UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

MASTER THESIS IN
EUROPEAN STUDIES

What is the EU?
The European Union's foreign policy discourse

Author: Elina Åström
Supervisor: Mats Andrén
25th May 2012

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to determine how the EU´s power projections are constructed in a depiction of its foreign policy actions in 2001 and 2011. Can the European Union be described as a normative or smart power? How is the EU´s foreign policy discourse constructed? This thesis employs a Discourse Historical Approach to answer these questions. The overall purpose of this thesis is to gain a deeper understanding of how the EU promotes itself through its foreign policy and to be able to contribute to answering the question: What is the European Union?

To deepen our understanding of the European Union and what kind of actor it is, or should be, in the world is a highly relevant and interesting topic that scholars have been debating for 50 years now. `The General report on the Activities of the European Union´, a yearly publication that is distributed in order for the public to know what the EU did in the past year, serves at material for this thesis. The conclusions drawn are that the EU promotes itself as a normative power, foremost towards regions in Africa, its neighbourhood and Latin America. The EU´s power discourse is constructed by creating in- and out-groups as well as using predication, positive or negative labels.

Keywords: *Smart power, Normative power, the European Union (EU), Foreign policy, Discourse, Power Projections*

Number of words: 19 363

Contents

Abbreviations:

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India & China
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
DHA	Discourse Historical Approach
ECHR	Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms
EDA	European Defense Agency
EEAS	the European External Action Service
EES	the European Security Strategy
EMP	Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
ENP	the European Neigbourhood Policy
ERRF	European Rapid Reaction Force
ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
EU	the European Union
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MS	Member States (of the European Union)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
OCTs	the Overseas Countries and Territories
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
TEU	Treaty of the European Union (Maastricht treaty)
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Lisbon treaty)
UDHR	the Universal declaration on human rights
UK	the United Kingdom
UN	the United Nations
US, USA	the United States of America

1. Introduction

When I began studying in 2007 our lecturers asked us about what Europe and the EU really is. Sadly, I´m not sure that my five years at University have provided me with answers to those questions, neither have I been able to find one on my own. But I´m not alone in pondering this, there are a very large number of scholars who focus on this topic and each of them has their own view and theory. Judging by the fact that this area is contested and interests many people, one might suspect that all perspectives of this topic have already been studied, but that is not the case. I´m taking this last chance at University, my master's thesis, to dedicate myself completely to finding an answer to the question; what is the European Union?

One way of finding out what the EU is, would be to look at what the people representing the EU claim it to be. A lot of researchers seem to presuppose that the EU is a soft power, but the European Union is far more complex than that, both in rhetoric and in action. But action is one thing; the focus of this thesis is not to look at actual power, but projections of it. I will conduct a study that determines what kind of power the modern EU displays to the rest of the world. Projection, in this thesis, means the image or reproduction of power given by the EU. What kind of power does the Union project to the world? In this thesis I will try to answer that question and place this study in relation to other important works in the EU academic debate.

This thesis is employing the social constructivist notion of language as creating reality when focusing on the EU´s foreign policy. Discourse analysis will be used when determining whether the EU is projecting an image of being a normative and/or smart power in a depiction of their foreign policy actions. Normative and smart power is presented as the theoretical framework that the case of the EU will be tested against.

The aim of this thesis is to explore what kind of power the EU projects to the outside world in 2001 and 2011. This research is important because clarifying what the European Union is and how it uses different forms of power make it easier to predict how it will or should act in international politics. However, my contribution to this field of research is not only to say something about what the Union is, but to also test normative and smart power in an actual case and observe how the self-proclaimed role of the EU in foreign policy is constructed.

1.1 Disposition

This thesis begins with an introduction after which some relevant concepts are presented. The area of interest for the purpose of the thesis is then described. Previous research and theory is reviewed, after which the aim and research questions are presented. The method is then described, along with the material. This part also deals with some alterative design issues, as well as limitations and problems with this research. The analysis is then presented. Concluding this thesis is a presentation of the major findings, as well as a discussion of these findings.

1.2 Concept definitions

Two concepts, `Power´ and `Security´, that are central to this thesis are explained below.

Concepts are not stable timeless entities; they are constantly changing throughout history. We all mean different things when using words as power, nation or democracy. Within concept history a distinction between words, or terms, and concepts on the one hand and concepts and ideas on the other is made. Concepts are the focal points where ideas and words get together and concepts are words that always have several meanings. The main idea of this type of analysis is to try to give new perspectives to social and political phenomenon.[1] For the purpose of this thesis a concept analysis will not however be made, due to time and scope limitations.

1.2.1 Power

The concept of power is a complex one, with several different meanings; to some, power means military power, to others, such as Moravcsik[2], it means for example high per capita income. Economic power is the most important for some scholars while for others power is used as just a synonym for a state or nation. Power is a fascinating concept that has evolved throughout history and the entry of the EU on the world stage has perhaps ushered in a new type of power?

As will be described in this thesis, the EU has the world's largest market, spends a lot on defence and bases its foundations on normative values. Some would say that it represents something totally new and unique in the international system, that it is a new type of political creature.

---

[1] Bergström, Göran och Boréus, Kristina (2005) *Textens mening och makt* p. 181-182

[2] Moravcsik, Andrew (2010) "Europe: The Second Superpower," *Current History ISSN 0011-3530, 03/2010, Volume 109, Number 725, p. 91*

Military power is the main type of power that interests the realists— with this as a central focus the EU´s power would be very insignificant, since it doesn't have a standing army and relies on the member states willingness to act.

But in order for a political system to last and be successful, other means than hard power must be used, just look at what has happened in the last 2 years in the Middle East. The basic definition of democracy, being able to elect the people who should lead your country, seems to be very important too. The United States is indeed also a democracy, while holding significant military might. However, narrowing down the idea of power to just hard power is not always fruitful. How has the EU succeeded in so many areas if it does not hold some kind of power?

Power can be defined in many ways; some would like to focus solely on `power over´ while other scholars focus on `power to´[3]. In this thesis the 'power to' side is more emphasized, because it is effectiveness, rather than forcefulness, the possibility to obtain the desired affect without force which is crucial in foreign policy.

1.2.2 (Human) Security

Social constructivist theory suggests that security is harder to gain in isolation than in community, something that the EU´s policies regarding security seem to support. Human security is a concept that has gained popularity within the EU in recent years, and can be defined as *"responsibility to protect, which 'weds' human rights to security including military security"*[4] Seeing the EU as a civilian power and the EU as a proponent for human security seems to go hand in hand. In the threats defined in the European Security Strategy there are clear signs of references to the UN´s Development Program of 1994.

> "*Security is a precondition of development. Conflict not only destroys infrastructure, including social infrastructure; it also encourages criminality, deters investment and makes normal economic activity impossible.*" [5]

The EU was pressured from the member states to form a description of what the European Security and Defense Policy was to become and to validate their foreign policy incentives, which brought about the human security agenda for the Union.

---

[3]Hokanson Hawk, Jane (1991) "Power: a concept analysis" *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 16, 754-762
[4] Matlary, Janne, Halaand (2009). *European Union Security Dynamics, In the New National Interest*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan p.205
[5] European Council (2003). *European Security Strategy*. Brussels p.2

In 2004 a group reporting to Javier Solana proposed in their Barcelona Report that 15,000 people should form a human security response force and that a legal framework should be set up to promote intervention when human security issues came up.[6] This report defined human security as moving away from seeing the state as being the referent of security to protecting individuals, as well as communities.

