



LUND UNIVERSITY

A Critical Copenhagen Reflection on the European Union as a Global Actor

Manners, Ian

Published in:
The EU as a Global Actor

2016

Document Version:
Other version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Manners, I. (2016). A Critical Copenhagen Reflection on the European Union as a Global Actor. In A. Franck, & F. Söderbaum (Eds.), *The EU as a Global Actor: 'A Force for Good in the World?'* (pp. 75-102). Centre for European Research, CERGU.

Total number of authors:
1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

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

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

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

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

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

A Critical Copenhagen Reflection on the European Union as a Global Actor

Ian Manners

As the introductory chapter sets out, this volume critically interrogates the EU as a global actor and its normative power in global politics as part of the 2013 European Research Day of the Centre for European Research at Gothenburg University (CERGU). This chapter will conclude this interrogation by providing a Copenhagen reflection on the EU as a global actor within the context of the Normative Power Approach (NPA). The chapter engages in a critical Copenhagen reflection, which means that it takes seriously the insights of critical social theory and the role of cultural hegemony. The chapter argues that the NPA must be understood within the context of two decades of Copenhagen critical social theory, as this is where the approach was born and where I have worked intermittently since 2000.

The chapter is organised as follows: first it will set out critical social theory and a Copenhagen reflection on the EU as a global actor. Second, it engages with Franck and Lorenzoni's chapter on postcolonialism in the NPA. Third, it interacts with Jonasson's chapter on the EU and the Mediterranean region through an examination of the EU's consensual democracy support approach. Fourth, the chapter contemplates Söderbaum's analysis of the EU and Africa by comparing sustainable peacebuilding and social solidarity in development cooperation. The chapter concludes by reflecting on what the book says about the study of the EU as a global actor in a Nordic context. The chapter argues that the CERGU European Research Day and the contributing

chapters demonstrate just how well developed the study of the EU as a global actor has become in the Nordic region over the past two decades since the Swedish and Finnish membership of the EU in 1995.

Critical Social Theory

According to Max Horkheimer's well known definition, a theory is critical only if it meets three criteria: it must be explanatory, practical, and normative, all at the same time. That is it must explain what is wrong with current social reality, identify actors to change it, and provide clear norms for criticism and practical goals for the future (Bohman 1996: 190).

The Normative Power Approach (NPA)⁸ to global politics is located in the critical social theory that emerged within social science in the 1990s. In particular the works of Bonnie Honig (1993), Craig Calhoun (1995), James Bohman (1996), Seyla Benhabib (1996), and Molly Cochran (1999), amongst many others, provide the grounds of critical social theory for the global politics of the 21st century. The extent to which this simple theoretical observation is not well understood is a considerable understatement. Despite significant scholarly output over the past two decades, including Adler *et al.* (2006), Lucarelli and Manners (2006), Sjursen (2006), Laïdi (2008a, 2008b), Tocci (2008), Aggestam (2008), Gerrits (2009), Kissack (2010), Manners (2010a), Sicurelli (2010), Whitman (2011), Kavalski (2012), Woolcock (2012), Nicolaïdis and Whitman (2013), Voloshin (2014), Björkdahl *et al.* (2015), Sinkkonen (2015), and Pardo (2015), the role of theory in the NPA remains misunderstood.

The reason behind these manifold misunderstandings is probably quite simple – there is little place for critical social theory in international political theory, and there is little place for international political theory in the study of the European Union. As the above quote from James Bohman sets out, within critical social theory a normative power approach should be *explanatory, practical, and normative*, all at the same time. In this respect the NPA is *explanatory* in approaching the EU as a 'European communion'; a sharing of communitarian, cosmopolitan and cosmopolitical relationships that provide an explanation of the EU as an actor in global politics (Manners 2013a). Sec-

⁸ The phrase 'normative power Europe' was reconsidered and last used over 10 years ago as an attempt to move away from Cold War (and neocolonial) approaches to the EU (Manners 2006a: 184). The phrase is not now used by those who understand this move. [check if "not now used" is correct?]

ond, the NPA argues for an analytical focus on the EU's use of 'normative justification', rather than physical force or material incentives, which provides a *practical* guide for the practice of EU normative power in global politics. Finally, the NPA is *normative* in arguing that cosmopolitical theory, linking local politics with global ethics, provides a normative basis for critique in global politics.

The origins of the NPA are to be found in a critical Copenhagen context, meaning the interlacing of post-structural securitisation theory, constructivist social identity theory, and Bourdieusian critical theory that have grown in and around the intellectual milieu of Copenhagen over the past 20 years. As Andrew Moravcsik mistakenly argued in 1999, 'this approach is often referred to as the "Copenhagen school." It is so named because the force of continental constructivist theories appears to radiate outward from the Danish capital, where it is the hegemonic discourse' (Moravcsik 1999: 669). What he got wrong was equating the 'Copenhagen School' of security studies with the emergent social constructivism in EU studies in the late 1990s (Jørgensen 1997; Christiansen, Jørgensen and Wiener 1999). But what Moravcsik got right was identifying the force of hegemonic discourse found in the critical social theory of Antonio Gramsci (2005) on cultural hegemony. It is this broader sense of critical social theory that is encompassed here, founded in historical materialisms, critical theory, post-structural theories, feminist theories, and postcolonial theories (Manners 2007). Hence the NPA is to be found developed in two research papers from the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) – 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?' (Manners 2000a) and 'The "Difference Engine" - Constructing and Representing the International Identity of the European Union' (Manners 2001). These papers wove together, yet antagonised, the works of COPRI staff such as Ole Wæver, Thomas Diez, Lene Hansen and Stefano Guzzini, together with critical social theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu (1990, 1998), Craig Calhoun (1991, 1995), Stuart Hall (1996a, 1997) and Catarina Kinnvall (1995, 1999). It is within this critical Copenhagen context that a postcolonial engagement with the EU as a global actor must be located, as Europe is literally the creation of the third world.

Europe is the Creation of the World

Is it true – as *Frantz Fanon* claimed – that since its development has required the spoliation of the non-European world, 'Europe

is literally the creation of the Third World'? (Fanon 1963: 102 in Manners 2000b: 200).

Anja Franck and Patricia Lorenzoni's contribution to this volume reminds us of the importance of situating any discussion of the EU as a global actor in its post-colonial and postcolonial context. As set out in 2000: '[i]t is worth acknowledging the impact of Europe's colonial past. European states (including Russia) have, over the past 500 years, conquered and colonised virtually every single corner of the world in one form or another.... From this perspective Europe can be seen to be the exploiter of the world, with its relations being characterised by a combination of colonial legacy, predominance in international institutions, and continued exploitation through the forces of globalisation' (Manners 2000b: 182). More recent scholarship on the EU has reiterated this legacy through emphasising the colonial origins of the EU (Hansen and Jonsson 2012, 2014), the postcolonial move into Europe (Kinnvall 2006a, 2016), and current EU postcolonial relations (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2013, 2014). Following Franck and Lorenzoni, this section draws on the postcolonial work of five critical social theorists used in the NPA in order to improve understanding of the EU as a global actor.

