body of work cited in this essay and use more specific terms – such as EPC, CFSP, and ESDP – where relevant to the historical period or specific sources covered.

from, other political questions such as regional integration or international cooperation outside Europe.

For example, changes in the content and pursuit of EFP over the past several decades are a result of two larger trends not necessarily confined to Europe. The first involves the difficulty of distinguishing between domestic and international politics, as most domestic issues involve some degree of international influence (and vice-versa). The second involves the difficulty of distinguishing between economic and political affairs at both levels of analysis, domestic and international (Hocking and Spence 2002; Hill 2003; Jörgensen 2004). In EFP, these two problems are compounded by a uniquely regional - European - dynamic, often represented by a continuum ranging from "intergovernmental" to "supranational" decision-making, which refers to the balance between national and collective/EU influence in the realm of EFP. The most extreme intergovernmental position, which is closely related to realism, would focus almost exclusively on negotiations or bargains among EU member states, and concurrently exclude a decisive role for EU factors. The most extreme version of supranationalism, which has strong conceptual links to both liberalism and social constructivism, would generally argue that European influences strongly condition the formation and pursuit of what used to be national foreign policy decisions. In this sense it is difficult if not impossible to analytically disentangle purely "national" and purely "European" aspects of EFP. Moreover, in this view certain EU bureaucracies, particularly the European Commission, possess decisive autonomy and can assert their own EFP positions. Between these positions one can find a range of views in the literature.

In short, then, depending on one's theoretical priorities, the region-specific effects on foreign policy-making in Europe can range from none or minimal (i.e., pure power politics among stronger European states), to moderate (i.e., shared history, democratic traditions, the

involvement of institutions such as the EU, interdependence), to quite extreme (i.e., "Europe" as a critical, even dominant, normative reference point for all EFP participants). The problem, of course, is how to prioritize among these concepts and approaches: domestic/international, economic/political, and intergovernmental/supranational. In addition, there is still a fair amount of contestation over the very term "EFP" as I have approached it above; indeed, the question whether "a European foreign policy worthy of the name must await a federal European state" (Hill 1993: 316) is still very relevant for many analysts. Since there is no federal European "state" some scholars continue to question the basic existence of EFP, a curious point of view considering that the EU in fact possesses more coherence, policy tools, and unity of purpose than many states. Others have asserted that a "common" European foreign policy necessarily means a *single* policy (Gordon 1997/98); again, the fact that national foreign policies still co-exist with collective European policies greatly complicates our understanding of what actually comprises EFP as a policy domain and as a research field. Ultimately, one can therefore: 1) focus almost exclusively on national inputs and largely ignore or downplay collective or EU processes (a more realist/intergovernmental approach); 2) ignore or assume national processes/preferences and focus on collective/EU processes (a more liberal/institutionalist or social constructivist approach); or 3) attempt a more unified approach by linking national and European processes into a general theory of EFP.

As will be seen in this essay, which covers the historical and conceptual evolution of EFP as a research field, the expanding literature on the topic largely maintains this diversity of approaches and can be organized in multiple ways (for details, see White 1999; Tonra 2000; Carlsnaes 2004). It is therefore pointless to assert a single rigid definition of EFP that narrows the field to certain European states, certain EU institutions, or certain policy problems or issue-

areas; all of these aspects of EFP – and thus one's working definition of it – are highly contingent on how a specific research question is framed. There is however enough consensus among most EFP scholars to justify the existence of this research field within the broader context of FPA/IR. All students of EFP, for example, do seem to agree that the idea of Europe does inform the foreign policy decisions of European states, although they conceptualize "Europe" in many different ways. Many – though certainly not all - students of EFP would further agree that *global* metatheoretical systemic/structural approaches – whether realist or liberal or constructivist – are quite limited in explaining the dynamics of this research domain (White 1999), which further justifies the need to conceptualize "Europe" as a critical region-specific political dynamic. Systemic approaches by definition stress general pressures or constraints on the agency of various actors within the system; conversely, EFP involves precisely the ability and willingness of European states to assert their own agency against that system, but (increasingly) through collective processes and actions.

Thus, while one might apply any *single* theory as a starting point in an EFP analysis, inevitably one ends up employing factors and processes from other schools of thought to explain fully the processes and outcomes of EFP: realists often must pay more attention to common EFP reference points (whether institutions or policies or ideas); liberals must pay more attention to the role of certain powerful states or coalitions; and constructivists must pay more attention to non-ideational factors (such as material resources). One might even argue that EFP in fact involves the creation of a new type of European political space, whose boundaries vis-à-vis the global system vary and can be difficult to discern with monolithic theoretical approaches that privilege traditional views about foreign policy. As a result the conventional tools of FPA or IR, many of which adopt a strong instrumental rational choice perspective, might be inappropriate to certain

aspects of EFP (White 1999; Warleigh 2006). Finally, given the increasingly prominent role of EU inputs into foreign policy, which frequently involve socio-economic policy competences, many EFP scholars would argue for adopting a broad definition of "foreign policy" and, similarly, reject an exclusive or primary focus on military power or external threats to explain EFP. In short, then, the study of the relationship between EFP and national foreign policies seriously calls into question the virtues of stressing international or domestic factors over regional/European factors, whether manifested at the collective/EU level or among European states themselves.

I. The emergence of EFP

The emergence of EFP as a research field can be broken down into three major phases. These comprise: 1) traditional IR/FPA with some speculation regarding the potential for EFP (1950s-60s); 2) the first recognition of European foreign policy cooperation and some very limited conceptual innovation (1970s - early 1980s); and 3) the period surrounding the advent of the Single European Act (1986), which placed European foreign policy cooperation on a new institutional path that resulted in the reforms – and the emergence of EFP proper - under the Treaty on European Union. Within each of these periods, one can discern several major empirical themes, each of which has persisted to the present day EFP research agenda covered later in this chapter. These include: 1) the status of EFP political influence relative to other global actors, particularly the U.S.; 2) a seeming disconnect between EFP procedures and substance; 3) tensions between the economic/trade and political/security dimensions of EFP; and 4) the relative inputs of European states vs. EU institutional actors, particularly the European Commission. These empirical debates often provided the core material for emerging theoretical

debates about EFP as well, mainly in terms of realism vs. liberalism, then intergovernmentalism vs. institutionalism, then constructivism, normative theory, and beyond.[2]

A. Early years (1950s-60s)

What might be termed the pre-history of EFP as a research field generally involved a traditional approach to FPA involving European states, coupled with increasing attention to the foreign policy implications stemming from European economic integration under the original 1957 Treaty of Rome. However, some leading figures in European studies continued to raise questions about the possibility of EFP, though for quite different reasons. One of the key founding fathers of European integration studies, Ernst Haas, explicitly excluded foreign and security policy from his neo-functional logic of regional integration, which stressed "spillover" processes in socio-economic affairs (Haas 1961; Haas 1964). For Haas, although EFP in the form of trade or development policy was possible owing to the emerging single European market, he thought there was no explicit functional linkage to encourage the growth of the political/security aspects of EFP, or greater delegation of authority to institutions such as the Commission. Another key figure during this period, Stanley Hoffman, made a similar argument though from a somewhat different angle (Hoffman 1965; Hoffman 1966). He argued that deeply entrenched concerns over national sovereignty and autonomy would stifle foreign policy cooperation among European states. Although they might be willing to coordinate trade policy, European states were likely to retain their independence in foreign/security policy, and to pursue their involvement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) rather than any type of EFP arrangement, including the Western European Union (WEU). Thus, from an early stage we

[2]Space considerations prevent a detailed discussion of all approaches to EFP that appear in the literature; consequently, this essay deals only with the dominant themes.

can see a fair amount of pessimism about the potential for EFP from scholars associated with both liberalism (Haas) and realism (Hoffman).[3]

These views about the potential for EFP were supported with related work on European political "union" or "integration" during this period (Bodenheimer 1967; Lindberg 1970). However this term slightly confused the issue by attempting to embed EFP in a larger context regarding the creation of a regional European polity with its own electoral system, legal or constitutional basis, and related political dynamics drawn from the study of complex, even federal, polities. The implicit assumption in this work, which further called into question the future potential of EFP, was that a "European" foreign policy worthy of the name could not be accomplished without the creation of a true "European" polity or state, at the core of which was the EC. This view, as well as those of Haas and Hoffman, has also appeared now and again in the EFP literature to the present day. Though subsequent events related to EFP would challenge the assumptions of all of these arguments, even before the end of the Cold War, they are still important in terms of specifying the very real limits to, if not the actual content or development of, EFP as an empirical domain and theoretical reference point.

B. The advent of EFP (1970s-80s)

Despite the seeming impasse among European states regarding the scope and means of EFP through the 1960s, the idea simply would not die owing in large part to French desires for a greater European role in world affairs. Various strands of activity eventually came together to create a new approach to EFP, in the form of European Political Cooperation (EPC) in 1970. These strands of activity included the creation of the WEU in 1954 to facilitate the inclusion of Germany and Italy in Western defense architectures (Menon et al. 1992); the creation in late

[3] For slightly more optimistic early assessments, see Dahrendorf 1971 and Galtung 1973.

1959 of informal quarterly meetings of EU foreign ministers (M.E. Smith 2003: 66); a series of proposals in the early 1960s (the so-called "Fouchet Plans") centered on the idea of a new "council of heads of state or government" with powers to "harmonize, coordinate, and unify the foreign, economic, cultural, and defense policies" of EU member states (Allen and Wallace 1982); and the Franco-German Treaty of Cooperation (Elysée Treaty) of 22 January 1963, which established twice-yearly meetings of French and German heads of government and quarterly meetings of foreign ministers to promote cooperation in foreign policy, defense, and culture (Wallace 1986).

The 1970 Luxembourg (or Davignon) Report on EPC represented a solution to the impasse noted above in the form of two key compromises. The first involved the idea of intergovernmental cooperation, which refers to regular policy discussions among European heads of government or foreign ministers rather than explicit delegation to, or involvement of, EU institutions such as the Commission and the European Parliament (EP). These talks eventually would be supported by a transgovernmental infrastructure of EPC participants (Political Directors and European Correspondents) in national capitals and, eventually (after 1986), at EU headquarters in Brussels. And the second compromise involved the (apparent) compartmentalization of "high politics" EPC issues from the "low politics" issues generally handled by the EC. Theoretically, these aspects of EPC appeared to confirm what later became known as the liberal intergovernmental approach to European integration (Moravcsik 1993), a process dominated by national governments rather than EC actors, and where institutional arrangements were weak or non-existent. Empirically, the advent of EPC as a new form of diplomatic practice in the 1970s also allowed scholars to take a closer look at, rather than merely speculate about, what various EPC/EC insiders actually thought and did in the name of what

would become known as EFP (Kohnstamm & Hager 1973); several of these early studies were in fact written by EPC practitioners (von der Gablentz 1979; de Schoutheete de Tervarent 1980; da Fonseca-Wollheim 1981; Hurd 1981), who provided key details about the social networking and "soft law" aspects of EPC that would later inform a great deal of analysis. Early recognition of the so-called "coordination reflex," or the tendency for member states to consult with each other before fixing foreign policy positions of their own, was an especially important aspect of this work, as gradually a "European dimension" was built into policy issues "which previously had been almost exclusively based on national considerations" (de Schoutheete de Tervarent 1980: 118).