The European Security Strategy of 2008 also mentioned the concept of human security. In the report the EU´s foreign and security policy was described as distinctive and mentioned EU operations such as post-tsunami aid and protections of refugees. Human security was in this report labeled a strategic goal.[7] Respect for human rights and a gendered dimension of security where also things not previously mentioned by the EU that now where pressed upon.[8]

Global security has also become an increasingly important feature of the EU, since their budget for missions under the CFSP (Common Foreign and Security Policy) has reached 1 billion euro. However, it still needs to define what kind of actor it should become in the world, to improve consistency of its actions and enable the rest of the world to predict where the EU should act independently. Some argue that this narrative can substitute the broader issue of what the European Union project really is. The future of security policy for the EU also rests on this.[9]

1.3 Area of Interest

An area where the Union can project a power image to the world must be identified since power cannot exist without an interpersonal relationship. The area of focus must be one where the Union interacts with another political entity. The EU has a plethora of policies in a number of issues but, in most cases, it is mostly the member states that are affected. Because the aim of this thesis is to look at the power the Union projects to the world, many policy areas have been eliminated. The area of foreign policy and the EU´s place in the world should be the best fit for this type of research. In foreign policy, a traditional area of political prestige the EU seems to promote itself as a softer power, than countries such as Russia, China and the US, even though it recently started developing harder power tools, like military bodies. The

---

[6] Martin, Mary and Owen, Taylor (2010) The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience *International Affairs* 86: 1 211–224 Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs. P. 217

[7] Martin and Owen (2010) p. 216

[8] Martin and Owen (2010) p. 217

[9] Martin and Owen (2010) p. 219

EU´s foreign policy is also an area where much has happened in recent years and where, even though a lot of research has been done, much is left to explore.

The EU´s foreign policy is a policy area where power in one form or another should be exercised and projected. Although the area is one where the member states (especially countries like Britain and France) have a lot of agenda setting power, the EU institutions are gaining influence over this area, as described in the following section on the EU as a Global Actor.

Trade can be considered as a part of the foreign policy of the EU, however for the purpose of the thesis this area is rejected in order for the amount of material to be manageable.

1.3.1 The EU as a Global Actor - A modern history

This part aims to give an overview of the Union's capacities in the Foreign Policy field as well as dividing the features of the Union between hard, soft, smart and normative power. This division is not something the EU itself is presenting, but is made in order to clarify the distinction between the different types of power.

1.3.1.1 Soft power

Soft power is what the scholarly community terms as inducing the opposing party in order for them to succumb to your view, which may, for example entail culture or commerce attraction.

With the EU growing from just 15 to 27 member states in the 2000´s certain changes was brought about, such as treaty reforms, altering of decision making procedures, growing institutions, more official languages, the development of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) and the possibility for smaller members states to get their way by working together against the larger ones[10]. Of course, the new member states also brought with them a lot of new priorities and problems such as redistribution of economic development policies. But, most importantly, with the EU becoming a Union of 27 members it is now one of the most powerful and economically important international organizations in the world. [11]

In 2003, the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) was created. It aimed to create a friendly neighborhood around the EU. Trade, aid and cultural and political cooperation are to be pursued with the neighborhood countries, these goals are formulated in individual action plans. Eastern European states as well as northern African ones are examples of states that

---

[10] Nugent, Neill (2010) *The Government and Politics of the European Union 7th edition.* Palgrave Macmillan p. 48-49.
[11] Nugent (2010) p. 49-50

enjoy this relationship with the EU. This programme has however been accused of being too wide in context and therefore two other programmes was developed in relation to the ENP, the Union for the Mediterranean (2008) and the Eastern partnership (2009).[12]

The Union is of course also involved in a number of other programmes, joint actions etc, that can be described as soft power actions, but because the Union's soft power has already received so much attention this background will present more of the Unions hard, normative and smart power features.

1.3.1.2 Common Foreign and Security Policy

The former second pillar of the EU, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), was first created in the Single European act in 1986 and was developed in the treaty of Maastricht (the Treaty on the European Union or TEU) in 1992.[13] The CFSP was to be handled via cooperation between the member states on foreign policy issues that were of interest to all. The council could, if necessary, define a common standpoint in these issues, and this institution was also given to power to decide whether a foreign and security policy challenge required a joint action.

1.3.1.3 Smart power

Smart power entails using features of both hard and soft power to get the opposite party to agree to what you are proposing. This concept will be elaborated further on in the thesis.

In Article 24 of the TEU it states that: the Union's competence in matters of common foreign and security policy shall cover all areas of foreign policy and all questions relating to the Union's security, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy that might lead to a common defence.[14] Article 43 TEU explains further where the Union should act

> *"the Union may use civilian and military means, shall include 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. All these tasks*

---

[12] Nugent (2010) p. 385
[13] Nugent (2010) p. 58
[14] Consolidate version of The Treaty on European Union, TEU. (2008) Official Journal of the European Union C 115/13 Article. 24

may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories".[15]

`A secure Europe in a better world´ is the name of a proposal for a European Security Strategy adopted in 2003 in Brussels by the Council in which affective multilateralism was emphasized. In 2003 Javier Solana, the High Representative for the CFSP looked over the security strategy and wrote a `Declaration by the European Council on the Enhancement of the European security and Defence Policy´ that stated that the EU should make better use of both military and civilian capacities.[16] *"In short, if you want a credible EU foreign policy, you need a credible defence policy too"*[17]

Policy instruments used by the EU in foreign policy are specified in art. 25 TEU and in the TFEU[18] (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union), there are diplomatic channels used to pressure other states, such as removing or offering different forms of benefits in trade or other areas and lastly combing civilian and military means to exert pressure. [19]

The EU clearly has features of both hard and soft power; it therefore has the potential to exercise smart power.

1.3.1.4 Normative Power

Normative values are: sustainable peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance.[20]. The EU uses normative values as a guide to determine in which conflicts it should act.

In the ESS, `A secure Europe in a better world´ the threats mentioned include terrorism, proliferation, local conflicts, organized crime and state failure as occurrences where the Union should act. The ESS also mentions building a peaceful neighborhood. In 2008, the treaty was supplemented by adding the ´Report on the implementation of the ESS: Providing security in a changing world´ in which security on the internet, energy security and climate change was added as threats to Europe. The civilian direction of CFSP was strengthened in 2010 when the

---

[15] TEU Article. 43
[16] Nugent (2010) p. 382
[17] Solana, Javier (2007) Speech at the 40th Commanders Conference of the German Bundeswehr. http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/discours/86523.pdf. Accessed:2012-03-01 p. 2
[18] Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2010) *Official Journal of the European union C 83 of 30.3.2010*
[19] Nugent (2010) p. 385-386
[20] Manners, Ian (2008) "The normative ethics of the European Union" *International Affairs Volume 84, Issue 1, pages 45–60.* P. 46

Council stated that the goal of it was; *"promoting international cooperation, develop and consolidate democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms"[21]*. Goals of the missions performed by the EU were also decided in the ESS as; *"promoting the strengthening of civilian administration, police, the rule of law and civil protection"[22]*.