Beyond Fanon's work, one of the earliest postcolonial scholars to influence the NPA was *Stuart Hall* and his work on race, identity and cultural studies (Hall 1961, 1977, 1996b; Spivak 2014). Hall's work sets out how 'systems of representation and signifying practices' (Hall 1997: 17 in Manners and Whitman 2003: 390) establish cultural identities found in postcolonial studies, but also how we must be 'critical of the notion of an integral, originary and unified identity' (Hall 1996a: 1 in Manners and Whitman 2003: 396). His work on the EC/EU was a critical starting point for understanding the co-constitution of identity effects of EU relations with the rest of the world (Manners and Whitman 2003: 381): 'Europe's external relations with its others has been central to the European story since its inception, and remains so. The story of European identity is often told as if it had no exterior. But this tells us more about how cultural identities are constructed – as 'imagined communities', through the marking of difference with others – than it does about the actual relations of unequal exchange and uneven development through which a common European identity was forged' (Hall 1991: 18 in Manners 2014: 263).

The work of *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak* has been important for the NPA. As discussed elsewhere (Manners 2013b: 319-320), it is worth reflecting on the extent to which 'past European failures and crimes (such as colonialism, nationalism, world wars, the holocaust and inequality) [including] historical

failures such as injustice, intolerance, and inhumanity' are part of the normative power narrative (Manners 2006a: 174). Clearly there is also 'the obvious postcolonial concern that civilian power Europe is read as a neocolonial attempt to "civilise" the world (again)' (Manners 2006a: 174). As has been argued, invoking Spivak, 'Postcolonial theory makes absolutely clear that the term "civilization" is part of "Eurocentric strategies of narrativizing history, so that Europe can congratulate itself for progress" which in contemporary terms invokes the "culture of capitalism" (Spivak 1999: 91, 93)' (Manners 2006b: 184). Here the difference between communitarian, cosmopolitan and cosmopolitical normative theory becomes important, particularly in the context of globalisation and neo-liberalism (Manners 2013a). As Kinnvall has argued, there is a need to understand the 'multifaceted nature of globalisation [...] in terms of a global-local nexus of dominance and resistance' using postcolonial, poststructural political theory and political psychology (Kinnvall 2006b: 11–35; Kinnvall and Nesbitt-Larking 2010; Manners 2011a: 227). Thus 'a communitarian emphasis on normative power as promoting European values raises concerns of neocolonial hegemony', while 'postcolonial theory and concerns for neocolonial practices must be explicit in attempts to understand how to judge and justify normative power' (Manners 2011a: 245). As Spivak has emphasised, 'it is not just Eurocentric communitarian strategies that are problematic, but also the "culture of capitalism" which evokes a wider critique of neo-liberal cosmopolitanism' (Kinnvall 2008; Manners 2011a: 245; Spivak 1999: 93).

The work of *Julia Kristeva* on the 'self as other' is important for postcolonial understandings in the NPA. As previously discussed (Manners 2006a: 177-8), Julia Kristeva's Lacanian psychoanalytically-based work has illustrated over the past three decades that the other is always part of the self – an abject-foreigner which is part of our conscious and unconscious selves (Kinnvall 2004):

Abject. It is something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object ... The abjection of Nazi crime reaches its apex when death, which, in any case, kills me, interferes with what, in my living universe, is supposed to save me from death: childhood, science, among other things (Kristeva 1982: 4).

The foreigner is within us. And when we flee from or struggle against the foreigner, we are fighting our unconsciousness – that 'improper' facet of our impossible 'own and proper' ...

To discover our disturbing otherness, for that indeed is what bursts in to confront that ‘demon’, that threat, that apprehension generated by the projective apparition of the other at the heart of what we persist in maintaining as a proper, solid ‘us’ (Kristeva 1991: 191-2).

To understand the way in which European selves are othered in abject-foreigners, it is worth briefly reflecting on recent EU-wide discourses surrounding the rise of the far-right in or near government in Austria, Italy, Denmark, Hungary, Poland, Belgium, Finland, and beyond (together with election successes of the far-right ‘Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy’ and ‘Europe of Nations and Freedom’ groups in the European Parliament). The reactions to Jörg Haider, Pia Kjaersgaard, Francine Le Pen, Geert Wilders, Timo Soini, and Jimmie Åkesson, and the hatred they attract are interesting exactly because of the ambiguity between abject-foreignness in questions of immigration, European integration, white supremacy, homophobia, and imperialism. The projection of otherness onto individuals and the social groups they represent is so strong precisely because they are also an abjected and disturbing part of ourselves.

The fifth critical social theorist who has influenced the NPA is *Étienne Balibar* with his work on race, nation and class and how this has postcolonial connotations. As set out in Manners (2009: 572), the 1980s saw the biological racism of the colonial era adapted to cultural racism for the postcolonial era with ‘colour’ exchanged for ‘religion’ (Balibar 1991: 21; Loomba 2003: 13), with Balibar arguing that:

current racism . . . fits into a framework of ‘racism without races’ . . . It is a racism whose dominant theme is not biological heredity but the insurmountability of cultural differences, a racism which, at first sight, does not postulate the superiority of certain groups or peoples in relation to others but ‘only’ the harmfulness of abolishing frontiers, the incompatibility of life-styles and traditions (Balibar 1991: 21).

The rise of cultural- or neo-racism and neo-nationalism within the context of ‘civilizational Europe’ has been discussed extensively within the NPA (Manners 2009: 571-3), in particular with the observation that ‘the use of civil, civilian, civilianize, civilianizing, civilize, civilization, and civilizing as if they were interchangeable makes their use highly problematic...

‘civilizing’ is far too encumbered a term to be used in any self-reflexive discussion of European relations with the rest of the world’ (Manners 2006b: 184).