The early years of EPC also involved an attempt to coordinate European policy positions in international organizations, which inspired a series of studies of EU voting behavior on foreign policy in the UN General Assembly (Hurwitz 1975; Hurwitz 1976; Lindemann 1976; Foot 1979). By the end of the 1970s, these studies generally confirmed that the nine EU member states at the time were voting as a bloc around 60 per cent of the time, although there were serious limitations regarding the use of UN vote data as key indicators of the existence of EFP.[4] Other important early work involved the expanding role of the six-month rotating EU Council Presidency, which organized and chaired EPC meetings and articulated EFP positions at the UN and elsewhere, crucial tasks considering that EU member states were still opposed to the idea of greater Commission involvement in EPC at this time (Wallace & Edwards 1976). And, although it was not part of the EPC diplomatic system, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) also began to

[4] Specifically: 1) most UN resolutions are taken by consensus and are therefore not usually reflected in vote data; 2) on some votes EU cohesion was undermined by the dissent of a single EU member state; and 3) dissents often resulted from tactical differences rather than fundamental policy disagreements (de Schoutheete de Tervarent 1980; Nuttall 1992b).

play a supporting role in EFP in terms of attempting to define the legal boundary between the external relations of the EC and the activities of EPC (Pescatore 1979).

Many of these scholarly themes were synthesized into what eventually became known as EFP by several classic early studies, such as those by Wallace & Allen (1977) on policy-making in the EU; Hill & Wallace (1979) on "diplomatic trends" in the EU which paid close attention to the EPC infrastructure, and a study of comparative foreign policy in Western Europe (Wallace & Paterson 1978). The latter volume was explicitly inspired in part by a dissatisfaction with (largely American) trends in FPA, such as behaviorism in general and the focus on bureaucratic politics in particular, and attempted to strike a balance between conceptual generalizations and empirical examples of important trends. And, although the Wallace & Paterson text focused on case studies of western European states, it also included a path-breaking chapter entitled "Foreign policy at the European level: Beyond the nation-state?" (Allen 1978a). Although Allen effectively highlighted some of the real limits facing EFP at the time – its reactive nature, the difficulty of carving out a political space between levels of analysis, and the struggle to maintain a consensus in EPC decisions – the real achievement here was the deliberate inclusion of a chapter on EFP within a CFP text such as this while EPC was still in such an embryonic state.

This recognition of EFP as an emerging field of inquiry was bolstered by the first serious studies of EPC policies, starting with the Euro-Arab Dialogue (Allen 1978b) and related studies on the EU in the Middle East peace process (Allen & Pijpers 1984; Ifestos 1987). These works generally confirmed that the EPC machinery did help to produce common views, that the EU was "doing more" in the realm of foreign policy, and that it was deliberately attempting to reorganize and even expand itself to meet these responsibilities. Yet they also pointed to the very real limits apparent to even sympathetic observers of EFP: that much of this activity seemed

uncoordinated if not incoherent in the absence of a permanent source of institutional leadership, that opposition by a single EU member state could prevent progress, and that the lack of more robust policy tools would seriously hinder the external impact of EFP no matter how smoothly the EPC diplomatic machinery operated. These realizations were reflected in the themes of several insightful evaluations from this period, which tended to highlight the mismatch in EFP between procedures and substance, or between rhetoric and reality, or between "external (economic) relations" and "foreign (political) policy" (Twitchett 1976; Wallace & Allen 1977; Hill & Wallace 1979).

C. The 1980s and the Single European Act

The study of EFP, then, necessarily began rather more inductively rather than deductively, as the new machinery of EPC did not fit very well with established models of either IR or FPA. EU member states continued to reform the system throughout the 1980s, beginning with the 1981 London Report on EPC and the 1986 Single European Act (SEA), efforts which inspired new scholarly works about the functioning of EPC. The London Report opened the door to greater consideration of security affairs in the context of EPC, while the SEA legally linked EPC to the EC and gave EFP its first permanent bureaucratic foundation in the form of a small EPC secretariat in the Council of Ministers building. These institutional changes, and the policies they facilitated, provided more grist for the EFP conceptual mill. Two important edited collections appeared in the early 1980s: one provided a general overview of various EPC procedures and policies (Allen et al. 1982) and the other covered national foreign policies and EPC (Hill 1983a). The volume by Allen et al. (originally published in German in 1978) represented the first truly comprehensive study of EFP, as represented by EPC and EPC-EC linkages, and highlighted the difficulties of compartmentalizing EPC and EC affairs with two

overlapping sets of official roles and procedures (see especially Bonvicini 1982; Wallace 1982; Wessels 1982). It also included several important case studies on EFP activities, each of which offered insights into the peculiar dynamics of EFP decision-making (see below). The Hill volume focused on the two-way relationship between national and European foreign policy-making, and included case studies on all ten EU member states at the time. Although, like the Allen et al. volume, it did not provide a general theory or conceptual framework to guide the contributors, it did ask a coherent set of questions about each EU member state. And as national "inputs" provided the real dynamism and leadership for EFP at the time (Wallace 1983b; Hill 1983b), the Hill volume was entirely justified in its approach and served as a useful complement to the more European-level approach of the Allen et al. volume.

By the time of the SEA, the literature on EFP had become relatively self-sustaining as new scholars joined the field. The topic of transatlantic relations continued to receive attention (Kohler 1982; Pardalis 1987), as did the issue of EFP coordination at the UN (Lindemann 1982). One major early success of EFP involved the origins of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process, which required a great deal of institutional improvisation between EPC and the EC, including an expanded role for the Commission (von Groll 1982). The security dimension of EPC as provided by the London Report, even though it focused on "political and economic aspects" of security, still complicated things for the EU's one neutral state at the time (Ireland), as some scholars recognized (Salmon 1982; Keatinge 1983). This issue was part of a broader debate about "civilian power Europe" (Duchêne 1973; Bull 1982) and the question of an EU military capacity, which was still quite dormant at the time. However, the EU did attempt, though with some difficulty, to involve itself more in crises (van Praag 1982a), and took steps to facilitate counter-terrorism cooperation among its member states

through what was known as the "Trevi" framework (Freestone 1985).[5] The EPC machinery was somewhat more successful regarding the 1982 Falkland Islands War, where EU member states managed to agree on the UK's request for a ban on Argentinean imports to the EU (Edwards 1984). As with the CSCE process,[6] this involved considerable legal coordination between the EC and EPC domains, this time under the pressures of a crisis situation, and the EU acted more effectively here than it had during previous crises (such as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan). As always, however, not all member states were equally committed to this policy, as one comprehensive study revealed later (Stavridis and Hill 1996). Studies of EFP activity involving South Africa highlighted the range and creativity of policies, involving both the EPC and EC domains, intended to help end the apartheid regime in that country, although for some EU member states this effort directly conflicted with their economic interests (van Praag 1982b; Holland 1987).

Holland's work on South Africa was particularly insightful as it attempted to develop a broader conceptual approach to EFP. This involved three broad approaches to explaining EPC outcomes. The first was a domestic politics explanation closely related to intergovernmentalism, though it stressed constraining domestic political factors, rather than intergovernmental negotiations, as the critical elements in EPC. The "pseudo-policy" approach focused on the need for EU states to do something about the apartheid issue in the face of conflicting pressures and uncertainty of information. Finally, the "agenda-management" approach is a more active public policy response than mere pseudo-policies, and focuses on the ability of EFP actors to take the

[5] Trevi was a loose intergovernmental framework established in 1976 in response to terrorist attacks in Europe. It eventually formed part of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) cooperation under the 1991 Treaty on European Union and was largely treated as a internal, rather than EFP, EU competence until the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the U.S.

[6] From 1995, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

lead in defining a problem and, in turn, devising appropriate solutions to it. These approaches of course are not mutually exclusive, and Holland pursued a more integrated approach to the EU's South African policy in his later works, including a major theoretically-informed book (Holland 1988).

By mid-1980s, all major texts on European integration, such as the periodic editions of *Policy-making in the European Community*, were also including chapters on EPC/EFP as a regular feature (Wallace 1983; Lodge 1989). Book-length studies on more specific EFP-related topics also began to appear on a regular basis by this time, most of which were edited collections (Pijpers et al. 1988; Rummel 1990; Crawford & Schulze 1990; Edwards & Regelsberger 1990). Nearly all of these, however, lacked an overarching theoretical or conceptual framework to help consolidate the findings. However, the volume edited by Pijpers et al. (1988) was especially useful as it combined both the more traditional intergovernmental approaches to EFP as its institutional dimensions, as EPC was becoming more institutionalized (though not necessarily more supranational) following the SEA. Thus, the volume included chapters on not only national foreign policies and EFP (de la Serre 1988) but also studies of both the role of the Presidency (de Schoutheete de Tervarent 1988) and the role of the Commission (Nuttall 1988; also see Nuttall 1990), plus analyses of other institutional/procedural aspects of EFP (Bonvicini 1988), including the role of the new EPC Secretariat (da Costa Pereira 1988), the first permanent EU bureaucracy devoted to EFP. Several well-constructed, though theoretically eclectic, case studies on EFP rounded out the volume, including chapters on terrorism (Hill 1988) and EFP activities "out of area" (i.e., beyond the European region)(Pijpers 1988). Finally, a chapter on EPC and the challenge of theory (Weiler & Wessels 1988) helped pave the way for later studies focused on the social and normative dimensions of EFP.

The focus on norms and rules in EFP inspired by the SEA's reforms became part of a tradition of legal-institutional analyses of EFP (Weiler 1985; Lak 1989), some of which highlighted the European Council (Bulmer & Wessels 1987) and the Council Presidency (O'Nuallain 1985) in the tradition of intergovernmentalism, though strictly intergovernmental approaches were becoming somewhat limited as top-level government officials only set the broad agenda rather than micro-managed policy on a daily basis. The "re-launching" of Europe under the terms of the SEA also gave the EP a small role in the EFP policy process, thus inspiring studies of the EPC-EP relationship (Lodge 1988; Corbett 1989; Elles 1990; Neunreither 1990). The EP had a voice in trade affairs and in vetting EU agreements with third countries, but it enjoyed little real power over external political relations relative to other actors noted above. The same held true of the role of public opinion in EPC affairs, although European citizens were becoming more aware of EPC since the SEA. The last major edited volume on EFP before Maastricht era (Holland 1991a) included, as always, several eclectic case studies, such as the difficult question of control of sanctions (Holland 1991b), plus several solid theoretical essays interpreting EFP in terms of realism (Pijpers 1991); intergovernmental (i.e., two-level) bargaining (Bulmer 1991); legal-institutional theory (Dehousse & Weiler 1991); and world systems theory (George 1991). These contributions, of course, were too short to test any single theory, though their inclusion in the volume did help to specify the fairly wide range of approaches to EFP on offer at the time.