The Amsterdam Treaty also states that the Petersburg-tasks *"humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacekeeping"[23]* should be the specific security issues that the EU should act upon. In Article 3 TEU the objectives of the Union are described, promotion of peace, security and justice without internal frontiers, among other values are mentioned. [24]

1.3.1.5 Defence (hard power)

When it comes to the area of defense and foreign policies the Union has a lot of features that would enable them to act as a strong player on the world stage in common actions. The Union is made up by 27 member states (MS), some with traditional high-status throughout the world, and the EU also have skills and capacities in the diplomatic field. Two member states have nuclear weapons at their disposal, these same countries; the UK and France also have seats at the UN Security Council. Collectively, the EU has more full time troops than the US whilst spending less on defence; and in economic terms the EU is very powerful.[25] However, as the area of defence is one that is governed by the member states acting in unanimity, the EU´s powers are dependent of the MS willingness to act as one. Therefore, the alleged potential that lies in the area is hitherto not fully realized, although more and more is happening in the EU in the area if defence policy[26].

The Amsterdam Treaty contains a paragraph stating that should any EU country be attacked, the other states should provide it with different forms of aid.[27] However, as national sovereignty and a national defence are seen by states as connected intertwined, it could explain why this is one of the less integrated policy areas. Nevertheless, he EU´s lack of strong leadership in the Balkans wars lead to a realization that something had to be done. In

---

[21] 2010 Council of Ministers (2010) cited in Magone, José (2011) . *Contemporary European Politics, A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Routledge. P.567

[22] Council of Feira (2000), cited in Magone (2011) p.571

[23] Nugent (2010) p. 61

[24] Nugent (2010) p. 78-83

[25] Nugent (2010) p. 376

[26] Nugent (2010) p. 378

[27] Nugent (2010) p. 382

1998, the UK and France proposed that the EU should have a better security and defence strategy, within NATO. However, as not all EU MS are members of NATO, this could cause some problems.

In 1999, with the UK showing a willingness to develop further integration in security and defence policy, the declaration `On strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence´ was written at the Cologne Summit. In Helsinki the same year, this declaration was clarified and the European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF) establish. The Petersburg tasks where again mentioned as a criteria for when the EU could act.[28]

One of the core features of the CFSP is that there is to be no such thing as European armies fighting for the EU, the battle groups are made up by how many or few men and women the member states choose to commit and there is no common uniform. There is however a European command chain and European bodies can summon them to action, they are also paid by the common resources. [29]

The EU seems to develop a different approach to security and defense compared to the other great players, NATO, the UN and the USA. In April of 2011, the EU where engaged in 11 missions, 3 of which are military and 8 civilian. Of the 23 operations led by the EU, only 7 have been defined as military. [30]

1.3.1.6 The Lisbon Treaty

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) declared that a new role, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy was created. This person should develop the CFSP, replacing the former post of High Representative for the CFSP, as well as, the Commissioner for external (Political) Relations. This person should have its base in both the Commission and the Council, and will also act as the Vice President of the Commission. The TFEU did not however change much in the actual Common Foreign and Security Policy; it is still based on operating principals that are largely intergovernmental. Nonetheless a European External Action Service (EEAS) was created, to aid the High Representative. A higher profile is also given to defence and the title Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) was created, within which permanent structured cooperation between MS that want to bind themselves more tightly in military operations can exist. In the Lisbon

---

[28] Nugent (2010) p. 381-382
[29] Nugent (2010) p. 383
[30] Cheetham, Andrew (2012) "The EU in Foreign Policy; a Military or Civilian Power?" http://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/06/the-eu-in-foreign-policy-a-military-or-civilian-power/. Accessed: 2012-01-17

Treaty the Foreign Affairs Council and the Permanent Structured Cooperation were also created, the latter to function as a way to improve effectiveness between the different EU forces. [31]The European Defense Agency (EDA), whose job it is to provide the forces with common equipment, was also established in the treaty.

Considering the changes in foreign policy between the years 2001 and 2011 one would suspect that the EU´s power projections also have changed. The material and method that will be presented and used in this thesis will further clarify how this will be determined.

---

[31] Nugent (2010) p. 386

2. Previous Research and Theory

The following section of the thesis aims to present what other scholars have to say concerning what kind of power the EU is. Another purpose of this section is to explain what normative and smart power is.

2.1 Power and the EU

Neo-Realists like Ted Galen Carpenter and Robert Kagan sees power as something almost purely found in military might, or in the ability to harm others in some way. They also stand for the view that there is only a certain amount of power and if one country, or organization, gains power the others must lose power, that power in a zero-sum game. In his 2002 article Kagan[32] argues that the EU is losing or has lost most of its power whilst the US is the strongest power in the world, that "*Europe is turning away from power*"[33] is one of the strongest statements he makes in his article. He also states that relying on the soft forms of power is not enough, and that Europe needs to build more military power in order for them to not lose their place in the world.

> *"Because Europe has neither the will nor the ability to guard its own paradise and keep it from being overrun, spiritually as well as physically, by a world that has yet to accept the rule of `moral consciousness´, it has become dependent on America's willingness to use its military might to deter or defeat those around the world who still believe in power politics"*[34].

Kagan also argues that because the US was so strong, the EU or Europe, could afford not to be and that the EU only uses rhetoric concerning the rule of law and other normative values because it is unable to use harder forms of power. One of Kagan´s most famous catchphrases is that Europeans are from Venus and that Americans are from Mars[35].

Ted Galen Carpenter[36] is also convinced that the US has to be responsible for the protection of the world, because there is no one else to take its place in international relations. He

---

[32] Kagan, Robert (2002) **"Power and Weakness - Why the United States and Europe see the world differently"**. http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/7107. Accessed: 2012-01-10

[33] Kagan (2002) p. 3

[34] Kagan (2002) p. 24

[35] Moravcsik (2010) p. 93

[36] Galen Carpenter, Ted (2008) *Smart Power: Towards a prudent foreign policy for America*. Cato Institute. Washington.

however argues that the US is in need of more smart power in order to balance their hard foreign policy. Carpenter does not take his realists views as far as Kagan does, he instead thinks that military power, however important, is not enough for creating national power and influence. The author states in his work that it was NATO who caused the wave of democratization in Europe, a view that he shares with Kagan who seems to think that the Europeans have the US alone to thank for the developments after the Second World War. Although both realists, Carpenter and Kagan´s biggest differences lie in how they see military power, the former argues that the US also has to incorporate some soft power in order to have a better foreign policy whilst the other thinks that military power is almost the only power worth mentioning.

Joseph S. Nye Jr. was the person who coined the terms soft, hard and smart power and he describes the first as attraction or co-option, the second as command or coercion and the last one as a combination of the two. He argues that in order to be a successful leader one has to use contextual intelligence and use both soft and hard power, in the right way, to achieve smart power. In his article he states that leaders should not think of themselves as on top of a mountain as a ruler, but as the center of a circle and a node in a network. [37]

In 2010, Andrew Moravcsik, who is one of the most well-known liberal scholars when it comes to the EU, wrote an article entitled `Europe, the Second Superpower´[38] in which he , as clearly articulated in the title, claims that there are two superpowers in the world, the US and Europe. However, Moravcsik defines power in a significantly different way from the realists, namely as; *"high per capita income, sophisticated economic production, and patterns of global consensus"*[39]. If one chooses to define power in a more multidimensional way, Europe can be seen as a superpower. He goes on to state that Europe also has a certain global influence *"across the whole spectrum of power, from "hard" to "soft".* Moravcsik also claims that not only does Europe have a wide variety of civilian instruments, but that it also projects intercontinental military power. The European Union´s neighborhood policy, enlargement, trade, foreign aid and so on are the tools that the authors claim to be normative ones that are used to influence the world around us. Moravcsik goes on to state that because Europe has combat troops on several locations in the world, Europe is also the world's second

---

[37] Nye, Joseph, Samuel. (2009)" Smart Power: It's a Blend of Soft and Hard" *Leadership Excellence,* Feb
[38] Moravcsik (2010)
[39] Moravcsik (2010) p. 91

military power. Apart from the realists, this author claims that *"international interactions are positive-sum, such that the rise of more than one country or region can be complementary"[40]*. In economic terms, Moravcsik states that Europe is a global economic superpower larger than the US and that the greatest allure of the EU is access to its huge market.