In addition, Balibar’s notion of Europe as a ‘vanishing mediator’ is important in a postcolonial context (Manners 2006a: 174-5). Balibar takes Fredric Jameson’s ‘vanishing mediator’ a step further by giving it the meaning of an EUtopia or myth where the EU becomes the anti-systemic mediator – ‘a transitory institution, force, community ... that creates the conditions for a new society by rearranging the elements inherited from the very institution that has to be overcome’ (Balibar 2003). In contrast to the concept of exceptionalism, the extent to which the EU becomes a ‘vanishing mediator’ helps to judge the claim to normative power. If the successful exercise of normative power with reference to external points of international reference (such as the UN) leads to a more ‘universal’ acceptance of those norms, then the expectation would be that the EU would become less, not more powerful. It would, in effect, increasingly vanish through its mediation. It is for this reason that the terms ‘*sui generis*’ or ‘unique’ have not been used in the NPA – ‘any and all of the norms discussed in the NP approach are not uniquely European, and neither is Europe itself’ (Manners 2006a: 180). Clearly, the idea of ‘universal’ is problematic, but following the work of Edward Said, it is understood as particular/culture transcending norms such as human rights, justice, and human dignity that are found in generally agreed statements of principle such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Manners 2006a: 170 fn. 25; Triggs 2003; Ebadi 2004).

Following the postcolonial work of Fanon, Hall, Spivak, Kristeva, Balibar, and Said, the NPA returns to the question raised by *Pierre Bourdieu* which he believed ‘ought to be at the centre of any reasoned utopia concerning Europe: how do we create a really European Europe, one that is free from all the dependence on any of the imperialisms?’ (Bourdieu 1998: 129–30 in Manners and Whitman 2003: 397; Manners 2007: 83; Kinnvall 2016: 157). This question is very similar to that set out by Gurminder Bhambra who argues against neo-colonial cosmopolitanism and in favour of ‘a properly post-colonial cosmopolitanism [which] would make a difference to the ways in which we approach contemporary forms of exploitation of those represented as ‘outside’ Europe. By acknowledging historical connections, we make the contemporary issues we face shared ones, providing the basis for more adequate and more inclusive ways of addressing them’ (Bhambra 2016: 201). As the creation of the world, the study of the EU as a global actor should acknowledge this reality, in particular through recognising the EU as a ‘Europe-

an communion'; a sharing of communitarian, cosmopolitan and cosmopolitical relationships that provide an explanation for the EU as an actor in global politics, for good or for bad (Manners 2013a).

European Union Consensual Democracy Support

Ann-Kristin Jonasson's contribution to this volume on EU democracy promotion in the Mediterranean region serves as a good analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the EU as a global actor. Jonasson's chapter, together with Söderbaum's on development cooperation and peace-building, analyse three of the nine principles covered in the current NPA research programme including sustainable peace-building, consensual democracy, and social solidarity in development cooperation (Manners 2002: 242-4; 2008a: 47-55).

The Treaty of Lisbon amended the Treaty on European Union to include a general provision on the Union's External Action referring to seven substantive principles it seeks to promote, including democracy. It has been argued that there is a particular EU-specific conception of democracy underlying its democracy support activities. But it is also clear that assessing the substantive processes and practices of EU democracy support within the dense interconnections of international programmes of other actors and agencies, as well as interactions with rule of law, human rights and good governance support, is particularly challenging.

Consensual democracy is the operating principle within the majority of EU member states and includes proportional representation electoral systems, coalition governments and power-sharing among parties (Manners 2008a: 50; 2013c: 252). Similarly, the EU itself is a consensual form of polity, with PR and power-sharing in the European Parliament, non-majoritarian voting (either qualified majority voting or unanimity) in the Council, and power sharing among all the member states. Equally important is the need for democracy support to be consensual amongst the EU and its partners. Thus the NPA advocates that the EU should be engaging in socialisation rather than imposition, which should be seen as being a part of an open-ended process where the EU thinks and reflects on the impact of its policies with the partner countries, in particular through encouraging local ownership. Local ownership is crucial in ensuring that the EU's relationship is one that is 'other empowering' rather than replicating some of the self-empowering motivations of much foreign, development and humanitarian policy (Manners 2010b: 42).

The EU has helped to spread consensual democracy into Central and

Eastern Europe as part of the transition and accession processes. The trinity of democracy, human rights and rule of law, as the Lisbon Treaty suggested, is to be consolidated and supported in the EU's external action. The treaty indicates at least three ways in which democracy is to be supported: first, internally, through the provisions on democratic principles, including democratic equality, representative and participatory democracy, and the role of national parliaments; second, through the solidarity clause, which the EU and its member states can invoke to protect democratic institutions from any terrorist attack; and third, through enlargement and accession, as well as neighbourhood and development policies.

It can be suggested that the substance of EU democracy support contains elements of *horizontality*, *hierarchy*, *depth* and *sustainability* (Manners 2011b). The NPA sets out the close interdependence between the principles, actions and impact of EU democracy support. Besides the substantive empirical insights of case study analysis, the NPA attempts to address the very real analytical difficulties of assessing the substantive impact of EU democracy support. In this way it becomes possible to analyse the '*horizontal*' importance of the EU's 'wider policy' of support for the 'indivisible' core norms of democracy, rule of law and human rights included in the Lisbon Treaty's general provision. Similarly, the status of democracy in the '*hierarchy*' of EU principles, beneath that of sustainable peace, should be examined. Thirdly, the '*depth*' of the EU's commitment to the support for 'consensual democracy' must be considered. In this respect it is important to examine whether support for consensual, rather than majoritarian, democracy is a form of more substantive democratic support in the way it reaches deep into the democratic, rather than electoral practices of the 'promoted' country. Finally, the question arises of whether the substantially longer terms of EU engagement in cases of democracy support, over decades rather than days, leads to more '*sustainable*' democracy.

The NPA also helps address the challenge of comparing, judging and reflecting on the democratic substance that the EU supports. By deploying three modes of critique – transcendental, immanent, and pragmatic – the tripartite NPA makes a contribution to the question of whether and how to compare with the democratic substance that EU member states, other actors and other international organisations support. What Jonasson's chapter makes clear in the cases of Turkey and Jordan, as the failure of all the Arab uprisings apart from Tunisia demonstrate, is that EU 'deep democracy' support must move beyond election assistance towards a much broader understanding of consensual democracy with all its economic, social and cultural connotations.

Sustainable Peacebuilding and Social Solidarity in Development Cooperation

Fredrik Söderbaum's analysis of the EU and Africa through comparing sustainable peacebuilding and social solidarity in development cooperation illustrates the interinstitutional tensions between EEAS-driven peacebuilding and Commission-driven development cooperation.

Sustainable Peacebuilding

Within the NPA, the prime EU principle is sustainable peace addressing the roots or causes of conflict, mirroring the experience of ensuring that war 'becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible'. The EU policy emphasis is placed on development aid, trade, interregional cooperation, political dialogue and enlargement as elements of a more holistic approach to conflict prevention (Manners 2008a: 48-9; 2013c: 243-4). However, the EU's growing civilian and military operational capacities also have a sustainable peace mission with a focus on 'peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter' (see Björkdahl 2011, and Björkdahl *et al* 2016). While the first objective of the Union is to promote peace, the rest of the Lisbon Treaty suggests that such an objective is to be achieved in at least three different ways. First, peace between European states is achieved through membership of the EU itself, intended to ensure that the peace in Europe of the last 60 years is sustained into the foreseeable future. Second, close and peaceful relations based on cooperation with neighbouring countries are promoted through special relations with the Union's neighbours. Third, peace and international security are generally promoted through the EU's external actions, including the provisions on the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) such as 'joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation'.