More focused approaches to EFP in the 1980s did appear however in the form of two major solo-authored studies, each of which attempted to provide some theoretical clarity to the topic. Ifestos (1987) critically analyzed the growth of EPC in light of a range of approaches, including federalism, functionalism, intergovernmentalism, and pluralism. Though he was

sympathetic to the latter two approaches where EPC was concerned, his lengthy study unfortunately did not attempt to test or defend rigorously any single theory in terms of specific causal propositions. A second comprehensive work, Ginsberg's study of foreign policy actions of the EC (1989), avoided this problem, by specifically proposing three "logics" to explain certain EFP outcomes, all of which were classified according to these logics in the manner of events-data analyses. Each causal logic of EFP activity was associated with a specific level of analysis: the "interdependence logic" derived from the international level and stressed exogenous global pressures; the "integration logic" involved the regional level and stressed how the EU (particularly its common market) could inspire third parties to demand certain EFP actions in a kind of backlash effect; and the "self-styled logic" involved the intra-EU level of analysis (meaning the interaction between EU institutions and EU member states), which resulted in EFP actions inspired by the EU's own sense of mission and place in the world, rather than those devised merely in reaction to external pressures. In Ginsberg's analysis, these logics – particularly the integration logic - were far more useful in explaining specific EFP actions than several traditional theories of IR/FPA: intergovernmentalism/realism/national interests, elite actors, domestic politics, and bureaucratic politics.

II. The Maastricht era (1990s)

The study of EFP expanded considerably following the negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty on European Union (TEU) of 1991, which entered into effect in 1993 after a difficult ratification process. It should be noted at the outset that not all observers of EFP were enthusiastic about its prospects; several scholars found much to criticize in the form and substance of EFP – particularly its defense ambitions - even after the TEU had supposedly

improved this domain (Gordon (1997/98; Zeilonka 1998). Other analysts, however, adopted a more sanguine view and focused on the specific mechanics of institution-building and policy-making in addition to the effectiveness of particular EFP initiatives.

A. Institutions and national inputs: The functioning of the TEU

Many other authors, however, took a more comprehensive view of EFP despite its obvious limits at the time. In fact, one the most widely-cited studies of the 1990s appeared just as the TEU was entering into effect: Hill's (1993) insightful analysis of Europe's "capability-expectations gap," which provided a useful way to think about measuring the scope of EFP performance in terms of a broad range of *functions* rather than capacities (also see Nuttall 1997), and the perceptions held by others about those functions. Although the Hill study also pointed to a similar gap in expectations and capabilities, it also suggested the EU could close the gap in many ways that did not involve or privilege military power. A year later a major edited volume entitled *European Foreign Policy* appeared (Carlsnaes & Smith 1994); it included over a dozen contributions representing a range of conceptual approaches, including a rare feminist critique of EFP (Zalewski 1994). Unfortunately the volume appeared before the TEU had produced any real EFP outputs (a similar limitation of Rummel's 1992 edited volume); however, more empirically up-to-date work on the topic began to appear in the second half of the 1990s after the TEU had been ratified and scholars had had a few years to reflect upon it. As during the 1980s, most studies involved either institutional issues or national inputs into EFP, or some combination, as revealed in several edited collections (Regelsberger et al. 1997; Holland 1997a; Peterson & Sjursen 1998). One important contribution by an EPC insider (Nuttall 1992a) helped to provide a considerable degree of empirical context for understanding the EPC to CFSP transition. Although this work was more historical than theoretical, it was highly insightful

about how things really worked in the realm of EFP, particularly in terms of distinguishing between "domestic" and "foreign/European" and between "economic" and "political/security" issues, as well as the larger process of institution-building in EFP. Other, though more concise, insider accounts helped to round out these reflections (Crowe 1993; Hurd 1994).

In the realm of institutional approaches, scholars were first pre-occupied with simply mapping the changes to EFP made under the TEU and evaluating whether the CFSP had improved upon the EPC mechanism (Nuttall 1992b; Edwards and Nuttall 1994; Regelsberger & Wessels 1996; Ginsbeg 1997b; Øhrgaard 1997; Regelsberger 1997; Rummel 1997a; Cameron 1998; M.E. Smith 1998). This type of work was especially salient as EU insiders were already considering reforms to the CFSP process just a few years after the TEU began operating; some of these changes found their way into the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam. Although most agreed that the CFSP was somewhat more coherent as a policy process as compared to EPC, and allowed a greater role for EU actors (particularly the Commission), it also was far more bureaucratic (especially regarding EFP finances; see Monar 1997b); and still lacked a sustained source of leadership as the TEU had maintained the rotating Presidency system as the primary "voice" of EFP. Some scholars examined the much greater legal formality of the CFSP and the complexities this legalism raised in terms of combing the three "pillars" of the EU[7] into coherent foreign policy action (Govaere & Eeckhout 1992; Lak 1992; Curtin 1993; Cheyne 1994; Eaton 1994; Sak 1995; Macleod et al. 1996; M. Smith 1998; M.E. Smith 2001a). One major study of the legal aspects of EU foreign relations (McGoldrick 1997) set a new standard for comprehensiveness in this area and must be seen as a critical reference work, although it did not advance a particular theoretical view and the CFSP still remained outside the jurisdiction of the

[7] That is, the EC (first pillar), the CFSP and what would become the ESDP (second pillar), and cooperation in JHA (third pillar).

ECJ. Related work involved the question of an international legal personality for the EU (Wessel 1997; Wessel 1999; Wessel 2000) and the role of committees in EFP (Tonra 2000b).

Overall, this work started to confirm in the 1990s what some scholars had suspected already in the 1980s: first, it was becoming increasingly difficult to disentangle various institutional responsibilities where EFP was concerned, which could vary widely across the intergovernmental-supranational continuum depending on what type of EFP instrument was at issue (diplomatic, trade, financial, police, etc.); and second, it was necessary to pay attention to the importance of customary or soft law in working out these institutional problems, which could eventually mature into hard law (i.e., treaty reforms) over time. In some areas, such as trade in intellectual property or environmental diplomacy, it was unclear whether EU member states or the EU as an institution, or both in some combination, had a right to enter international agreements or to join international organizations/conferences (M. Smith 1994; Sak 1995; Damro 2001; Damro 2006). This question of competence over various aspects of foreign policy under the TEU also inspired conceptual work on the issue of consistency/coherence in EFP (Coignez 1992; Neuwahl 1994; Krenzler & Schneider 1997; Tietje 1997; M.E. Smith 2001b; Szymanski & Smith 2005), which had a strong institutional/legal bias to it.

Other scholars took a more "bottom-up" approach to EFP; rather than focus on EU institutions or actors in Brussels they continued to flesh out the variation in national approaches to EFP (Pfetsch 1994). Most prominently, an update of Hill's 1983 study of national approaches to EFP, with a new title of *The Actor's in Europe's Foreign Policy*, appeared on the scene (Hill 1996), though this time it included a new chapter on the role of the European Commission (Nuttall 1996). Hill also contributed to a study on national (European) approaches to the Falkland Islands war (Stavridis and Hill 1996), which helped to map out the various reasons why

EU member states supported or opposed EU sanctions and other policies toward Argentina. In a similar view, various studies of the membership of individual EU states, particularly Germany and the UK, continued to appear, most of which included some analysis of the EFP domain. This work, too extensive to summarize here, became more prominent in light of the "Europeanization" thesis of Ladrech (1994), which attempted to map the processes by which EU member states adapted to the demands of EU membership. Some studies related to Europeanization were specifically devoted to EFP issues, as with M.E. Smith's (2000) study of national adaptation to EFP, work on small states and EFP (Arter 2000; Tonra 2001; Laatikainen 2003), and work on the relationship between national and European identities (A. Smith 1992; Waever 1996).

A more comprehensive effort appeared in the form of Manners & Whitman's (2000) analysis of the foreign policies of EU member states; like Hill's 1996 volume it included chapters on all EU member states at the time (except Luxembourg), and it also advanced a general analytical framework to structure the individual contributions. This involved measuring the scope of EFP in terms of foreign policy change through EU membership and elite socialization processes; foreign policy process involving domestic politics and bureaucratic politics; and foreign policy actions in terms of associating with EFP activities or through more unilateral efforts. The volume thus provided a great deal of conceptual and empirical material to help define the existence and functioning of EFP and should be considered a major reference work. It also provided some insights into the adaptation of new EU member states in the 1990s (Austria, Finland, and Sweden), and the related question of "post-neutrality" in light of the greater attention to security affairs in the new CFSP framework (Scheich 1992; Larsen 1993; Harden 1994; Sundelius 1994; Ingebritsen 1997). These studies confirmed the ability of all EU

states, even formally neutral ones (Austria, Finland, Ireland, and Sweden), to re-define "security" to accommodate their EU/EFP commitments, and to permit the expansion of same beyond territorial defense into new areas involving peacekeeping, peacemaking, and humanitarian aid (the so-called "Petersberg tasks"). All of this activity helped to lay the important groundwork for the emergence of the ESDP capability (see below).

B. EFP activities and impact

Finally, a third major trend in the post-Maastricht period involved specific case studies of EFP activity, many of which updated the initiatives already noted by attempting to bridge the gap between institutional analyses and broad overviews of EFP output trends. These included studies on EFP and the former Soviet Union (Allen 1997); transatlantic relations (Peterson 1996; Ginsberg 1997; Guay 1999); Somalia (Keatinge 1997); Central/Eastern Europe (Lippert 1997); the pending Central/Eastern Europe enlargement process (Luif 1997; Mayhew 1998 and Mannin 1999); the CSCE/OSCE process (Schneider 1997); relations with the Mediterranean region (Barbé & Izquierdo 1997) and other less developed countries (Cosgrove-Sacks 1999); multilateral cooperation (Long 1997; Jörgensen 2006); the Stability Pact with the Balkans (Ueta 1997); EU political dialogue agreements (Monar 1997a); "Europe agreements" with third states (McManus 1998); and the conspicuously limited human rights aspects of EFP (Clapham 1999). Three major post-TEU comprehensive case studies of EFP involved Central America (H. Smith 1995), South Africa (Holland 1995; also Holland 1997b), and Eastern Europe (K. Smith 1998), all of which could generally point to the increasing "actorness" of the EU in terms of its range of policy tools, complexity of policy goals/outputs, and measures of impact or effectiveness.