2.2 Normative Power EU

Normative values are recognized by the scholarly community to be; sustainable peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance.[41]

Ian Manners, one of the most influential scholars on the EU has written a number of articles about the Union. In one of his most prominent works, `The Normative Ethics of the European Union´[42], he argues that the EU is a normative power, because it changes the standards, norms and recommendations in international relations and moves away from the traditional patterns of the state being the most important. In his article Manners tries to uncover whether the EU also acts as a normative power. In his analysis of this he uses the EU´s principles, actions and impacts to assess their actions as a normative power. The material from the EU that this scholar looks at is the treaties, legal texts and policy documents. He find that the EU is on its way to becoming a normative power in action but that it is perhaps not quite there yet.

> *"The creative efforts and longer-term vision of EU's normative power towards the achievement of a more just, cosmopolitical world which empowers people in the actual conditions of their lives should and must be based on more universally accepted values and principles that can be explained to both Europeans and non-Europeans alike."*[43]

In the article he also argues that ethics and standards accepted worldwide in foreign policy are becoming more and more important and that the EU is right to pursue this. However, Manners is one scholar who thinks that should the EU militarize more it will risk losing its normative power.

---

[40] Moravcsik (2010) p. 92
[41] Manners (2008) p.46
[42] Manners (2008)
[43] Manners (2008) p. 60

There are a number of scholars who disagree with Manners when it comes to the power that is exercised by the EU. The most famous of these might be Adrian Hyde-Price, a neorealist who in 2006 published an article entitled `'Normative' Power Europe: a realist critique´. The gap between what the EU says and what it does is given the term capabilities-expectations gap in the critical realist literature. Manners also agrees that the EU is prioritizing military rather than civilian operations and this would make it harder to claim that the Union is a normative power. The development of ESDP (now known as The Common Security and Defence Policy, CSDP) is definitely a step away from `Normative Power Europe´.[44] In Hyde-Price´s work he argues that structural realist theory better frames the developments of the EU in foreign policy and security operations. The emergence of ESDP was caused by the system changing in power distribution according to him. He however differs from the neorealists previous mentioned when he states that; *the EU is used by its member states as a collective instrument for shaping its external milieu by a combination of hard and soft power*[45].

`Civilian, Normative and Ethical Power Europe: Role Claims and EU Discourse´ is the title of a 2011 article by Isabel Ferreira Nunes[46], in which she reviews the different role claims (Civilian, Normative and Ethical power Europe) of the EU after she goes on to test these claims made on the European Union´s official discourse in relation to its security policy. The conclusions reached are that these roles are not found in the official discourse as separate dimensions of the EU. However, they exist in relation to the principles that the EU supports and to the means available to the Union as well as the consensuses that are reached. Among others, the official discourse that Ferreira Nunes looks at is the treaty of the European Union, the European Security Strategy and Presidency Conclusions between 1998 and 2009.

2.3 Defense and Normative Power EU

In Manners article `Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?[47]´ He states that the EU´s normative power is power over views and ideological power, whilst the military and civilian power exercised by the Unions is concerned with the EUs statelike capacities, they

---

[44] Hardwick, Daniel (2011) "Is the EU a Normative Power?" http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/03/is-the-eu-a-normative-power/. Accessed: 2012-03-16

[45] Hyde –Price, Adrian (2006) "'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique" *Journal of European Public Policy* 13:2: 217–234 Routledge. P. 217

[46] Ferreira Nunes, Isabel (2011) "'Civilian, Normative, and Ethical Power Europe: Role Claims and EU Discourses'" *European Foreign Affairs Review vol* 16, pages 1–20

[47] Manners, Ian (2002) "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?" *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies Volume 40, Issue 2, pages 235–258*

can therefore exist simultaneously [48]. But the European Security Strategy of 2003 is according to Manners a ´signpost´ for the way the EUs foreign policy is taking and it marks a step away for normative power EU. [49] Manners also states that both civilian and military presence by the EU might lead to the people living there being less receptive to norms. [50]

There are scholars that argue that militarization is essential for the EU to be a normative power and means that is it necessary for the EU to have an army in order for them to continuing being a normative power. However, scholars representing the opposite view, claim that being a normative power with military capacities is contradictory, and that the EU would lose its normative power. The former scholars tend to be closer to the realist views whilst the latter are nearer to normative theory. [51]

2.4 EU - Smart power

The former European Commissioner for Enlargement, Olli Rehn held a speech in 2008 in which he claims that the EU is a so called smart power.[52] In the text Mr. Rehn gives the EU attributes such as engagement in global affairs and internal strength but he also argues for a strengthening in the unions external relations. He states that the EU need to *"project its values and interests in its own neighborhood more effectively in order to extend the European zone of peace and prosperity"*[53]. Russia is mentioned in the text as being an example of hard power and the EU in contrast as being a soft one. However, he states that the EU is a smart power on a number of occasions although he does not specifically mention an expansion of the Unions military capacities. Instead he claims that in recent years and after the Balkan war, the CFSP (The Common Foreign and Security Policy), has become *"worthy of its name."*[54]

Europe, a smart power? By Mai'a K. Davis Cross[55] is an article in which the author is trying to define what smart power actually is, something she feels is lacking in the scholarly

---

[48] Manners (2002) p. 239

[49] Manners, Ian (2006)" Normative power Europe reconsidered: Beyond the crossroads" *Journal of European Public Policy vol 13, nr 2 pages 235-258* p. 189

[50] Manners (2006) p. 194

[51]Löfgren, Johan and Pettersson, Teodor (2006) "EU: en fortsatt normativ makt? En studie om EU: s möjliga framtid i internationell politik" p. 16

[52]Rehn, Olli (2008) Europe's smart power in its region and the world SPEECH/08/222 EU Speech at the European Studies Centre, St Antony's College, University of Oxford. http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/222&format=HTML&aged=0&language =EN&guiLanguage=en. Accessed: 2011-11-24

[53] Rehn (2008) p. 4

[54] Rehn (2008) p. 3

[55] Cross, Mai´a K Davis (2011) Europe, a smart power? *International Politics vol 48 Issue* 6

community, and how it can be used in the debate concerning power in international relations. The aim of her article is to make the concept of smart power more useful for scholars. In the text Cross discusses the fact that *"the use of specific tools are not necessarily correlated with whether they are exercised in hard or soft power to achieve goals"*[56] and that even Nye, the father of the concept now agrees to this. Even language can be used in a coercive way, she writes. The most important thing is whether the tool is used to attract or coerce the other party in international relations. Concerning power Cross writes that it is relational *"(power over whom?)"* and situational "*(power to do what?)".*[57]

Cross contests the neo-realist view when she argues that although the US has almost doubled their defense budget since 2001, it has lost its power as the world's only superpower.