A question arises over where the balance of emphasis is to be found between addressing the causes of conflict in a peaceful way, and the ability to use force in peacekeeping and genocidal situations (Manners 2008b: 33-4).

Similarly, there is the associated question of whether this is best done through international cooperation, regional peacekeeping operations, or an UN-authorised force. In addressing these questions of the balance between conflict prevention and conflict management, a number of scholars have looked at the EU in the context of the exercise of normative power. Annika Björkdahl and Ana Juncos have both emphasised the normative power of the EU in South-eastern Europe, where there is an ‘asymmetrical relationship between the EU as a norm-maker and Macedonia as a potential norm-taker’ and arguing that ‘a parallel process has taken place in the last decade facilitating the (re)integration of [Bosnia] in the European mainstream and the (re)invention of the EU as a regional normative power’ (Björkdahl 2005: 277–8; Juncos 2005: 89). Sonia Lucarelli and Roberto Menotti have suggested that such normative power currently excludes certain forms of coercive actions, such as punishment and ‘pre-emption’, but must be seen as part of a distinctive political dynamic that is leading towards a greater acceptance of a wider notion of intervention in the EU (Lucarelli and Menotti 2006: 162–3). As Thomas Diez *et al* have illustrated in the case of border conflicts, the EU is able to exercise normative power through membership and association negotiations, which in some cases has led to ‘a long-term socialisation of policymakers into European normative discourses’ (Diez *et al.* 2006: 572–3 and 586–7).

The notion of the EU’s Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) representing an UN-sanctioned military force willing to promote human security is a common representation of normative power (Terriff 2004; Matlary 2006; Liotta and Owen 2006). For the European Commission, human security means a concern for individuals, not states, and encompasses both freedom from fear (for example conflict and human rights abuses) and freedom from want (for example poverty and disease) (European Commission 2005a: 2; Ferrero-Waldner 2006: 103–7). Interestingly, the origins of the 2003 European Security Strategy are informed by this understanding of human security, in particular with its references to the ‘complex causes’ of terrorism including ‘the pressures of modernisation, cultural, social and political crises’ (Council of Ministers 2003: 3; Glasius and Kaldor 2004; Liotta and Owen 2006: 97).

Social Solidarity in Development Cooperation

Within the NPA, an extensive understanding of social solidarity becomes clear in references in the objectives of the Lisbon Treaty to ‘balanced economic growth’, ‘social market economy’, ‘full employment’ and combating ‘social exclusion’, as well as promoting ‘social justice and protection’, inter-

generational solidarity, and social solidarity among (and between) member states (Manners 2008a: 53; 2013c: 224). The principle of social solidarity goes beyond intra-EU relations to inform and shape EU development and trade policies, as the Lisbon Treaty suggests with its references to the Union's contribution to 'solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty'. In addition to promoting equality, the third objective of the Lisbon Treaty is to promote social solidarity through a variety of treaty areas, including intergenerational solidarity, interstate solidarity and labour solidarity. Intergenerational solidarity emphasizes the role of families and the state in providing practical, financial and social support across the generations. Interstate solidarity involves a spirit of mutual solidarity between member states in order to promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, as well as in response to terrorist attack or natural or human-induced disaster. Labour solidarity is concerned with the promotion of labour rights and protection, including core labour standards and fair trade, and can be found entrenched in the twelve articles in the solidarity title of the Charter, as well as in the reference to 'free and fair trade' in the Lisbon Treaty.

But to what extent does this EU principle translate into relations and policies with the developing world? As previously suggested (Manners 2008b: 25-6), this is extremely difficult to evaluate as EU development policy largely consists of EU donor member states and the EU Commission working through the OECD DAC (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee). Similarly, the EU is not the only actor in the field of development assistance, with a wide variety of state, international and non-governmental organisations active. Finally, there is the highly charged question of whether trade (i.e. freer market access), aid (i.e. greater financial aid), or good governance (i.e. better instruments of government) is the best way to promote development.

A number of scholars have examined EU development policy in relation to the NPA, including issues such as the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA) in the 2000 Cotonou Agreement; the 2001 'Everything but Arms' (EBA) initiative; the 2002 Monterrey process; and the European Commission's idea of a development 'policy of solidarity'. In a critical review of EU development policy, Andy Storey makes the point that 'there may be some reality in the idea that Normative Power Europe is in action in the EPA negotiations', but that the EU promotion of good governance is too narrowly focused on liberal democracy and market economies which 'may not correspond to the developmental needs of African economies' (Storey 2006: 343). In other words, Storey suggests that the EU has normative power, but that in devel-

opment policy it has a preference for promoting norms of freedom and good governance at the expense of social solidarity. Peter Hilpold has argued the importance of the principle of good governance in the Cotonou Agreement for promoting human rights and democracy through a preference for positive measures and a recoupling of developmental assistance with its normative foundations (Hilpold 2002: 66–7, 71). In his studies of the EBA initiative and the Monterrey process, Jan Orbie argues that ‘EU trade policy discourse . . . shows a normative bias towards the achievement of [goals such as] sustainable development and global rules’ (Orbie 2004: 4). He suggests that EBA trade policy ‘may well be an important EU instrument for achieving the . . . goal of development of the South’ (ibid.). Orbie discusses the way in which EU self-perceptions ‘as a leading and benevolent actor played a role in the EU decisions towards Monterrey [including] a remarkable shift towards more integration in European development policy’ (Orbie 2003: 1). Orbie shares Storey’s concerns for the (neo)liberal promotion of multilateralism and the extent to which the EU is unable or unwilling to resist US hegemony (Orbie 2003: 26; 2004: 415).

The movement from the Lomé Convention’s emphasis on privileged partnership to the Cotonou Agreement’s focus on conditionality, differentiation and regionalisation has been criticised by Storey, Orbie and others. The Lomé and the ACP relationship prior to 2000 was motivated by the desire to promote social solidarity and discourse ethics through unconditional and undifferentiated aid and dialogue while being selective in excluding developing societies in the rest of the world. In the post-Cold War world such ‘paternalistic, neo-colonial attitudes undermined the principle of equality’ (Lethinen 1997 in Bonaglia et al. 2006: 172) and were criticised for ‘the poor results of EU development cooperation’ (Arts and Dickson 2004: 2). Since 1990, the EU’s development policy has increasingly moved in a less privileging but more holistic direction, placing an emphasis on conditional and differentiated aid encouraging regionalisation, together with greater overall funding. This changed direction is motivated by the aim of promoting more holistic normative principles (such as good governance, human rights, democracy and rule of law) reflecting a greater emphasis on the results-orientated consequentialist ethics witnessed in the Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development Goals which question the centrality of the Commission’s policy of solidarity.