Of particular importance at this time was the attempt by the EU to move into the security realm. Several analysts examined the EU's difficulties in the first Persian Gulf War (Anderson

1992) and the Balkans conflicts (Edwards 1992; Nuttall 1994; Edwards 1997; Kintis 1997), or both (Wood 1993), and their findings were similar to the more pessimistic views of EFP already noted. Assessments of what should or could have been done varied somewhat, but virtually all analysts agreed on two points: that the EU's lack of a robust military arm placed it at a serious disadvantage compared to NATO, and that the emphasis on consensus for all major decisions made the EFP prone to "lowest common denominator" decisions or (worse) outright stalemate and paralysis (for broader treatments, see Menon et al. 1992; Taylor 1994; von Staden 1994; Martin & Roper 1995; Howorth & Menon 1997; Sjursen 1998). These views also tended to apply to the potential for using the WEU to implement security/defense aspects of EFP (Duke 1996; Jopp 1997), based on its extremely limited material resources and lack of operational planning capacities relative to NATO. In some cases, such as Germany's unilateral recognition of Croatia, it seemed that the pursuit of EFP in the face of a major crisis was casually disregarded by one of its main supporters in favor of a unilateral approach. However, the area of nuclear non-proliferation saw some degree of success as an EFP security-related policy, where the EU was able to marshal its diplomatic resources behind a renewal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (Müller 1992; Müller & van Dassen 1997). Others attempted to find positive EFP contributions to security involving economic security/arms control (Cornish 1997), conflict prevention (Rummel 1997b), and the EU's emerging capacities for crisis management (Hill 1992; Wagner 2003), which were still extremely modest relative to the overall ambitions of the TEU.

A final aspect of the activities/impact approach to EFP involved a range of studies focused on the larger issue of EU "actorness" or "roles" or "identity" – even that of a "European superpower" (Hill 1993; Soetendorp 1994; M. Smith 1996; Schneider & Seybold 1997; Whitman

1998; Cederman 2000; Elgström & Smith 2006; Cerutti & Lucarelli 2008). To varying degrees, and with various analytical frameworks, these works attempted to map the full range of EFP activities and impact in world politics, an increasingly complicated task. As one might expect, these studies defined the scope of EFP in a variety of ways, and as a result highlighted some topics or activities while downplaying or ignoring others. They also tended to favor more descriptive approaches to EFP rather than advancing or testing a specific theory, though their comprehensiveness provided some very useful empirical material for those attempting a more conceptual approach to the study of EFP.

III. Current trends in European FPA

By the eve of the millennium, then, EFP was well-established as a fairly distinct sub-field of IR/EU studies. Beyond the works noted above, one might also mention the founding of at least two new journals devoted specifically to EFP: *European Security* (founded 1992), and the *European Foreign Affairs Review* (founded 1996). The creation of FORNET, an academic network on EFP hosted by the London School of Economics, also helped to institutionalize EFP as a research field; FORNET also publishes (since 2003) the *CFSP Forum*, a newsletter on current trends on the topic. The U.S.-based European Union Studies Association established an "EU as a Global Actor" interest section in 2002 to help build bridges in this area, while an EFP-related think-tank, the European Council on Foreign Relations, was established in 2007. Finally, we might note the regular appearance now of teaching texts on EFP (Cameron 1999; H. Smith 2002; K. Smith 2003; Carlsnaes, Sjursen & White 2004; Tonra & Christiansen 2004; Bretherton & Vogler 2005), as well as those focused more on security/defense affairs (Cottey 2007; Howorth 2007). One volume, *International Relations of the European Union* (Hill & Smith

2005) was especially noteworthy, as it attempted to consider EFP in light of European integration theory, FPA and IR.

A. General trends

In terms of specific research outputs, edited volumes on EFP have continued to appear on a regular basis, though their quality and coverage can be quite uneven; in many cases they lack a clear theoretical dimension and tend merely to update the scope of EFP activities (Foradori et al. 2007). On a more positive note, a number of scholars began to advance more rigorous conceptual approaches to EFP after the turn of the century. Two major institutional analyses of EFP appeared at this time (Winn & Lord 2001 and M.E. Smith 2003; also see Nuttall 2000 for an historical perspective). Winn & Lord focused on EFP policy-making as reflected in three case studies (Bosnia, Chechnya and former Yugoslavia/Mostar), while Smith applied a new institutionalist perspective to the broader development of EFP from the late 1950s to the late 1990s. Both studies highlighted the inappropriateness of treating national and European level activity as distinct processes in favor of more unified, coherent explanations involving institutional change, performance, and feedback effects, not all of which were necessarily functionally effective from an instrumental rational choice perspective.

Regarding EFP performance in particular, mention must be made of Ginsberg's 2001 work on the EU in international politics, which updated his earlier (1989) compendium of EFP actions and placed them on a more explicit conceptual foundation in terms of measuring EFP "impact" on specific problems, such as the Middle East and the Balkans. The volume also complemented his earlier reflections (Ginsberg 1999) regarding a more comprehensive approach to the study of EFP, which treated it as a political system for producing specific policy outputs. A similar evaluation can be made of White's article (1999) and volume (2001) on EFP, which

tended to favour an FPA approach to the topic rather than a systemic one, though one specifically based on its multi-dimensional nature: national foreign policies, the CFSP, and the foreign economic relations of the EU. Other noteworthy general conceptual contributions from this period include those of Tonra (1997) and Soetendorp (1999).

As always, numerous case studies of EFP provided much of the raw material for the more conceptual reflections, particularly studies of transatlantic relations following the 9/11 terror attacks and the 2003 war in Iraq (Shaffer & Pollack 2001; Howorth 2003; Penska & Mason 2003; Hill 2004; Gartner & Cuthbertson 2005; Longhurst & Zaborowski 2005; Dannreuther & Peterson 2006; McGuire & Smith 2008). Other scholars have recently examined EU human rights policy (K. Smith 2006), EU democracy promotion (Youngs 2002), EU-UN relations (Laatikainen & Smith 2006); EU-Mediterranean relations (Spencer 2001), EU-Asia relations (Wiessala 2002), Macedonia (Piana 2002), the EU's increasing efforts in policing and counter-terrorism (Occhipinti 2003), the implications of the eastern enlargement (Brown & Shepherd 2007), and the EU's emerging European Neighborhood Policy (Dannreuther 2004; K. Smith 2005; Weber et al. 2007).

Attention to the security/defense aspects of EFP has increased considerably in the last decade, particularly after the Anglo-French agreement at St Malo in 1998 to give the EU an autonomous and credible military capacity. In this realm studies have proliferated on the ESDP and various related initiatives, such as the EU's Civilian Crisis Management capability, security aspects of JHA, the new European Gendarmerie Force, the European Defense Agency, and related topics. However, as with EFP in general, there is very little consensus on how to problematize these efforts as a research question. Many studies have focused on the question of EU as a global military actor and/or security provider, particularly in light of the release in 2003

of the first-ever "European Security Strategy" (Gärtner 2001; Deighton 2002; Hunter 2002; Larsen 2002; Salmon & Shepherd 2003; Shepherd 2003; Giegerich & Wallace 2004; Shearman & Sussex 2004; Gnesotto 2005; Wivel 2005; Anderson & Seitz 2006; Merlingen et al. 2006; Anderson 2008; Biscop and Andersson 2008). Other scholars have focused on a more general question: whether these efforts represent some form of power balancing, either among EU member states and/or against the U.S. and the unilateral policies of the GW Bush administration. As ever, there is no clear consensus on this issue and scholars use a variety of measures to grapple with it (Jones 2003; Pape 2005; Posen 2006; Jones 2007). However, since the EU has been engaging in actual security operations since 2003, we now have more empirical material to work with in light of EFP actions in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Macedonia and others (Gourlay 2004; Keane 2004; Kronenberger & Wouters 2004; Mace 2004; Osland 2004; Ulriksen et al. 2004; Diez et al. 2006).

A final area of interest somewhat related to the question of EU security actions involves the question of the "soft power" aspects of EFP, such as the EU's so-called normative, civilian, ethical, civilizing, moral, or cosmopolitan power, after a highly influential article on "normative power Europe" (Manners 2002) instigated a lively debate.[8] As this proliferation of terms suggests, however, there seems to be a great deal of confusion in the literature over how these forms of power exert influence (i.e., by reputation or through action), how they relate to each other and to other ideational-cultural aspects of EFP (interests, values, principles, customs, institutions, human rights, etc), how one defines and measures these concepts empirically, and how one explains them – as a cause or an effect – theoretically (for somewhat more critical

[8] Space considerations prevent a more comprehensive discussion of these concepts; for more details see the special issue *International Affairs* ("Ethical Power Europe"), Vol. 84, No. 1 (2008); as well as Linklater 2005; Lerch & Schwellnus 2006; Lucarelli & Manners 2006; Manners 2006; and Telo 2006 (among others).

views, see Youngs 2004; Bicchi 2006; Hyde-Price 2006; Sjursen 2006; M. Smith 2006). Further, this aspect of EFP necessarily overlaps with the policing-military side of EFP, and very little attention has been paid to how the EU's forms of hard and soft power may complement or undermine each other (for one exception, see Sangiovanni 2003). Elgström & Smith 2006).

B. Major thematic approaches to EFP

As we have seen, the literature on EFP – particularly in terms of its content and formulation – has produced a range of possible explanations, many of which are associated more with IR theory rather than FPA theory. Some approaches are inspired by realism (intergovernmentalism, national interests), others by liberalism (institutionalism, domestic pluralism, bureaucratic/organizational politics), and still others reflect a constructivist orientation (socialization, identity-construction). However, another way to think about EFP as a research agenda is to examine systems and actors within this domain, keeping in mind the general trends noted above. As suggested earlier, there are at least four political systems directly relevant to the study of EFP: national foreign policies, supranational policies (involving the European Community or EC), intergovernmental policies (CFSP/ESDP), and "mixed" or "hybrid" policies which involve complex interactions between these systems. Although some aspects of EFP can be treated as a relatively closed system (such as policies which are exclusive EC or national competences), the very term "EFP" suggests it is difficult if not impossible to isolate these various systems from each other, especially where multiple EFP tools are used against a single target actor or problem (which is increasingly the case). In fact, one might argue that the basic reason for studying EFP is to reject the idea of these disparate systems drawn from more orthodox approaches to IR and FPA in favor of a more comprehensive approach, which may or may not involve the creation of a general or grand theory of EFP.