The author also states that the EU does not use its hard power without its soft power as well, they use hard power sometimes but always integrated with a longer period of soft power.

Cross also call out to the leaders of the union to make up a blueprint for smart power so that the EU can act more effectively when it needs to exercise different forms of power. In the end Cross´s conclusion is that the EU sometimes acts like a smart power but that it is essentially a soft power.

2.5 The EU as a Norm Entrepreneur

2.5.1 Social constructivism

Reality, in the constructivist sense, has no importance if not through each person's subjective understanding. This means that all actions by humans are constructed socially. Physical reality has little meaning; it is instead cultural beings, humans, who give the meaning to what they see in the world. Previous notions, norms and values help social beings to interpret society. Social constructivist emphasizes the role of norms, which help guide humans, or organisations, to gain understanding and serve as guide to behavior. Therefore, according to social constructivism, norms as well as discourse become crucial in helping us gain knowledge about societal actors. [58]

2.5.2 Norm Theory

Martha Finnemore and Katharine Sikkink, two prominent social constructivist scholars published an article entitled `International Norm Dynamics and Political Change´ in 1998. Although a few years has passed since then their work is still highly regarded. They pose a

---

[56] Cross (2011) p. 693
[57] Cross (2011) p. 694
[58] Ruggie, John, Gerard(1998). *Constructing the World Polity.* London: Routledge. P. 30-34

series of questions regarding norms; *"How do we know a norm when we see one? How do we know norms make a difference in politics? Where do norms come from? How do they change?"[59]* In the article they also try to investigate political change and the role of norms in that change. The authors choose to define norms as what, in a given situation, can be considered suitable behavior. They also recognize different types of norms; regulative norms, constitutive norms and evaluative or prescriptive norm.[60] Stability and social order is produced by norms they argue, as they channel and organize conduct and limit and constrain behavior.[61] The origin of norms, how they can influence and what conditions are necessary for norms to alter world events is one of the most important aspects in their work. They also present a norm life cycle, where different stages are ruled by different behavior.

The norm life cycle, invented by them begins with a norm emergence, after which norm acceptance follows, also called norm cascade. The third state in the norm cycle is internalization. Between the first and second stage there is a certain tipping point where a number of important actors accept the norm. Several motives, mechanisms and actors are behind the changes at each of these phases. When the norm first appears a norm entrepreneur is the promoter that tries to influence other actors (norm leaders) to accept the norm. In the second phase the norm leaders try to affect other state actors to follow them in accepting the norm and to also become norm leaders. Finnemore and Sikkink argue that "*pressure for conformity, desire to enhance international legitimation, and the desire of state leaders to enhance their self-esteem facilitate norm cascades"[62]*. After that phase a norm acceptance or internationalization follows, where the norm is taken for granted.[63]

2.5.3 The EU as a Norm Entrepreneur

Michelle Pace argue in her study that the EU´s normative power stems from their ability to *"project its rules, standards, values and institutions to non-member countries in Europe's periphery"[64]*.She exemplifies with the Europe-Mediterranean relationship, looking at both the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) and the European Neigbourhood Policy (ENP) and their normative base. Regional integration, as these policies are examples of, is what the

---

[59] Finnemore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn (1998) "International norm dynamics and political change". *International Organization 52 (autumn): 887-917*. P. 888
[60] Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) p. 891
[61] Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) p. 894
[62] Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) p. 895
[63] Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) p. 895
[64] Pace, Michelle (2007) "Norm shifting from EMP to ENP: the EU as a norm entrepreneur in the south**?**" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs 20:4, 659-675 Routledge* p. 659

author wants to raise questions about as well as about the role of norms in international politics.

Political and economic interest, on the one hand, and being seen as a normative power, on the other, has been identified as the reason behind the EU´s relations with the south[65]. Pace thinks that this poses some challenges to the relationship when the EU tries to act as model for other states to adopt. [66] *"Thus, the capabilities of neighbouring states are presumed to develop through (EU) norm emulation. The EU remains the exclusive generator of norms and the sole agent who defines and maintains this norm structure in EU–Mediterranean relations"[67]*. Pace´s conclusion is that the analysis of the Unions policies in the Mediterranean countries should be very much helped if what the EU wants to do in these countries where clear.[68]

In the article `Normative power – A contradiction in terms?´ the EU´s aim to abolish the death penalty worldwide is used by Manners as an example of the EU using new ways to direct international governance. Manners argues that the EU as a promoter of norms sets a new standard, and that it's no longer only states that govern international relations. He also means that we have to rethink civilian, as well as military power, in order to understand the EU´s normative power. [69] Claiming that the EU is a normative power is not a contradiction in terms, because as Manners argues, it has the ability to influence what passes for `normal´ in world politics.[70] The EU´s power is located within the sphere of power over opinions, and it can thus be labeled normative.[71] According to Manners and other leading political scientists, the EU represents something totally new in international politics.[72]

The Copenhagen declaration, which entailed that the Union should be based on respect for democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights etc., were given more force when they became part of the TEU in 1992. Many have argued that one of the Union most important features is that it these values are so emphasizes. [73] Human rights and fundamental freedoms (ECHR) and the Universal declaration on human rights (UDHR) have been used as guides for the Unions foreign policies and respect for the will of the UN is also enshrined in

---

[65] Pace (2007) p. 659
[66] Pace (2007) p. 662
[67] Pace (2007) p. 667
[68] Pace (2007) p. 671
[69] Manners (2002) p. 235-236
[70] Manners (2002) p. 236
[71] Manners (2002) p. 239
[72] Manners (2002) p. 240
[73] Manners (2002) p. 241

the treaties.[74] Manners goes on to argue that the Union was based on five core norms; peace, liberty, democracy, the rule of law and human rights and that four minor norms also exists, guiding the Unions work; social solidarity, anti-discrimination, sustainable development and good governance.[75]

---

[74] Manners (2002) p. 241
[75] Manners (2002) p. 242-243

3. Aim and specified Research Question

The aim of this thesis is to explore what kind of power the EU projects to the outside world. Whether it projects an image of being a smart and/or normative power will be determined. A comparison between the years 2001 and 2011 will also be made to see what kind of change has happened.

The research question is*;*

-How are the EU´s power projections constructed in 2001 and 2011?

The sub-questions are:

-   *How has the EU´s power projections changed between 2001 and 2011?*
-   *What kinds of power features are employed by the EU in the material?*
-   *Does the EU use different types of power towards different regions in the world?*

As previously mentioned, a lot of research has been made concerning what kind of `animal´ the EU really is. This study differs from the others in many ways since it aims to use discourse analysis to find out what kind of power the EU projects in foreign policy. Discourse analysis will be explained thoroughly in a following section of this thesis but such an analysis is probably the most appropriate when working with this type of material and issues. As mentioned a comparison will also be made, as the EU´s foreign policy is constantly changing, both due to major world event, internal pressure and changes such as treaty reforms. Settling the debate on what the Union is can perhaps not be done by a study of this scope, but it can help to clarify the picture of what the European Union is and how it wants to be seen. The reason why smart and normative power will serve as theoretical framework are that the Union clearly, according to previous research, is neither a hard nor a soft power, it is something new. That the Union might act in different ways towards different regions (or countries, organization and people) is a possibility strengthened by the fact that it enjoy different relationships with different regions. To some it is foremost a neighbor, to some a trading partner and to some a donor of aid.