Vicki Birchfield (2011) approaches the study of EU development assistance using normative power as ‘theoretically grounded, *empirical* framework of analysis’ concluding that, with the exception of two areas, the poli-

cies ‘represent the normative form and the empirical function on the concept as well as the praxis of normative power’. Birchfield explores how material development assistance is related to processes of internal and external normative justification, suggesting that ‘the EU seemingly undergoes and exercise in ... an identification and legitimation internal process coupled with an external process of justification and projection’. Birchfield explicitly applies the normative power tripartite analytical framework to conclude that ‘overall the bulk of the empirical evidence suggests a tentative affirmation of the congruence between the notion of the EU as a normative power and the reorientation and execution of its development policies’. Birchfield’s examination of EU development policy identifies the ‘key principles’ as equality and solidarity, although she also identifies the way the EU’s new (2005) development policy concepts of harmonization, results-orientation, ownership, and coherence align EU principles with those of the UN. Birchfield also discussed the question of ownership as a ‘fundamental concepts’ of new EU development policy, concluding that ‘the EU sees ownership by EU partner countries as pivotal for the efficiency and sustainability of its initiatives’.

Nordic Studies of the European Union as a Global Actor

The contributing chapters to this book illustrate how well developed the study of the EU as a global actor has become in the Nordic region over the past two decades (see Garsky, Jørgensen and Manners 2012). This critical Copenhagen reflection on the European Union as a global actor will conclude by briefly reflecting on what the book has to say about such Nordic scholarship, and hence what such Nordic scholarship has to say to the study of the EU as a global actor.

Firstly, the introduction by Anja Franck and Fredrik Söderbaum illustrates the way in which scholarship at Gothenburg University is at the peak of Swedish work on the EU as a global actor. In addition to the work by the contributing authors, Lisbeth Aggestam and Adrian Hyde-Price contribute to CERGU excellence in this field. Secondly, the work of Anja Franck and Patricia Lorenzoni illustrates the extent to which there is excellent Nordic scholarship in postcolonial studies, as work by Catarina Kinnvall (2006a, 2016; and with Nesbitt-Larking 2011); Peo Hansen and Stefan Jonsson (2012, 2014); and Rebecca Adler-Nissen and Ulrich Pram Gad (2013, 2014) demonstrate. Finally, both Ann-Kristin Jonasson and Fredrik Söderbaum’s chapters illustrate the empirical strengths on questions of EU relations with the Mediterranean and Africa (see also Jonasson 2013 and Söderbaum 2015).

Beyond Gothenburg there is also leading excellence on studying the EU as a global actor at Lund University found, for example, in the work of Annika Björkdahl (2015, 2016) on EU peacebuilding and norm importation, Annika Kronsell (2012, 2016) on CSDP and feminism in EU studies, and Catarina Kinnvall on postcolonial Europe. The final Swedish centre for excellence on the EU as a global actor is to be found in Stockholm amongst scholars linked to the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, in particular Björn Fägersten (2014), Stefan Borg (with Diez 2016), Niklas Bremberg (2015) Mark Rhinard (with Boin and Ekengren 2013), and Anke Schmidt-Felzmann (2008). Four further centres of international excellence on the EU as a global actor are to be found in the Nordic region in Tampere, Helsinki, Oslo, and Copenhagen. In Tampere Tuomas Forsberg and Hiski Haukkala (2016), together with Hanna Ojanen (2006), provide a core of expertise on the EU and Russia, as well as CSDP. In Helsinki the Finnish Institute for International Affairs also has a strong research programme on the EU as a global actor led by Juha Jokela (2010), Kristi Raik (2004), Sinikukka Saari (2011), and Niklas Helwig (2013). Research expertise in Oslo is divided between the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) with Nina Græger (2016), Pernille Rieker (2016), and Kristin Haugevik (with Græger 2011), and the Advanced Research on the Europeanisation of the Nation-State (ARENA) Centre for European Studies with Helene Sjørnsen (2009) and Marianne Riddervold (2011). Finally, leading Danish excellence on the EU as a global actor is to be found in the Centre for European Politics in the Department of Political Science at the University of Copenhagen. Scholars here include Rebecca Adler-Nissen (2014), Ben Rosamond (with Parker 2013), Jens Ladefoged Mortensen (2010), Henrik Larsen (2014), Anders Wivel (with Archer and Bailes 2014), Petra Debusscher (2011), Anders Persson (2014), Ruxandra Lupu Dinesen (with Raik 2015), and myself. This list of almost 40 Nordic scholars studying the EU as a global actor is by no means exhaustive, merely illustrative, with an equal number of excellent scholars not listed (for example Knud Erik Jørgensen at Aarhus and Michelle Pace at Roskilde).

Returning to the (sub)title of this volume, what is quite clear is that Nordic studies of the EU as a global actor have now moved a long way beyond arguments suggesting that the EU be considered a ‘force for good’ without critical self-reflection on such claims. As repeatedly pointed out within the NPA (e.g. Manners 2010b: 44; 2011a: 243), it is highly problematic to compound transatlantic discourses of ‘force for good’ with ‘normative power’ without too much reflection on how these have been differently constructed and by whom (see Pace 2008; Barbé and Johansson-Nogués 2008). Transatlanticist

discourses of the EU as a ‘force for good’ emanated from the New Transatlantic Agenda (EU-US Summit, Madrid, 3 December 1995), and were incorporated into the 2003 European Security Strategy (European Union 2003) as well as subsequent prioritisation of short-term security issues.⁹

What is also clear is that the long journey in the study of the EU as a global actor and the normative power approach since the mid-1990s has involved a fruitful intertwining of Nordic scholarship and international political theory, informed by critical social theory. There have been many twists and turns on this journey, but the study of the EU as a global actor in the 2010s is now much healthier compared with the 1990s. As pointed out in section 1, and re-emphasised throughout the chapter, space must be found for critical social theory in international political theory, and these approaches must inform the study of the EU in and of global politics.