One way to square this circle – or reject mono-causal or mono-systemic approaches on the one hand while admitting the lack of a general theory of EFP on the other hand – is by focusing on the larger institutional framework in which these various elements are embedded, which may extend to the treatment of EFP as a system of *governance* (Bulmer 1994; Hooghe et al. 2003). Briefly, these elements involve: intergovernmental negotiations over the general development of EFP, typically in the European Council; political steering by a transgovernmental communications network among EU foreign ministers, political directors, and other foreign policy specialists; the emergence and codification of norms and laws governing EFP; the increasing involvement of EU organizational actors (chiefly the Commission); and the establishment of a fairly coherent policy process whose contours vary according to the EFP domain in question (M.E. Smith 2003; also White 1999: 42). The governance approach is now fairly well-established in EU studies, and it allows scholars to assign different "weights" to the various factors noted above depending on the policy in question. It can also be applied to the influence of EFP on non-European states and actors (i.e. "external governance"; see Lavenex 2004 and Weber, Smith & Baun 2007) and to specific policy problems (i.e., "security governance"; see Kirchner & Sperling 2007). Finally, by admitting the importance of national "inputs" (chiefly at the intergovernmental and transgovernmental stages), the approach allows one to incorporate domestic political factors, but only to the extent that they influence actual EFP decision-making calculations by empowered elites (for more details, see M.E. Smith 2004a).

A related, and perhaps more flexible, approach involves the creation of *policy networks* within the realm of EFP. For example, there is little doubt that although EFP has come a long way since the 1970s, it has always remained an elite and even "self-contained" phenomenon involving confidential discussions among experts with limited interference by interest groups

(Hill & Wallace 1979). Indeed, Weiler & Wessels (1988: 243-48) have suggested the consociational model for EFP, where a "cartel" of elites regularly cooperates to preserve functionality and stability. In this model, elites must share a commitment to the maintenance of the system and to the improvement of its cohesion, functionality, and stability; as well as understand the dangers of political fragmentation. Such intensive deliberation within the EPC/CFSP working groups certainly encourages the formation of multilevel networks (Krahmann 2003), or even nascent epistemic communities, of technical experts devoted to solving particular problems, as Müller & van Dassen (1997: 68) have suggested in their analysis of the EU non-proliferation policy. In these more technical areas, the common understandings and solutions – or socialization processes - created by the participants help reinforce and perpetuate the substance and procedures of EFP; a similar approach is suggested by Tonra's (2003) application of a cognitive approach to EFP. More recently, some analysts have explored the emergence of an EFP "strategic culture" (Quille 2004; Cornish & Edwards 2005; Meyer 2005) in light of the EU's growing involvement in security operations, which lends itself to a policy network or epistemic community approach that stresses the importance of common mind-sets among relevant policy-makers.

Even if one rejects the idea of a governance or institutional approach to EFP in favor of a more orthodox treatment (such as classic FPA involving an EFP "system"; see Ginsberg 2001 and White 2001), there are multiple ways to introduce variance among these actors into the system and researchers must be very clear on why one criterion is selected over another. A sophisticated approach to national variance or inputs into EFP would recognize a number of potential political cleavages: large states vs. small states; neutral vs. non-neutral states; regional orientations or "dimensions" to EFP (Northern, Southern/Mediterranean, Eastern, Atlanticist);

older EU member states vs. more recent ones; former Communist or authoritarian states vs. those with a longer democratic tradition; the permanent UN Security Council member states (France and the UK); euro-zone member states; and so on. In addition to this general variation, one can expand the analysis further by examining domestic politics in more detail: party systems, electoral rules, bureaucratic politics and cultures, presidential vs. parliamentary control of foreign policy, social groups, trade relationships, factor endowments, and so on.[9] Thus, even when focusing on national inputs as a "first cut" in explaining EFP it is by no means apparent that certain state-level variables should be chosen over others, or that certain states should be favored over the others in any account. These choices must be made explicit and then justified, acts which will often reveal the true attitude of the scholar to EFP as a research topic.

IV. Unfinished business? The future of EFP

This last point leads us to what might be called the unfinished business of EFP analysis. Beyond the arguments already noted, there are several other important areas of opportunity for EFP scholars. As suggested above, there is in fact very little work involving a traditional FPA approach to EFP (for one exception, see White 2001) in light of state-level or individual-level factors. Although a few studies of public opinion have appeared, mainly in the context of broader studies of European integration (Eichenberg & Dalton 1993) or studies of European security (Manigart and Marlier 1993), there is very little work on EFP in terms of political parties, psychological factors (including crisis decision-making), bureaucratic politics, and interest groups. At the more macro level, some commentators have advanced the idea of a United States of Europe, a European superpower, and even a "European dream" (Reid 2004;

[9] For one insightful example of such an approach, see Risse-Kappen 1991.

Rifkin 2004; Leonard 2006; McCormick 2006). Each of these arguments involves a foreign policy element, yet we still lack a deep understanding of the specifically European content of these efforts, how they inspire EFP, and how they compare with other major global competitors (such as the U.S.) and even certain EU member states (such as France and the UK).

Some of these factors could be incorporated more systematically into studies of national approaches to EFP, particularly in light of the most recent enlargements and the greater involvement of the EU in security affairs. This would include more work on national adaptation or Europeanization (including defense adaptation, military force structures, civilian control of the military, intelligence cooperation, etc.) in light of EU/NATO commitments (Forster 2006; M.E. Smith 2004b; Major 2005), as well as more attention to non-EU EFP participants, such as Turkey and Norway (Gstöhl 2002), and research into the bordering states closely involved in the ENP and similar programs. The literature still lacks a comprehensive, theoretically-informed comparison of these various state actors involved in EFP, although we have many pieces of the puzzle. Moreover, the advent of greater flexibility (or "enhanced cooperation") in terms of EFP decision-making means we need to pay greater attention to how "coalitions of the willing" are created and led, and how these groups relate to other EFP-related groupings (such as the Quint; see for example Gegout 2002[10]).

Finally, we should note the stubborn persistence of the democratic deficit within the context of EFP (Stavridis 1997; Wagner 2006).[11] Here the question of democratic legitimacy (particularly with "coalitions of the willing" operating outside normal consensual EU decision-

---

[10] The "Quint" is a diplomatic grouping devoted to the Balkans and comprises France, Germany, Italy, the UK, and the U.S. A similar grouping involves the "Quartet" in the Middle East, comprising the EU, Russia, the UN, and the U.S.

[11] See also the special issue of *European Security* on security and democracy in the EU, Vol. 15, No. 4 (2006).

making rules) may deserve more attention than we see in the literature. The legitimacy and accountability of national foreign policy rest with elected representatives. For EFP, however, where many decisions are taken in the name of "Europe" but do not involve the input of all European (or EU) states or citizens, the question arises as to whom, precisely, EFP should be made accountable, and at what level (the EU, states participating in EFP operations, all EFP states, or some combination of these). Beyond the concerns already noted, this issue might involve greater attention to national parliaments, the EP, electoral inputs/cycles, and other factors that tend to receive little attention in the EFP literature as compared to government and EU elites. If EFP deserves to command our attention as a vibrant research topic as it now claims to represent the interests of hundreds of millions of Europeans, then both academics and publics must pay greater attention to its democratic foundations.

Bibliography

Allen, David (1978a). "Foreign Policy at the European Level: Beyond the Nation-State?" In Wallace and Paterson, *Foreign Policy Making in Western Europe*.

Allen, David (1978b). "The Euro-Arab Dialogue." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 16: 323-42.

Allen, David (1997). "EPC/CFSP, the Soviet Union, and the Former Soviet Republics: Do the Twelve Have a Coherent Policy?" In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Allen, David, and Alfred Pijpers, eds. (1984). *European Foreign Policy-Making and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Allen, David, and William Wallace (1977). "Political Cooperation: Procedure as Substitute for Policy." In *Policy Making in the European Communities*, eds. Helen Wallace, William Wallace, and Carole Webb. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Allen, David, Reinhardt Rummel, and Wolfgang Wessels, eds. (1982). *European Political Cooperation: Towards a Foreign Policy for Western Europe*. London: Butterworths.

Anderson, Scott (1992). "Western Europe and the Gulf War." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Anderson, Stephanie B. (2008). *Crafting EU Security Policy: In Pursuit of a European Identity*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Anderson, Stephanie, and Thomas R. Seitz (2006). "European Security and Defense Policy Demystified: Nation-Building and Identity in the European Union." *Armed Forces & Society* 33: 24-42.

Barbé, Esther, and Ferran Izquierdo (1997). "Present and Future of Joint Actions for the Mediterranean Region." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Bicchi, Federica (2006). "'Our Size Fits All': Normative Power and the Mediterranean." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 286-303.

Biscop, Sven, and Jan Joel Andersson, eds. (2008). *The EU and the European Security Strategy*. London: Routledge.

Bodenheimer, Susanne J. (1967). "The Political Union Debate in Europe: A Case Study in Intergovernmental Diplomacy." *International Organization* 21: 24-54.

Bonvicini, Gianni (1982). "The Dual Structure of EPC and Community Activities: Problems of Coordination." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

Bonvicini, Gianni (1988). "Mechanisms and Procedures of EPC: More than Traditional Diplomacy?" In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Bretherton, Charlotte, and John Vogler (2005) *The European Union as a Global Actor*. London: Routledge.

Brown, David, and Alistair J.K. Sheperd, eds. (2007). *The Security Dimensions of EU Enlargement: Wider Europe, Weaker Europe?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bull, Hedley (1982). "Civilian Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 21: 149-70.

Bulmer, Simon (1991). "Analyzing EPC: The Case for Two-Tier Analysis." In Holland, *The Future of European Political Cooperation*.

Bulmer, Simon J. (1994). "The Governance of the European Union: A New Institutionalist Approach." *Journal of Public Policy* 13: 351-80.

Bulmer, Simon, and Wolfgang Wessels (1987). *The European Council: Decision-making in European Politics*. London: Macmillan.

Cameron, Fraser (1998). "Building a Common Foreign Policy: Do Institutions Matter?" In Peterson and Sjursen, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*

Cameron, Fraser (1999). *The Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Past, Present and Future*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Carlsnaes, Walter (2004). "Where is the Analysis of European Foreign Policy Going?" *European Union Politics* 5: 495-508.

Carlsnaes, Walter and Steve Smith (eds.)(1994). *European Foreign Policy: The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*. London: Sage.

Carlsnaes, Walter, Helene Sjursen, and Brian White, eds. (2004). *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*. London: Sage.

Cederman, Lars-Erik, ed. (2000). *Constructing Europe's Identity: The External Dimension*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Cerutti, Furio, and Sonia Lucarelli, eds. (2008). *The Search for a European Identity: Values, Policies, and Legitimacy in the European Union*. London: Routledge.