4. Method

Choosing appropriate material is the first and crucial step when conducting discourse analysis. A lot of thought has to go into that decision and a lot of possible material has to be reviewed before making a definite choice.

4.1 Material Selection

When the choice of material is made we also choose what texts that are to become our data. One has to consider who is speaking in the texts, what time periods to include and what genres. All of these issues have to be solved with the aim and research question of the research project in mind.

Since the aim of the thesis is to discern the image that the Union is producing of itself material from other actors than the EU could quickly be disregarded.

The EU produces an enormous amount of material each year and most of it is also available on their website. So there is no lack of access and definitely no lack of material produced by the Union. But, when choosing material for this type of research one ultimately has to pose the question; who speaks for the EU? Where do we find the material that can be said to represent the entire Union? It is possible that an answer to this question is impossible to find, even though the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty brought with it new positions, such as High Representatives for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and a Council president. These people, and the Commission President, are still not representing the EU in all its parts.

What needs to be find in order to answer the research questions in this thesis is material that represents the entire Union or that is produced to give a depiction of what the EU does in foreign policy.

Using the treaties as material have been considered, as well as the Council Presidency Conclusions, the Commission Work Programmes, speeches by EU representative and negotiations with a third party. Material from the European parliaments such as agendas, meeting minutes and legislation from the European court of Justice has also been reviewed when looking for appropriate material. They have all been found to be either to context specific, too much of an account of only that body, too short about foreign policy, give a too shattered image or not suitable for other reasons.

4.1.1 Material

Each year since 2001 the European Commission publishes a `General report on the Activities of the European Union´ that they present to the European Parliament. This report is distributed in order for the EU citizens and the rest of the world to know what the EU did in the past year. That the Commission is responsible for producing this report each year is also stated in the treaty. [76]

Two of these report, the first one of 2001 and the last one of 2011 was chosen as material as a large time span is desirable to detect the potential change. They are in a way linked to each other in an intra-textual relationship because they are the `same´ report, but from different years.

The reports have looked a little different from year to year but in the latest issue, the one for 2011, the section describing the Unions foreign policy is entitled `A stronger EU in the world´[77]. In 2001 this section was titled `Role of the Union in the world´[78]

This material is selected because the report presents what the union has done in the past year and must be approved by a lot of EU representatives before being printed. This report should therefore represent the views of most of the European Union.

The material that will be used comes straight from the EU and should therefore fulfill the criteria of authenticity. The criteria of proximity could possibly have been fulfilled better if I was able to actually attend conferences, meeting or perform interview with people working at the EU. However, that is very difficult to do with a study of this scope, and the written documents produced by the EU are a better fit to the research questions in this thesis, the sources used are also better in terms of the research aim and should interviews have been used only a few people's views would have been uncovered. The independency criterion is also fulfilled since the texts are not depending on other sources but stands for themselves. When we come to the criteria of tendency we can suppose that the sources are full of tendency since they come from the EU itself and it wants to put forward a certain image of itself, but since that is what this study aims to look into that does not cause any problems but is rather a prerequisite for performing the research.

---

[76] European Union website. General report on the Activities of the European Union.
http://europa.eu/generalreport/index_en.htm. Accessed: 2012-03-10
[77] European Commission (2001) General report on the activities of the European Union SEC(2001) 1000 final
ISBN: 92-894-1953-9 p.249
[78] European Commission (2011) General report on the activities of the European Union 2011. ISBN: 978-92-79-22258-0 p. 107

Ethical issues are something one has to consider when performing any social science study, since it is always humans and society we are studying. Nevertheless this study does not have the potential to run into any severe ethical issues since public sources that the EU itself has chosen to publish will be used. The material and method are unobtrusive ones.[79]

4.2. Discourse analysis

In the book The Practice of Qualitative Research the author's states that texts can be used for theory generation about social life and grasping social processes and that it is possible to recognize big social processes and world view in the things we produce[80]. Taking their assumption as a starting point, text analysis should be ideal for this type of research. There are a number of different ways of conducting text analysis and for reasons stated below discourse analysis will be used in this particular thesis. When conducting discourse analysis it is important to work very thoroughly with the material as that is the most important thing in this type of analysis.

The social constructivist idea of production of truth in speech and texts or language as creator of reality is what all kind of discourse analytical perspectives are mostly concerned with. The truth and meaning that are the parts of a certain reality are what discourse analysis tries to expose. [81] An objective truth is hard to define, but describing the dominance of some type of discourse in the material can lead to understanding more about society. But, it is important to distinguish between what is being said and what the person speaking actually means. Discourse analysis is not a method that uncovers what is really being meant, the only thing it uncovers is how it is being said and constructed.[82]

When it comes to the actual operationalization of this method Michel Foucault, one of the fathers of the discourse analysis, did not write anything about how to actually employ it. Other scholars like Reisigl and Wodak has however developed discourse analysis further and structures the analysis with the help of five heuristic questions that will be explained thoroughly.[83]

---

[79]Nagy Hesse-Biber, Sharlene and Leavy, Patricia (2011).*The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. Second Edition. p. 228

[80]Nagy Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011) p. 237

[81]Bergström och Boréus (2005) p. 357-358; Jorgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise (2002*). Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE p. 1 and 145

[82] Howarth, David, R. and Torfing, Jacob (2005) *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance* Palgrave MacMillan. P. 35

[83] Reisigl, Martin and Wodak, Ruth (2009). The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

4.2.1 The Discourse-Historical approach

The Discourse-Historical approach is a critical discourse analytical perspective that emphases ideology, power and discourse and should therefore be best suited for this type of material and research question. Critical discourse analysis in general are used when discovering and investigating relations "between the discourse and social and cultural developments in different social domains"[84].

Reisigl and Wodak[85] describes the method as having three dimensions; identifying themes and topics of the discourse, identifying discursive strategies used to portray certain world-views or influence the reader and lastly how verbal or written means are used to enforce the arguments in the discourse.

The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) is also inspired by Foucault's classic works and uses five exploratory questions in order to uncover power, discourse and ideology in the material. [86]

These questions are;[87]

Table 1. Discourse-Historical approach		
Heuristic Question	*Discursive strategy*	*Objectives*
1. How are persons, objects, events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?	Nomination	Construction of in-groups and out-groups
2. What characteristics and qualities are attributed to different actors, objects, events and processes?	Predication	Labelling social actors more or less positively or negatively
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?	Argumentation	Justification of negative or positive attributions
4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?	Perspectivization	Expressing involvement. Positioning speakers point of view
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly? Are they intensified or mitigated?	Intensification/mitigation	Modifying the epistemic status of a proposition

---

[84] Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) p. 60 ff
[85] Reisigl and Wodak (2009) p. 72-73
[86] Reisigl and Wodak (2009) p. 73
[87] Reisigl and Wodak (2009) p. 73

Each of these questions is linked to a discursive strategy in the analysis of the material. The construction of the discourse is gained through the questions applied to the data and the analysis performed. Using a critical discourse analysis entails not taking the structures found in the material as a given but to question these. As previously mentioned this method is often used when observing power and dominance and looking at discriminatory structures in the data.