References

- Adler, Emanuel, Federica Bicchì, Beverly Crawford, Raffaella Del Sarto (eds.) (2006) *The Convergence of Civilizations: Constructing a Mediterranean Region* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- Adler-Nissen, Rebecca (2014) ‘Symbolic power in European diplomacy: the struggle between national foreign services and the EU’s External Action Service’, *Review of International Studies*, 40(4): 657-81.
- Adler-Nissen, Rebecca, and Ulrik Pram Gad (2013) *European Integration and Postcolonial Sovereignty Games: The EU Overseas Countries and Territories* (London: Routledge).
- Adler-Nissen, Rebecca, and Ulrik Pram Gad (2014) ‘Introduction: Postimperial sovereignty games in the Nordic region’, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 49(1): 3-32.
- Aggestam, Lisbeth (ed.) (2008) ‘Ethical power Europe?’, *International Affairs*, 84(1): 1-143.

⁹ The 1995 New Transatlantic Agenda stated ‘we are determined to reinforce our political and economic partnership as a powerful force for good in the world’, while the 2003 European Security Strategy stated that ‘the transatlantic relationship is irreplaceable. Acting together, the European Union and the United States can be a formidable force for good in the world’. These different constructions may be seen as embodied in the symbolism of Clare Short’s (former British Secretary of State for Development) discourse of good global development and her 2003 resignation over the invasion of Iraq.

- Anderson, Perry, and Stuart Hall (1961) 'The Politics of the Common Market', *New Left Review*, I/10, July-August.
- Archer, Clive, Alyson Bailes, Anders Wivel (eds.) *Small States and International Security: Europe and Beyond* (London: Routledge).
- Arts, Karin, and Anna Dickson (2004) *EU development cooperation: from model to symbol* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Balibar, Étienne (1991) 'Is there a 'neo-racism'?', in Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds.) *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso), pp. 17–28.
- Balibar, Étienne (2003) 'Europe: Vanishing Mediator', *Constellations*, 10(3): 312–38.
- Barbé, Ester, and Elisabeth Johansson-Nogués (2008), 'The EU as a modest "force for good": the European Neighbourhood Policy', *International Affairs*, 84(1): 81–96.
- Benhabib, Seyla (ed.) (1996) *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Benhabib, Seyla (2002) *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Benhabib, Seyla (2004) *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bhabra, Gurinder (2016) 'Whither Europe? Postcolonial versus Neocolonial Cosmopolitanism', *Interventions*, 18(2): 187-202.
- Birchfield Vicki (2011) 'The EU's development policy: empirical evidence of 'Normative Power Europe'?', in Richard Whitman (ed.) *Normative Power Europe: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), pp. 140–159.
- Björkdahl, Annika (2005) 'Norm-maker and Norm-taker: Exploring the Normative Influence of the EU in Macedonia', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 10(2): 257–78.
- Björkdahl, Annika (2011) 'Building peace: normative and military power

- in EU peace operations’, in Richard Whitman (ed.) *Normative Power Europe: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), pp. 103–125.
- Björkdahl, Annika, Natalia Chaban, John Leslie, and Annick Masselot (eds.) (2015) *Importing EU Norms: Conceptual Framework and Empirical Findings* (Dordrecht: Springer).
- Björkdahl, Annika, Kristine Höglund, Gearoid Millar, Jair van der Lijn, Willemijn Verkoren (eds.) (2016) *Peacebuilding and Friction: Global and Local Encounters in Post Conflict-Societies* (London: Routledge).
- Bohman, James (1996) ‘Critical Theory and Democracy’, in David Rasmussen (ed.) *Handbook of Critical Theory* (Cambridge: Blackwell), pp. 190-225.
- Boin, Arjen, Magnus Ekengren, and Mark Rhinard (2013) *The European Union as Crisis Manager: Patterns and Prospects* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bonaglia, Federico, Andrea Goldstein, and Fabio Petito (2006) ‘Values in European Union development cooperation policy’, in Sonia Lucarelli and Ian Manners (eds.) *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge).
- Borg, Stefan, and Thomas Diez (2016) ‘Postmodern EU? Integration between Alternative Horizons and Territorial Angst’, in Ian Manners and Richard Whitman (eds.) Special Issue on ‘Another Theory is Possible: Dissident Voices in Theorising Europe’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(1): 136-151.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* (Oxford: Polity Press).
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1998) ‘A reasoned Utopia and economic fatalism’, *New Left Review*, 98(227): 125–30.
- Bremberg, Niklas (2015) *Diplomacy and Security Community-Building: EU Crisis Management in the Western Mediterranean* (London: Routledge).

- Calhoun, Craig (1991) 'Indirect relationships and imagined communities: large-scale social integration and the transformation of everyday life', in Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman (eds), *Social Theory for a Changing Society* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).
- Calhoun, Craig (1995) *Critical Social Theory: Culture, History, and the Challenge of Difference* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Calhoun, Craig (2003) 'The class consciousness of frequent travellers: towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism', in Daniele Archibugi (ed.) *Debating Cosmopolitics* (London: Verso), pp. 86–116.
- Christiansen, Thomas, Knud Erik Jørgensen, and Antje Wiener (eds.) (1999) 'The Social Construction of Europe', Special issue of the *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(4): 527–691.
- Cochran, Molly (1999) *Normative Theory in International Relations: A Pragmatic Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Debusscher, Petra (2011) 'Mainstreaming gender in European commission development policy: conservative Europeanness?', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 34(1): 39-49.
- Diez, Thomas, Mathias Albert and Stephan Stetter (eds.) (2006) *European Union and Border Conflicts: The Power of Integration and Association* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press).
- Ebadi, Sharin (2004) 'Human Rights Embody the Fundamental Values of Human Civilizations', *UN Human Development Report 2004* (New York: UNDP), p. 23.
- Fanon, Frantz (1963) *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press).
- Forsberg, Tuomas, and Hiski Haukkala (2016) *The European Union and Russia* (London: Palgrave).
- Fägersten, Björn (2014) 'The Implications of the Euro Crisis for European Foreign Policy- Lessons from Crisis Management and International Trade', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 19(4): pp. 483–502.
- Garsky, Salla, Knud Erik Jørgensen, and Ian Manners (2012) 'EU Studies