Cheyne, Ilona (1994). "International Agreements and the European Community Legal System." *European Law Review* 19: 581-98.

Clapham, Andrew (1999). "Where is the EU's Human Rights Common Foreign Policy, and How is it Manifested in Multilateral Fora?" In *The EU and Human Rights*, eds. Philip Alston, Mara R. Bustelo, and James Heenan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coignez, Veerle (1992). "A Test Case of Consistency: The San Jose Dialogue." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Corbett, Richard (1989). "Testing the New Procedures: The European Parliament's First Experience with its New 'Single Act' Powers." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 27: 359-72.

Cornish, Paul (1997). "Joint Action, 'The Economic Aspects of Security' and the Regulation of Conventional Arms and Technology Exports from the EU." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Cornish, Paul and Geoffrey Edwards (2005). 'Identifying the Development of an EU "Strategic Culture."' *International Affairs* 77(3): 587-604.

Cosgrove-Sacks, Carol, ed. (1999). *The European Union and Developing Countries: The Challenges of Globalisation*. London/New York: Macmillan/St. Martin's.

Cottey, Andrew (2007). *Security in the New Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Crawford, Beverly, and Peter W. Schulze, eds. (1990). *The New Europe Asserts Itself: A Changing Role in International Relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Crowe, Brian L. (1993). "Foreign Policy-Making: Reflections of a Practitioner." *Government & Opposition* 28: 174-89.

Curtin, Deirdre (1993). "The Constitutional Structure of the Union: A Europe of Bits and Pieces." *Common Market Law Review* 30: 17-69.

da Costa Pereira, Pedro Sanchez (1988). "The Use of a Secretariat." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

da Fonseca-Wollheim, Hermann (1981). *Ten Years of European Political Cooperation*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1971). "Possibilities and Limits of a European Communities Foreign Policy." *The World Today* 27: 148-61.

Damro, Chad (2001). "Building an International Identity: The EU and Extraterritorial Competition Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8: 208-26.

Damro, Chad (2006). "Transatlantic Competition Policy: Domestic and International Sources of EU-US Cooperation." *European Journal of International Relations* 12: 171-196.

Dannreuther, Roland, ed. (2004). *European Union Foreign and Security Policy: Towards a Neighbourhood Strategy*. New York: Routledge.

Dannreuther, Roland, and John Peterson, eds. (2006). *Security Strategy and Transatlantic Relations*. Oxford: Routledge.

de la Serre, Françoise (1988). "The Scope of National Adaptation to EPC." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

de Schoutheete de Tervarent, Philippe (1980). *La Coopération Politique Européenne.* Brussels: F. Nathan Editions Labor.

de Schoutheete de Tervarent, Philippe (1988). "The Presidency and the Management of Political Cooperation." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Dehousse, Renaud, and Joseph H.H. Weiler (1991). "EPC and the Single Act: From Soft Law to Hard Law?" In Holland, *The Future of European Political Cooperation*.

Deighton, Anne (2002). "The European Security and Defence Policy." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40: 719-41.

Diez, Thomas, Stephan Stetter, and Mathias Albert (2006). "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration." *International Organization* 60: 563-93.

Deutsch, Karl et al (1957). *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Duchêne, François (1973). "The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence." In *A Nation Write Large? Foreign Policy Problems Before the European Communities*, eds. Max Kohnstamn and Wolfgang Hager. London: Macmillan.

Duke, Simon (1996). "The Second Death (or Second Coming?) of the WEU." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34: 167-90.

Eaton, M.R. (1994). "Common Foreign and Security Policy." In *Legal Issues of the Maastricht Treaty*, eds. David O'Keeffe and Patrick M. Twomey. London: Wiley Chancery Law.

Edwards, Geoffrey (1984). "Europe and the Falklands Islands Crisis, 1982." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 22: 295-313.

Edwards, Geoffrey (1992). "European Responses to the Yugoslav Crisis: An Interim Assessment." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Edwards, Geoffrey (1997). "The Potential and Limits of the CFSP: The Yugoslav Example." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Edwards, Geoffrey, and Elfriede Regelsberger, eds. (1990). *Europe's Global Links: The European Community and Inter-Regional Cooperation*. London: Pinter Publishers.

Edwards, Geoffrey, and Simon Nuttall (1994). "Common Foreign and Security Policy." In *Maastricht and Beyond: Building the European Union*, eds. Andrew Duff, John Pinder, and Roy Price. London: Routledge.

Eichenberg, Richard C., and Russell J. Dalton (1993). "Public Support for European Integration." *International Organization* 47: 507-34.

Elles, James (1990). "The Foreign Policy Role of the European Parliament." *The Washington Quarterly* 13: 69-78.

Elgström, Ole and Michael Smith (eds.)(2006). *The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis.* Oxford: Routledge.

Foot, Rosemary (1979). "The European Community's Voting Behavior at the United Nations' General Assembly." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 17: 350-9.

Foradori, Paolo, Paolo Rosa, and Riccardo Scartezzini (eds.)(2007). *Managing a Multilevel Foreign Policy: The EU in International Affairs*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Forster, Anthony (2006). *Armed Forces and Society in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Freestone, D. (1985). "The EEC Treaty and Common Action on Terrorism." *Yearbook of European Law 1984*: 207-30.

Galtung, Johan (1973). *The European Community: A Superpower in the Making*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Gartner, Heinz, and Ian Cuthbertson, eds. (2005). *European Security and Transatlantic Relations After 9/11 and the Iraq War: A Fork in the Road*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Gegout, Catherine (2002). "The Quint: Acknowledging the Existence of a Big Four - US Directoire at the Heart of the European Union's Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40: 331-44.

George, Stephen (1991). "European Political Cooperation: A World Systems Perspective." In Holland, *The Future of European Political Cooperation*.

Giegerich, Bastian, and William Wallace (2004). "Not Such a Soft Power: The External Deployment of European Forces." *Survival* 46: 163-82.

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

Ginsberg, Roy (1997). "Transatlantic Dimensions of CFSP: The Culture of Foreign Policy Cooperation." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Ginsberg, Roy (1999). "Conceptualizing the European Union as an International Actor: Narrowing the Theoretical Capability Expectations Gap." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37: 429-54.

Ginsberg, Roy (2001). *The European Union in International Politics: Baptism by Fire*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gnesotto, Nicole, ed. (2005). *EU Security and Defence Policy: The First Five Years (1999-2004)*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.

Gordon, Philip H. (1997-98). "Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy." *International Security* 22: 74-100.

Gourlay, Catriona (2004). "European Union Procedures and Resources for Crisis Management." *International Peacekeeping* 11: 404-21.

Govaere, Inge, and Piet Eeckhout (1992). "On Dual Use Goods and Dualist Case Law: The Aime Richardt Judgment on Export Controls." *Common Market Law Review* 29: 940-65.

Gstöhl, Sieglinde, ed. (2002). *Reluctant Europeans: Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland in the Process of Integration*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Guay, Terence R. (1999). *The United States and the European Union: The Political Economy of a Relationship*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Haas, Ernst B. (1961). "International Integration: The European and the Universal Process." *International Organization* 15: 366-92.

Haas, Ernst (1964). *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and European Integration*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Harden, Sheila, ed. (1994). *Neutral States and the European Community*. London: Brassey's.

Hill, C. (ed.)(1983a) *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Hill, Christopher (1983b). "National Interests - The Insuperable Obstacles?" In Hill, *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation*.

Hill, Christopher (1988). "European Preoccupations With Terrorism." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Hill, Christopher (1992). "EPC's Performance in Crises." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Hill, Christopher (1993). "The capability-expectations gap, or conceptualizing Europe's international role." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31: 305-328.

Hill, Christopher, ed. (1996). *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.

Hill, Christopher (1998). "Closing the capabilities-expectations gap?" In Peterson and Sjursen, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*

Hill, Christopher (2003). *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hill, Christopher (2004). "Renationalizing or Regrouping? EU Foreign Policy Since 11 September 2001." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42: 143-63.

Hill, Christopher, and Michael Smith (eds.)(2005). *The International Relations of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, Christopher, and William Wallace (1979). "Diplomatic Trends in the European Community." *International Affairs* 55: 47-66.

Hocking, Brian, and David Spence, eds. (2002). *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1965). "The European Process at Atlantic Crosspurposes." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 3: 85-101.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1966). "Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe." *Daedalus* 95: 862-74.

Holland, Martin (1987). "Three Approaches for Understanding European Political Cooperation: A Case-Study of EC South African Policy." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 25: 295-313.

Holland, Martin (1988). *The European Community and South Africa: European Political Cooperation Under Strain*. London: Pinter Publishers.

Holland, Martin, ed. (1991a). *The Future of European Political Cooperation: Essays on Theory and Practice*. London: Macmillan.

Holland, Martin (1991b). "Sanctions as an EPC Instrument." In Holland, *The Future of European Political Cooperation*.

Holland, Martin (1995). *European Union Foreign Policy: From EPC to CFSP Joint Action and South Africa*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Holland, Martin, ed. (1997a). *Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Record and Reforms*. London: Pinter Publishers.

Holland, Martin (1997b). "The Joint Action on South Africa: A Successful Experiment?" In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Record and Reforms*.

Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks (2003). "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-level Governance." *American Political Science Review* 97: 233-43.

Howorth, Jolyon (2003). "ESDP and NATO: Wedlock or Deadlock." *Cooperation & Conflict* 38: 235-54.

Howorth, Jolyon (2007). *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Howorth, Jolyon, and Anand Menon, eds. (1997). *The European Union and National Defense Policy*. London: Routledge.

Hunter, Robert E. (2002). *The European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor?* Santa Monica: RAND.

Hurd, Douglas (1981). "Political Cooperation." *International Affairs* 57: 383-93.

Hurd, Douglas (1994). "Developing the Common Foreign and Security Policy." *International Affairs* 70: 421-8.

Hurwitz, Leon (1975). "The EEC in the United Nations: The Voting Behavior of Eight Countries, 1948-1973." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 13: 224-43.

Hurwitz, Leon (1976). "The EEC and Decolonization: The Voting Behavior of the Nine in the UN General Assembly." *Political Studies* 24: 435-47.

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2006). "'Normative' Power Europe: A Realist Critique." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 217-34.

Ifestos, Panayiotis (1987). *European Political Cooperation: Towards a Framework of Supranational Diplomacy?* Aldershot, UK: Avebury.

Ingebritsen, Christine (1997). "Redefining National Security: Scandinavia Comes Out of the Cold." *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 20: 27-44.

Jones, Seth G. (2003). "The European Union and the Security Dilemma." *Security Studies* 12: 114-56.