The first of the heuristic question is the one concerning how persons/object/events/processes and so on are referred to in the text. Metaphors can, for example, be used in the discourse to give an actor certain attributes, as well as personalization or other categorization devices used to portray actors in different ways. Relationships, such as `friend´ can be used in the texts to represent someone, but they can also be presented as belonging to a group a, such as `the EU´ or `the Middle East´. The same actor can be mentioned as a single person but also as part of a group.

The second question refers to what characteristics the actors are attributed linguistically. Attitude and qualities given to certain actors in the texts is what the researcher should focus on in this step. How these attributes are described using for example adjectives or comparisons, positive or negative is also something to take note of.

The arguments used in the text to explain the characteristics and qualities given to the different actors are what one is looking for in the following third question. Rightness, as defined by the author of the text, is also looked into during this third strategy as well as how he or she argues for why this is normatively right or true.

The fourth question, perspectivization, is used to position the author in relation to what he or she is saying. Detecting involvement or distance to what the authors is stating, using for example indirect speech or quotation marks should also be done.

The claims made in the text are then intensified by for example using rhetorical questions, which is what the fifth question aims to uncover. This discursive strategy also involves searching for justification of any arguments made in the texts, as well as how strong or weak the arguments are. Vague expressions can for example be used when making statements that would be controversial.

These steps or questions don't necessarily have to occur in this order, some may also be more interesting in relation to the material used and therefore demand more time and effort. If one is working with data that is very argumentative in its nature one should of course focus most on the strategy regarding argumentation.

Reisigl and Wodak also separate between intratextual and intertextual context, where intratextual context means the relationship between different and within texts and intertextual means the relationship between the texts and the outside world, for example the political climate.

The overall political context of the EU´s foreign policy has been described earlier as well as the intratextual relationship between the two texts.

Regarding the use of theory, in this method the researcher should always consult theory when looking for what should or shouldn't be found in the texts as well as what is actually found or not found.

4.3 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework will serve as a guide to what will be looked for in the discourse. These are presented more thoroughly in the earlier section on previous research of the thesis.

4.3.1 Normative power EU

Manners asks if the EU can be described as a normative power. Can it impose its values on other countries or people it is bargaining with? The concepts of principles, actions and impacts are used by Manners to analyze the EU´s power in relation to other states[88]. Ferreira Nunes further clarifies when she states that normative power is "*the EU, by stressing its legal and legitimate authority, seeks to persuade or condition others to incorporate EU norms*"[89] Normative power Europe is, in her view, not used to describe actual policy practice but should be reflected in the diffusion of normative goals and ends.

4.3.2 Smart power

Smart power is a combination of hard (military or economic coercion) and soft power (diplomacy, culture and commerce attraction) used in for example negotiations. Strategically using the different powers to get the opposite party to want what you want is the objective of smart power. [90] "*it is combining soft and hard power better in the EU's external relations by using the whole spectrum of our policy instruments and economic resources. This should be done in a forward-looking, consistent and unified way.*"[91]

---

[88]Manners (2008)
[89]Ferreira Nunes (2011) p. 7
[90]Nye, Joseph, Samuel (2004) *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, Public Affairs
[91]Rehn (2008) p. 3

Cross develops this concept further in her work, she says that;

> *"Second, both hard and soft power have negative and positive aspects. Soft power can lead to attraction or repulsion, depending on the audience. Hard power can be viewed as a carrot or a stick. An actor can be coerced because it wants access to a new market (carrot) or because it fears a trade embargo (stick)"*[92].

She would like to propose a slightly different definition that Nye when she states that: *"Smart power can be redefined as the strategic and simultaneous use of coercion and co-option."* [93]

4.4 Concepts in the Discourse on Normative Power Europe and Smart Power

In order to know what is to be looked for in the discourse of what the EU is and what is to be defined as a normative power and smart power, some concept will be defined in this section.

If in the material it is mentioned that the EU has attempted to have a transformative effect on other countries, institutions, federations and so on, the author of this thesis will note this and then try to uncover what kind of change that was conveyed by the EU according to the material. If the alleged change that was instigated by the EU resembles the rule of law, democracy or women's right or other normative values, that will be defined as the EU having a normative power influence. Normative values will, as previously mentioned, be recognized as; "sustainable peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance".[94]

When it comes to smart power some definite concepts that will be looked for in the texts are hard to pinpoint, but wherever hard power is mentioned in relation to commerce, culture or other traditional soft power areas will be looked for in the texts. Different types of attraction or coercion used simultaneously is also something that will be defined as smart power. The concepts that were developed by Nye and redefined by Cross as smart power is one that is hard to get hold of, but in the discourse signs pointing to the use of this kind of power should be evident. *How* the different forms of power actually have been used by the EU is however impossible to detect using this method.

---

[92] Cross (2011) p. 698
[93] Cross (2011) p. 698
[94] Manners (2008) p. 46

4.5 Alternative design, problems and limitations

4.5.1 Alternative design

One possible alternative method could have been to use content analysis but since what this study aims to uncover are power structures hidden in the material one can argue that discourse analysis will fit better. Marshall and Rossman[95] state in their book that when studying the construction of realities qualitative method should be used, so although quantitative methods surely could have been utilized for this thesis qualitative method is also a better alternative. Interviews may well also have been used to perform this study but getting the right people to agree to be interviewed would have no doubt been very difficult. One might also suspect that what has been written down in documents is the official view of the EU and the interviews might not have uncovered more than what is also printed.

Using a different area of interest than foreign policy would certainly have given other results, looking at for example financial policy might have given a picture of the EU as a very liberal actor struggling to cope with the crisis. Perhaps a change in the discourse might have been detected from before and during the crisis. The area of trade would most likely also have given an interesting picture, as that might be an area where the EU can use market advantages to bargain with other actors.

Had different material been used to perform the discourse analysis on, given that material from the Union would still have been used, a pretty similar image would probably have appeared. An official discourse used by all representatives of the Union seems to exist and material that differs from that official image would probably not be published. However, had material from a Member State or the Council been used perhaps their own part in what happened would have be emphasized.

4.5.2 Possible Problems

Validity is a concept used to assure that one is measuring what one thinks one is measuring when performing research, and in order for this thesis to fulfill this the concepts used and the frame of analysis, the discourse analysis, will be thoroughly presented. Quotes from the data will also be presented in order for the reader to understand the conclusions that are drawn.

Transparency is a big issue when doing discourse analysis (or any type or method) and in order for this study to fulfill this every step of the analysis will be presented so that it will be as intersubjective as possible. The concepts of dependability or reliability are just synonyms

---

[95] Marshall, Catherine & Rossman, Gretchen B (2011) *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. Fifth Edition. p. 91

for the same thing; the ultimate outcome is that the study would generate the same results if a different person conducted the same study. And as already mentioned this study aims to fulfill the criterion concerning this. However, discourse analysis is a method that entails a lot of own reflection and sinking into the material and therefore this method is often criticized for being very dependent of the person performing the study. Immersion in the material with such an open mind as possible without any preconceptions about what will be found will be the objective of the research. Nevertheless, no-one is a blank slate and we all have some ideas about the world we live in. When discussing this problem beforehand the intention is to be as aware as possible about it to try for a good and clear structure so that the dependability will increase.