- in Denmark and Sweden', in Federiga Bindi and Kjell Eliassen (eds.) *Analyzing European Union Politics* (Bologna : Il Mulino), pp. 135-154.
- Gerrits, Andre (ed.) (2009) *Normative Power Europe in a Changing World: A Discussion* (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael).
- Graeger, Nina (2016) *EU-NATO Cooperation: European Security as Informal Practice* (London: Routledge).
- Græger, Nina, and Kristin Haugevik (2011) 'The EU's performance with and within NATO: Assessing objectives, outcomes and organisational practices', *Journal of European Integration*, 33(6): 743-57.
- Gramsci, Antonio (2005) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd).
- Hall, Stuart (1977) 'Pluralism, Race and Class in Caribbean Society', in *Race and Class in Post-colonial Society* (Paris: UNESCO), pp. 150-82.
- Hall, Stuart (1991) 'Europe's other self', *Marxism Today*, 35: 18–19.
- Hall, Stuart (1992) 'The question of cultural identity', in Stuart Hall, David Held and Tony McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and its Futures* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).
- Hall, Stuart (1996a) 'Introduction: Who needs "identity" ?', in Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London: Sage).
- Hall, Stuart (1996b) 'When was 'the post-colonial'? Thinking at the Limit', in Ian Chambers and Lidia Curti (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Question* (Routledge, London).
- Hall, Stuart (ed.) (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).
- Hansen, Peo, and Stefan Jonsson (2014) *Eurafrica: the untold history of European integration and colonialism* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing).
- Hansen, Peo, and Stefan Jonsson (2012) 'Imperial Origins of European Integration and the Case of Eurafrica: A Reply to Gary Marks' 'Europe

- and Its Empires', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6): 1028-41.
- Helwig, Niklas (2013) 'EU Foreign Policy and the High Representative's Capability-Expectations Gap: A question of Political Will', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 2: 235-53.
- Hilpold, Peter (2002) 'EU Development Cooperation at a Crossroads: The Cotonou Agreement of 23 June 2000 and the Principle of Good Governance', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 7(1): 53-72.
- Honig, Bonnie (1993) *Political Theory and the Displacement of Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Honig, Bonnie (2006) 'Another cosmopolitanism? Law and politics in the new Europe', in Robert Post (ed.) *Seyla Benhabib: Another Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 102-27.
- Jonasson, Ann-Kristin (2013) *The EU's Democracy Promotion and the Mediterranean Neighbours: Orientation, Ownership and Dialogue in Jordan and Turkey* (London: Routledge).
- Jokela, Juha (2010) *Europeanization and Foreign Policy: State Identity in Finland and Britain* (London: Routledge).
- Juncos, Ana (2005) 'The EU's post-Conflict Intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina:(re) Integrating the Balkans and/or (re) Inventing the EU?', *Southeast European Politics*, 6(2): 88-108.
- Jørgensen, Knud Erik (ed.) (1997) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- Kavalski, Emelian (2012) *Central Asia and the Rise of Normative Powers: Contextualizing the Security Governance of the European Union, China, and India* (London: Continuum/Bloomsbury Academic).
- Kinnvall, Catarina (1995) *Cultural Diffusion and Political Learning: The Democratization of China* (Lund: Studentlitteratur).
- Kinnvall, Catarina (1999) 'Globalizing Identity: Knowledge, Self and Power in Transition', paper presented to the International Society of Political Psychology, 22nd Annual Conference, July, Amsterdam.

- Kinnvall, Catarina (2002a) 'Analysing the global–local nexus', in Catarina Kinnvall and Kristina Jönsson (eds), *Globalization and Democratization in Asia: The Construction of Identity* (London: Routledge).
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2002b) 'Nationalism, religion and the search for chosen traumas: comparing Sikh and Hindu identity constructions', *Ethnicities*, 2(19): 79–106.
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2004) 'Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security', *Political Psychology*, 25(5): 741-67.
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2006a) 'The Postcolonial has moved into Europe', guest lecture to the Swedish Institute of International Affairs.
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2006b) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism in India: The Search for Ontological Security* (London: Routledge).
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2008) 'Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak', in Jenny Edkins and Nick Vaughan-Williams (eds.) *Critical Theorists and International Relations* (London: Routledge), pp. 317–29.
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2016) 'The Postcolonial has Moved into Europe: Bordering, Security and Ethno-Cultural Belonging', in Ian Manners and Richard Whitman (eds.) Special Issue on 'Another Theory is Possible: Dissident Voices in Theorising Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(1): 152-68.
- Kinnvall, Catarina, and Paul Nesbitt-Larking (2010) 'Security, subjectivity and space in postcolonial Europe: Muslims in the diaspora', *European Security*, 18(3): 305–26.
- Kinnvall, Catarina, and Paul Nesbitt-Larking (2011) *The Political Psychology of Globalization: Muslims in the West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Kissack, Robert (2010) *Pursuing Effective Multilateralism: The European Union, International Organisations and the Politics of Decision Making* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

- Kristeva, Julia (1982) *Powers of Horror: An Essay in Abjection* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Kristeva, Julia (1991) *Strangers to Ourselves* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Kronsell, Annica (2012) *Gender, Sex and the Postnational Defense: Militarism and Peacekeeping* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Kronsell, Annica (2016) 'The Power of EU Masculinities: A Feminist Contribution to European Integration Theory', in Ian Manners and Richard Whitman (eds.) Special Issue on 'Another Theory is Possible: Dissident Voices in Theorising Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(1): 104-120.
- Laïdi, Zaki (ed.) (2008a) *EU Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: Normative Power and Social Preferences* (London: Routledge).
- Laïdi, Zaki (2008b) *Norms Over Force: The Enigma of European Power* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Larsen, Henrik (2014) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe* (London: Routledge).
- Liotta, Peter, and Taylor Owen (2006) 'Why human security', *Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, 7: 37-55.
- Loomba, Ania (2003) 'Remembering Said', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 23(1-2): 12-14.
- Lucarelli, Sonia, and Ian Manners (eds.) (2006) *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge).
- Lucarelli, Sonia, and Roberto Menotti (2006) 'The Use of Force as Coercive Intervention', in Sonia Lucarelli and Ian Manners (eds.) *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge), pp. 147-164.
- Manners, Ian (2000b) 'Europe and the World: the Impact of Globalisation', in Anne Stevens and Richard Sakwa (eds.) *Contemporary Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan), pp. 182-201.

- Manners, Ian (2000a) 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?', Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) Working Paper 38.
- Manners, Ian (2001) 'The 'Difference Engine' - Constructing and Representing the International Identity of the European Union', Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) Working Paper 40.
- Manners, Ian (2002) 'Normative power Europe: a contradiction in terms?' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(2): 235–58.
- Manners, Ian (2006a) 'The European Union as a normative power: a response to Thomas Diez', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35(1): 167–80.
- Manners, Ian (2006b) 'Normative power Europe reconsidered: beyond the crossroads', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(2): 182–99.
- Manners, Ian (2007) 'Another Europe is possible: critical perspectives on European Union politics', in Knud Erik Jørgensen, Mark Pollack, and Ben Rosamond (eds.) *Handbook of European Union Politics* (London: Sage), pp. 77–95.
- Manners, Ian (2008a) 'The normative ethics of the European Union', *International Affairs*, 84(1): 45–60.
- Manners, Ian (2008b) 'The normative power of the European Union in a globalised world', in Zaki Laïdi (ed.) *EU Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: Normative power and social preferences* (London: Routledge), pp.23-37.
- Manners, Ian (2009) 'Normative Power Europe: A Transdisciplinary Approach to European Studies', in Chris Rumford (ed.) *SAGE Handbook of European Studies* (London: Sage), pp. 561-86.
- Manners, Ian (ed.) (2010a) Virtual Special Issue on 'Normative Power', *Journal of European Public Policy*. Available at: <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/access/rjpp.pdf>
- Manners, Ian (2010b) 'As you like it: European Union normative power in

the European Neighbourhood Policy’, in Richard Whitman and Stefan Wolff (eds.) *The European Neighbourhood Policy in Perspective: Context, Implementation and Impact* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), pp., 29–50.