Jones, Seth G. (2007). *The Rise of European Security Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jopp, Mathias (1997). "The Defense Dimension of the European Union: The Role and Performance of the WEU." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Jörgensen, Knud Erik (2004). “European Foreign Policy.” In Carlsnaes, Sjursen, and White, *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*.

Jörgensen, Knud Erik (2006). “A Multilateralist Role for the EU?” In Elgström and Smith, *The European Union’s Roles in International Politics*.

Keane, Rory (2004). "The Solana Process in Serbia and Montenegro: Coherence in EU Foreign Policy." *International Peacekeeping* 11: 491-507.

Keatinge, Patrick (1983). "Ireland: Neutrality Inside EPC." In Hill, *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation*.

Keatinge, Patrick (1997). "The Twelve, the United Nations, and Somalia: The Mirage of Global Intervention." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Kintis, Andreas G. (1997). "The EU's Foreign Policy and the War in Former Yugoslavia." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Kirchner, Emil, and James Sperling (2007). *EU Security Governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kohler, Beate (1982). "Euro-American Relations and European Political Cooperation." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

Kohnstamm, Max, and Wolfgang Hager, eds. (1973). *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign Policy Problems Before the European Community*. London: Macmillan.

Krahmann, Elke (2003). *Multilevel Networks in European Foreign Policy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Krenzler, Horst-Gunter, and Henning C. Schneider (1997). "The Question of Consistency." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Kronenberger, Vincent, and Jan Wouters, eds. (2004). *The European Union and Conflict Prevention: Policy and Legal Aspects*. The Hague: Asser Press.

Laatikainen, Katie V. (2003). "Norden's Eclipse: The Impact of the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy on the Nordic Group in the United Nations." *Cooperation and Conflict* 38: 409-41.

Laatikainen, Katie Verlin, and Karen E. Smith, eds. (2006). *The European Union at the United Nations: Intersecting Multilateralisms*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Ladrech, Robert (1994). "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32: 69-88.

Lak, Maarten W.J. (1989). "Interaction Between European Political Cooperation and the European Community (External) - Existing Rules and Challenges." *Common Market Law Review* 26: 281-99.

Lak, Maarten W.J. (1992). "The Constitutional Foundation." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Larsen, Henrik (2002). "The EU: A Global Military Actor?" *Cooperation and Conflict* 37: 283-302.

Laursen, Finn (1993). "The Maastricht Treaty: Implications for the Nordic Countries." *Cooperation and Conflict* 28: 115-41.

Lavenex, Sandra (2004). "EU External Governance in 'Wider Europe'." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11: 680-700.

Leonard, Mark (2006). *Why Europe Will Run the 21st Century*. London: Public Affairs.

Lerch, Marika, and Guido Schwellnus (2006). "Normative by Nature? The Role of Coherence in Justifying the EU's External Human Rights Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 304-21.

Lindberg, Leon N. (1970). "Political Integration as a Multidimensional Phenomenon Requiring Multivariate Measurement." *International Organization* 24: 649-731.

Lindemann, Beate (1976). "Europe and the Third World: The Nine at the United Nations." *The World Today* 32: 260-9.

Lindemann, Beate (1982). "European Political Cooperation at the UN: A Challenge for the Nine." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

Linklater, Andrew (2005). 'A European Civilising Process?" in Christopher Hill and Michael Smith (eds) *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lippert, Barbara (1997). "Relations with Central and Eastern European Countries: The Anchor Role of the European Union." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Lodge, Juliet (1988). "The European Parliament and Foreign Policy." In *Foreign Policy and Legislatures*, ed. M.L. Sondhi. New Delhi: Abhinav.

Lodge, Juliet (1989). "European Political Cooperation: Towards the 1990s." In *The European Community and the Challenge of the Future*, ed. Juliet Lodge. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Long, David (1997). "Multilateralism in the CFSP." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Longhurst, Kerry, and Marcin Zaborowski, eds. (2005). *Old Europe, New Europe and the Transatlantic Security Agenda*. London: Routledge.

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

Luif, Paul (1997). "Enlargement as a Challenge and Incentive for Reform." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Mace, Catriona (2004). "Operation *Concordia*: Developing a 'European' Approach to Crisis Management?" *International Peacekeeping* 11: 474-90.

Macleod, I., I.D. Henry, and Stephen Hyett (1996). *The External Relations of the European Communities: A Manual of Law and Practice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Major, Claudia (2005). "Europeanisation and Foreign and Security Policy: Undermining or Rescuing the Nation-State?" *Politics* 25: 175-190.

Manigart, Philippe, and Eric Marlier (1993). "European Public Opinion on the Future of Its Security." *Armed Forces & Society* 10: 335-52.

Manners, Ian (2002). "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40: 234-58.

Manners, Ian (2006). "Normative Power Europe Reconsidered: Beyond the Crossroads." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 182-99.

Manners, Ian, and Richard G. Whitman (eds.)(2000). *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mannin, Mike, ed. (1999). *Pushing Back the Boundaries: The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Martin, Lawrence, and John Roper, eds. (1995). *Towards a Common Defence Policy*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies of the WEU.

Mayhew, Alan (1998). *Recreating Europe: The European Union's Policy Towards Central and Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCormick, John (2006). *The European Superpower*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

McGoldrick, Dominic (1997). *International Relations Law of the European Union*. London: Longman.

McGuire, Steven, and Michael Smith (2008). *The European Union and the United States: Competition and Convergence in the Global Arena*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

McManus, Claire (1998). "Poland and the Europe Agreements: The EU as a Regional Actor." In Peterson and Sjursen, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*

Menon, Anand, Anthony Forster, and William Wallace (1992). "A Common European Defense." *Survival* 34: 98-118.

Merlingen, Michael et al. (eds.)(2006). *European Union Peacebuilding and Policing*. London: Routledge.

Meyer, Christoph O. (2005). "Convergence Towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms." *European Journal of International Relations* 11: 523-49.

Monar, Jörg (1997a). "Political Dialogue with Third Countries and Regional Political Groupings: The Fifteen as an Attractive Interlocutor." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Monar, Jörg (1997b). "The Financial Dimension of the CFSP." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1993). "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31: 473-524.

Müller, Harold (1992). "West European Cooperation on Nuclear Disarmament." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Müller, Harold, and Lars van Dassen (1997). "From Cacophony to Joint Action: Successes and Shortcomings of the European Nuclear Non-Proliferation Policy." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Neunreither, Karl-Heinz (1990). "The European Parliament: An Emerging Political Role?" In Edwards and Regelsberger, *Europe's Global Links*.

Neuwahl, Nanette (1994). "Foreign and Security Policy and the Implementation of the Requirement for 'Consistency' Under the Treaty on European Union." In *Legal Issues of the Maastricht Treaty*, eds. David O'Keeffe and Patrick M. Twomey. London: Wiley Chancery Law.

Nuttall, Simon (1988). "Where the European Commission Comes In." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Nuttall, Simon (1990). "The Commission: Protagonists of Inter-Regional Cooperation." In Edwards and Regelsberger, *Europe's Global Links*.

Nuttall, Simon J. (1992a). *European Political Cooperation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nuttall, Simon (1992b). "The Institutional Network and the Instruments of Action." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Nuttall, Simon (1994). "The EC and Yugoslavia: *Deus ex Machina* or *Machina sine Deo*?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32: 11-25.

Nuttall, Simon (1996). "The Commission: The Struggle for Legitimacy." In Hill, *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*.

Nuttall, Simon (1997). "Two Decades of EPC Performance." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Nuttall, Simon (2000). *European Foreign Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Occhipinti, John D. (2003). *The Politics of EU Police Cooperation: Toward a European FBI?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Øhrgaard, Jakob C. (1997). "'Less than Supranational, More than Intergovernmental': European Political Cooperation and the Dynamics of Intergovernmental Integration." *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 26: 1-29.

Osland, Kari M. (2004). "The EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *International Peacekeeping* 11: 544-60.

Pape, Robert A. (2005). "Soft Balancing Against the United States." *International Security* 30: 7-45.

Pardalis, Anastasia (1987). "European Political Cooperation and the United States." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 25: 271-94.

Penska, Susan E., and Warren L. Mason (2003). "EU Security Cooperation and the Transatlantic Relationship." *Cooperation and Conflict* 38: 255-80.

Pescatore, Pierre (1979). "External Relations in the Case-Law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities." *Common Market Law Review* 16: 615-45.

Peterson, John (1996). *Europe and America: The Prospects for Partnership*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Peterson, John, and Helene Sjursen, eds. (1998). *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP*. London: Routledge.

Pfetsch, Frank (1994). "Tensions in Sovereignty: Foreign Policies of EC Members Compared." In Carlsnaes and Smith, *European Foreign Policy*.

Piana, Claire (2002). "The EU's Decision-Making Process in the Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Case of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 7: 209-26.

Pijpers, Alfred (1988). "The Twelve Out-of-Area: A Civilian Power in an Uncivil World?" In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Pijpers, Alfred E. (1991). "European Political Cooperation and the Realist Paradigm." In Holland, *The Future of European Political Cooperation*.

Pijpers, Alfred, Elfriede Regelsberger, and Wolfgang Wessels, eds. (1988). *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s: A Common Foreign Policy for Western Europe?* Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Posen, Barry R. (2006). "European Union Security and Defense Policy: A Response to Unipolarity?" *Security Studies* 15: 149-86.

Quille, Gerrard (2004). "The European Security Strategy: A Framework for EU Security Interests?" *International Peacekeeping* 11: 422-38.

Regelsberger, Elfriede (1997). "The Institutional Setup and Functioning of EPC/CFSP." In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Regelsberger, Elfriede, and Wolfgang Wessels (1996). "The CFSP Institutions and Procedures: A Third Way for the Second Pillar." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 1: 29-54.

Regelsberger, Elfriede, Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wolfgang Wessels, eds. (1997). *Foreign Policy of the European Union: From EPC to CFSP and Beyond*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Reid, T.R (2004). *The United States of Europe*. New York: Penguin.

Rifkin, Jeremy (2004). *The European Dream*. New York: Pengiun.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1991). "Public Opinion, Domestic Structure and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies." *World Politics* 43: 479-512.

Rummel, Reinhardt, ed. (1990). *The Evolution of an International Actor: Western Europe's New Assertiveness*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Rummel, Reinhardt, ed. (1992). *Toward Political Union: Planning a Common Foreign and Security Policy in the European Community*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Rummel, Reinhardt (1997a). "The Intergovernmental Conference 1996: How to Reform CFSP?" In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Rummel, Reinhardt (1997b). "The CFSP's Conflict Prevention Policy." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Salmon, Trevor C. (1982). "Ireland: A Neutral in the Community?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 20: 205-27.

Salmon, Trevor C., and Alistair J.K. Shepherd (2003). *Toward a European Army: A Military Power in the Making?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Sangiovanni, Mette Eilstrup (2003). "Why a Common Security and Defence Policy is Bad for Europe." *Survival* 45: 193-206.

Scheich, Manfred (1992). "View from Austria: Preparing for Membership." In Rummel, *Toward Political Union*.

Schneider, Gerald, and Claudia Seybold (1997). "Twelve Tongues, One Voice: An Evaluation of European Political Cooperation." *European Journal of Political Research* 31: 367-96.

Schneider, Heinrich (1997). "The Twelve/Fifteen's Conference Diplomacy: Has the CSCE/OSCE Remained a Successful Platform?" In Regelsberger, de Schoutheete de Tervarent, and Wessels, *Foreign Policy of the European Union*.

Shaffer, Gregory C., and Mark A. Pollack, ed. (2001). *The New Transatlantic Dialogue: Intergovernmental and Transnational Perspectives*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.

Shearman, Peter, and Matthew Sussex, eds. (2004). *European Security After 9/11*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Shepherd, Alistair J.K. (2003). "The European Union's Security and Defence Policy: A Policy Without Substance?" *European Security* 12: 39-63.

Sjursen, Helene (1998). "Missed Opportunity or Eternal Fantasy? The Idea of a European Security and Defense Policy." In Peterson and Sjursen, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*

Sjursen, Helene (2006). "The EU as a 'Normative' Power: How Can This Be?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 235-51.

Smith, Anthony D. (1992). "National Identity and the Idea of European Unity." *International Affairs* 68: 55-76.

Smith, Hazel (1995). *European Foreign Policy and Central America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, Hazel (2002). *European Union Foreign Policy: What it is and What it does*. London: Pluto Press.

Smith, Karen E. (1998). *The Making of EU Foreign Policy: The Case of Eastern Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, Karen E. (2003). *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Smith, Karen E. (2005). "The Outsiders: The European Neighbourhood Policy." *International Affairs* 81: 757-73.

Smith, Karen E. (2006). "Speaking with One Voice? European Union Co-ordination on Human Rights Issues as the United Nations." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44: 113-37.

Smith, Michael (1994). "The European Union, Foreign Economic Policy, and the Changing World Arena." *Journal of European Public Policy* 1: 1994.

Smith, Michael (1996). "The EU as an International Actor." In *European Union: Power and Policy-Making*, ed. Jeremy J. Richardson. London: Routledge.

Smith, Michael (1998). "Does the Flag Follow Trade? Politicisation and the Emergence of a European Foreign Policy." In Peterson and Sjursen, *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*

Smith, Michael (2006). "Comment: Crossroads or Cul-de-sac? Reassessing European Foreign Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 322-7.

Smith, Michael E. (1998). "Rules, Transgovernmentalism, and the Expansion of European Political Cooperation." In *European Integration and Supranational Governance*, eds. Wayne Sandholtz and Alec Stone Sweet. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Michael E. (2000). "Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of European Foreign Policy Cooperation." *Journal of European Public Policy* 7: 613-31.

Smith, Michael E. (2001a). "Diplomacy by Decree: The Legalization of EU Foreign Policy." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39: 79-104.

Smith, Michael E. (2001b). "The Quest for Coherence: Institutional Dilemmas of External Action from Maasricht to Amsterdam." In *The Institutionalization of Europe*, ed. Alec Stone Sweet, Wayne Sandholtz, and Neil Fligstein. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Michael E. (2003). *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Michael E. (2004a). "Toward a Theory of EU Foreign Policy-making: Multi-level Governance, Domestic Politics, and National Adaptation to Europe's Common Foreign and Security Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11: 740-58.

Smith, Michael E. (2004b). "Institutionalization, Policy Adaptation, and European Foreign Policy Cooperation," *European Journal of International Relations* 10: 95-136.

Soetendorp, Ben (1994). "The Evolution of the EC/EU as a Single Foreign Policy Actor." In Carlsnaes and Smith, *European Foreign Policy*.

Soetendorp, Ben (1999). *Foreign policy in the European Union.* Longman, London and New York.

Spencer, Claire (2001). "The EU and Common Strategies: The Revealing Case of the Mediterranean." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 6: 31-51.

Stavridis, Stelios (1997). "The Democratic Control of CFSP." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Stavridis, Stelios, and Christopher Hill, eds. (1996). *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Western European Reactions to the Falklands Conflict*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Sundelius, Bengt (1994). "Changing Course: When Neutral Sweden Chose to Join the European Community." In Carlsnaes and Smith, *European Foreign Policy*.

Szymanski, Marcela, and Michael E. Smith (2005). "Coherence and Conditionality in European Foreign Policy: Negotiating the EU-Mexico Global Agreement." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43: 171-92.

Taylor, Phillip (1979). *When Europe Speaks With One Voice: The External Relations of the European Community*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Telo, Mario (2006). *Europe: A Civilian Power? European Union, Global Governance, World Order*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Tietje, Christian (1997). "The Concept of Coherence in the Treaty on European Union and the Common Foreign and Security Policy." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 2: 211-33.

Tonra, Ben (1997). "The Impact of Political Cooperation." In *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, ed. K.E. Jorgensen. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Tonra, Ben (2000a). "Mapping EU Foreign Policy Studies." Journal of European Public Policy 7: 163-169.

Tonra, Ben (2000b). "Committees in Common: Comitology and the Common Foreign and Security Policy." In *Committee Governance in the European Union*, eds. Thomas Christiansen and Emil Kirchner. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Tonra, Ben (2001). *The Europeanisation of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Tonra, Ben (2003). "Constructing the Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Utility of a Cognitive Approach." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41: 731-56.

Tonra, Ben, and Thomas Christiansen, eds. (2004). *Re-Thinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Twitchett, K. (1976). "External Relations or Foreign Policy?" In *Europe and the World*, ed. Ken Twitchett. London: Europa.

Ueta, Takako (1997). "The Stability Pact: From the Balladur Initiative to the EU Joint Action." In Holland, *Common Foreign and Security Policy*.

Ulriksen, Stale, Catriona Gourlay, and Catriona Mace (2004). "Operation *Artemis*: The Shape of Things to Come?" *International Peacekeeping* 11: 508-25.

van Praag, Nicholas (1982a). "Political Cooperation and Southern Europe: Case Studies in Crisis Management." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

van Praag, Nicholas (1982). "European Political Cooperation and Southern Africa." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

von der Gablentz, Otto (1979). "Luxembourg Revisited, or the Importance of European Political Cooperation." *Common Market Law Review* 16: 685-99.

von Groll, Götz (1982). "The Nine at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

von Staden, Alfred (1994). "After Maastricht: Explaining the Movement Towards a Common European Defence Policy." In Carlsnaes and Smith, *European Foreign Policy*.

Waever, Ole (1996). "European Security Identities." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34: 103-32.

Wagner, Wolfgang (2003). "Why the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy Will Remain Intergovernmental: A Rationalist Institutional Choice Analysis of European Crisis Management Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 10: 576-95.

Wagner, Wolfgang (2006). "The Democratic Control of Military Power Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13: 200-16.

Wallace, Helen (1986). "The Conduct of Bilateral Relationships by Governments." In *Partners and Rivals in Western Europe: Britain, France, and Germany*, eds. Roger Morgan and Caroline Bray. Brookfield, VT: Gower.

Wallace, Helen, and Geoffrey Edwards (1976). "European Community: The Evolving Role of the Presidency of the Council." *International Affairs* 53: 535-50.

Wallace, William (1982). "National Inputs into European Political Cooperation." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

Wallace, William (1983a). "Political Cooperation: Integration Through Intergovernmentalism." In *Policy-making in the European Community*, eds. Helen Wallace, William Wallace, and Carole Webb. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Wallace, William (1983b). "Introduction: Cooperation and Convergence in European Foreign Policy." In Hill, *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation*.

Wallace, William, and David Allen (1977). "Political Cooperation: Procedure as Substitute for Policy." In *Policy-Making in the European Communities*, ed. Helen Wallace, William Wallace, and Carole Webb. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Wallace, William, and William E. Paterson, eds. (1978). *Foreign Policy Making in Western Europe: A Comparative Approach*. Edited by William Wallace. Hants, England: Saxon House.

Warleigh, Alex (2006). "Learning From Europe? EU Studies and the Re-thinking of 'International Relations'." *European Journal of International Relations* 12: 31-51.

Weber, Katja, Michael E. Smith, and Michael Baun (eds.)(2007). *Governing Europe's Neighbourhood: Partners or Periphery?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Weiler, Joseph H.H. (1985). *The Evolution of the Mechanisms and Institutions for a European Foreign Policy*. Florence: European University Institute Working Paper, no. 202.

Weiler, Joseph and Wolfgang Wessels (1988). "EPC and the Challenge of Theory." In Pijpers, Regelsberger, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation in the 1980s*.

Wessel, Ramses A. (1997). "The International Legal Status of the European Union." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 2: 109-29.

Wessel, Ramses A. (1999). *The European Union's Foreign and Security Policy: A Legal Institutional Perspective*. The Hague: Kluwer Law.

Wessel, Ramses A. (2000). "Revisiting the International Legal Status of the EU." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 5: 507-37.

Wessels, Wolfgang (1982). "European Political Cooperation: A New Approach to European Foreign Policy." In Allen, Rummel, and Wessels, *European Political Cooperation*.

White, Brian (1999). "The European Challenge to Foreign Policy Analysis." *European Journal of International Relations* 5: 37-66.

White, Brian (2001). *Understanding European Foreign Policy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Whitman, Richard (1998). *From Civilian Power to Superpower? The International Identity of the European Union*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Wiessala, Georg (2002). *The European Union and Asian Countries*. London: Continuum.

Winn, Neil, and Christopher Lord (2001). *EU Foreign Policy Beyond the Nation-State: Joint Actions and Institutional Analysis of the Common Foreign and Security Policy*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Wivel, Anders (2005). "The Security Challenge of Small EU Member States: Interests, Identity and the Development of the EU as a Security Actor." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43: 393-412.

Wood, Pia Christina (1993). "European Political Cooperation: Lessons from the Gulf War and Yugoslavia." In *The State of the European Community, Vol. 2: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond*, eds. Alan W. Cafruny and Glenda G. Rosenthal. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Youngs, Richard (2002). *The European Union and the Promotion of Democracy: Europe's Mediterranean and Asian Policies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Youngs, Richard (2004). "Normative Dynamics and Strategic Interests in the EU's External Identity." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42: 415-36.

Zalewski, Marysia (1994). "What's New? Feminist Observations on the New Europe." In Carlsnaes and Smith, *European Foreign Policy*.

Zielonka, Jan (1998). *Explaining Euro-Paralysis: Why Europe is Unable to Act in International Politics*. New York: St. Martin's.