Manners, Ian (2011a) ‘The European Union’s normative power: critical perspectives and perspectives on the critical’, in Richard Whitman (ed.) *Normative Power Europe: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), pp. 226–47.

Manners, Ian (2011b) ‘Consensual democracy: a normative power approach to the substance of EU democracy support’, paper presented to research workshop on ‘Comparing the Substance of EU Democracy Promotion’, 16/12/11, Gent University.

Manners, Ian (2013a) ‘European communion: political theory of European Union’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(4): 473–94.

Manners, Ian (2013b) ‘Assessing the decennial, reassessing the global: Understanding European Union normative power in global politics’, in Kalypso Nicolaïdis and Richard Whitman (eds.) Special Issue on ‘Normative Power Europe’, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(2): 304-329.

Manners, Ian (2013c) ‘Den Europeiska unionen i en globaliserande värld’, in Rikard Bengtsson, Ian Manners, Hans-Åke Persson, Linda Gröning and Ola Zetterquist, *Det europeiska projektet: Politik och juridik – historia och framtid* (Stockholm: Liber), pp. 209-258.

Manners, Ian (2014) ‘Political Psychology of European Integration’, in Tereza Capelos, Catarina Kinnvall, and Paul Nesbitt-Larking, with Henk Dekker (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology* (London: Palgrave), pp. 263-78.

Matlary, Janne Haaland (2006) ‘When soft power turns hard: Is an EU strategic culture possible?’, *Security Dialogue*, 37(1): 105-21.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999) ‘Is something rotten in the state of Denmark? Constructivism and European integration’, *Journal of European Public*

Policy, 6(4): 669-81.

Mortensen, Jens Ladefoged (2010) 'The World Trade Organization and the European Union', in Knud Erik Jørgensen (ed.) *The European Union and International Organizations* (London: Routledge), pp. 156-99.

Nicolaïdis, Kalypso, and Richard Whitman (eds.) (2013) Special Issue on 'Normative Power Europe', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(2).

Ojanen, Hanna (2006) 'The EU and NATO: two competing models for a common defence policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(1): 57-76.

Orbie, Jan (2003) 'EU Development Policy Integration and the Monterrey Process: A Leading and Benevolent Identity?', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 8(3): 395-415.

Pace, Michelle (2008), 'The EU as a "force for good" in border conflict cases?', in Thomas Diez, Mathias Albert and Stephan Stetter (eds.), *European Union and Border Conflicts: The Power of Integration and Association* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press), pp. 203-19;

Pardo, Sharon (2015) *Normative Power Europe Meets Israel: Perceptions and Realities* (Lanham MA: Lexington Books).

Parker, Owen, and Ben Rosamond (2013) "'Normative power Europe' meets economic liberalism: Complicating cosmopolitanism inside/outside the EU', in Kalypso Nicolaïdis and Richard Whitman (eds.) Special Issue on 'Normative Power Europe', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(2), pp. 229-2.

Persson, Anders (2014) *The EU and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict 1971-2013: In Pursuit of a Just Peace* (Lanham MA: Lexington Books).

Raik, Kristi (2004) 'EU accession of Central and Eastern European countries: Democracy and integration as conflicting logics', *East European Politics & Societies*, 18(4): 567-94.

Raik, Kristi, and Ruxandra Lupu Dinesen (2015) 'The European Union and Upheavals in its Neighbourhood: A Force for Stability?', in Sanne

- Brasch Kristensen and Tamara Hoch Jovanovic (eds.) Special Issue on 'Understanding EU Actorness Today: The Role of Crisis on the Division Between EU's Internal and External Actions and Practices', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 38(12): 902-14.
- Riddervold, Marianne (2011) 'Finally flexing its muscles? Atalanta–The European Union's naval military operation against piracy', *European Security*, 20(3): 385-404.
- Rieker, Pernille (2016) *External Governance as Security Community Building: The Limits and Potential of the European Neighbourhood Policy* (London: Palgrave).
- Saari, Sinikukka (2011) *Promoting Democracy and Human Rights in Russia* (London: Routledge).
- Schmidt-Felzmann, Anke (2008) 'All for one? EU member states and the Union's common policy towards the Russian Federation', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 16(2): 169-87.
- Sicurelli, Daniella (2010) *European Union's Africa Policies: Norms, Interests and Impact* (Farnham: Ashgate).
- Sinkkonen, Ville (2015) *A Comparative Appraisal of Normative Power: The European Union, the United States and the January 25th, 2011 Revolution in Egypt* (Leiden: Brill).
- Sjursen, Helene (ed.) (2006) *Civilian or Military Power? The European Union at a Crossroads* (London: Routledge).
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2014) 'After Pan-Africanism: Placing Stuart Hall', *Radical Philosophy*, 185, May/June.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Storey, Andy (2006) 'Normative power Europe? Economic partnership agreements and Africa', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 24(3): 331-46.

- Söderbaum, Fredrik (2015) *Rethinking Regionalism* (London: Palgrave).
- Terriff, Terry (2004) 'The European Union Rapid Reaction Force: an embryonic cosmopolitan military?', in Lorraine Elliott and Graeme Cheeseman (eds.) *Forces for Good: Cosmopolitan Militaries in the Twenty-first Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), pp. 150-167.
- Tocci, Natalie (ed.) (2008) *Who is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor? The European Union and Its Global Partners* (Brussels: CEPS).
- Triggs, Gillian (2003) 'Remembering the Life of Edward Said: A Tribute', *Ejournalist*, 3:2. <http://www.ejournalism.au.com/ejournalist/triggs.pdf>
- Voloshin, Georgiy (2014) *The European Union's Normative Power in Central Asia: Promoting Values and Defending Interests* (London: Palgrave).
- Whitman, Richard (ed.) (2011) *Normative Power Europe: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Woolcock, Stephen (2012) *European Union Economic Diplomacy: The Role of the EU in External Economic Relations* (Farnham: Ashgate).