Regarding the transferability of this study, it may be that since the EU is so different from any other institution, it might be hard to take the results found in this study and assume to find them in other settings. However, the theoretical and analytical contributions concerning the different types of power made in this thesis can be used in other settings when trying to uncover how states project power. Also other researchers can probably perform similar studies in other areas within the Union, for example the environment or economy.[96]

4.5.3 Limitations

If in the material it is found that the EU projects an image of being a normative and/or smart power it does not mean that it actually is one—as actual power is not the same thing as projections of power. Consequently there are limitations to what this research can say. However, the design of this thesis can help to gain a deeper understanding of how the EU´s foreign policy power discourse is constructed.

---

[96] Marshall and Rossman (2011) p. 42-43 and 252

5. Results

This chapter begins with the idea of the EU brought forward by the Union itself in 2001, after which other groupings are presented. The same is then done for the 2011 report. In order to structure this chapter, different regions and countries have been selected that best demonstrate the ideas and concept that have been most prominent in the reports. The aim of this part of the thesis is to present the reader with quotes to better understand the conclusion drawn and to make the analysis more transparent. A short presentation of the most noticeable physical differences and similarities, as well as differences and similarities of the content concludes this chapter. This last part serves to give the reader an idea of how the report looks and a background for the analysis.

5.1 2001 –

The name of the foreign policy part is `Role of the Union in the world´, the title of the section is neutral but it indicates that the EU claims that it has a role to play in the world.

In the following section, the projected image of **The EU** will be presented**.** The Unions action in the foreign policy field are described in a very straight forward manner, but positive adjectives such as strong and swift are used to enhance the image of this actor. *"These events generated strong political will on the part of the European Union for collective action…"[97]* That the Union is trying to promote itself as a normative power also becomes apparent on the very first page of the report:

> *"On a more general political front, the Union took frequent part in political dialogue meetings with non-member countries and regional groupings at which it raised priority issues such as human rights, good governance, conflict prevention and humanitarian aid".[98]*

This discourse is very prominent throughout the report, the EU are definitely trying to put forward an image of itself as a normative power. [99]

Regarding the smart power agenda of the Union it is not prominent in the 2001 report, but some signs of smart power being desirable can be found, for example *"improve the Union's capacity for action in both fields by military and civilian means".[100]* A combination of hard

---

[97] General report (2001) p. 249
[98] General report (2001) p. 249
[99] See for example p.285 and p. 337 in the general report (2001)
[100] General report (2001) p. 250

and soft power tools is mentioned and, how these instruments are to be used is, however, not declared. The EU using some smart power is also evident in the section of the report relating to Afghanistan and the Taliban regime. The EU freezes funds and ban flights to Afghanistan in an effort to target the Taliban, but it also sets up a humanitarian aid programme for refugees[101]. The EU also expressed their willingness to assist the United States in their mission in Afghanistan.[102] It does, however, not refer to the objective of these actions. Smart power is more difficult to find in the reports because it is hard to detect where the EU has used both soft and hard power and more importantly *how* they have used these powers features.

In this report under section 4 `Development cooperation´, an interesting passage can be found that illustrates the fact that the European Union is not a unified actor:

> *"Parliament welcomed the Commission communication of April 2000 on the European Community's development policy (3), endorsing its focus on the elimination of poverty. However, this did not prevent Parliament from making a critical analysis of objectives, strategy and organisation behind the policy."*

A clear sign of disagreement between the European Commission and the Parliament is described. Another disagreement, between the Parliament and the Council is also apparent in this passage: *"Regretting that it had not yet been formally involved in defining negotiating mandates with third countries, Parliament asked the Council, in recommendations of 1 March (2), to amend the current negotiating directives"[103]*. Making these differences of opinions between European institutions so apparent, by using words like critical and regretting, in the report makes the EU seem less coherent and strong.

With regard to **The European neighbourhood,** the image brought forward by the Union is that it has the authority to perform different functions in this region. This is clearly demonstrated through comments such as *"Adopted… Joint Actions …concerning the European Union monitoring mission to the western Balkans.."[104]* Here the impression of the EU as an overseer is projected. That function would not be possible for the EU to have in all the regions of the world at this time. Later on it is stated that the EU: *"welcomed the encouraging progress made by the region along the road to democracy, a market economy*

---

[101] General report (2001) p. 332-333
[102] General report (2001) p. 325
[103] General report (2001) p. 337
[104] General report (2001) p. 251

31

and peaceful coexistence"[105] Here the EU is giving positive attention to the regions that are trying for normative values, as well as economic progress.

Concerning the relationship between Turkey and the EU there is a passage that illustrates the EU´s position:

> *"In June, the European Union noted with concern the decision of the Turkish Constitutional Court to order the closure of the Virtue Party, confiscate its assets and deny some of its members various political rights (2). In October, the Union considered that the recently adopted constitutional reforms were an encouraging step in the democratisation of the country and a first stage in the swift implementation of the national programme for the adoption of the acquis"*[106].

The EU wants to focus on the positive, and it enhances these features by using words like `swift´ and `encouraging´, but it still mentions the negative occurrences in the country to make Turkey aware of the EU´s position towards these issues. Note the use of the word `concern´ when talking about things the EU considers negative, versus the word `encouraging´ when mentioning democratisation.

"It also noted with satisfaction the orderly conduct of the parliamentary elections in Montenegro"[107]. The EU would, for example, never mention with satisfaction an orderly election in a member country or the United States. This indicates that the EU has a different role towards this region.

The sections dealing with the **Eastern European countries** is titled `Independent states of the former Soviet Union´ [108] This relatively negative nomination would indicate that these countries are still associated with Soviet in 2001 and that they are not seen as fully independent states even though they are describes as such.

The relations with **The United States** are quite prominent in the report. Terrorist attacks on the USA and conflict in Macedonia are described slightly positively on the first page of the report because they strengthened the EU´s foreign and security policy. [109] However, in the rest of the report the terrorist attacks are described in a negative way and the solidarity with the

---

[105] General report (2001) p. 301
[106] General report (2001) p. 256
[107] General report (2001) p. 258
[108] General report (2001) p. 259
[109] General report (2001) p. 249

United States is expressed several times. The difference of opinion between the EU and the United States concerning the Kyoto protocol are commented upon in the report, however it is also mentioned that this relationship is important and that the EU are determined to make it work. [110]

> *"In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September and in conjunction with other initiatives ... expressing Europe's solidarity with the American nation and declaring a day of mourning. At the same time, it calls on all countries to step up their efforts to combat terrorism and announced the Union's commitment to contribute to the emergence of a strong, sustained and global action against terrorism."[111]*

The EU is calling on other states to act, and setting itself as an example. Terrorism is a problem that needs to be rectified by the EU, and a `strong, sustained and global action´.

The relationship with the USA is then also described in the section entitled: `Relations with the United States, Japan and other industrialised countries´ this would indicate that these countries enjoy a special economic relationship with the EU, they are grouped together regardless of geography. In the words of Reisigl and Wodak; the EU are creating in-groups, and consequently also out-groups. A distinction between industrialised and non-industrialised countries is used to give these countries a special position. Even though the non industrialised countries are backgrounded in this section, they serve as a point of negative comparison.

A normative value, the environment, is talked about with **Japan**, but the repetitive mentioning of economic related terms make it more prominent and important in the discourse as can be seen in this quote: *"future EU-Japan ties, the action plan involves joint initiatives in the areas of political relations (e.g. UN reform), economic and trade relations, particularly with regard to two-way investment, and new challenges such as the environment"[112]*

A distinction is made between Japan and Korea and the other **Asian states** already in the list of contents. Japan is mentioned in relation to other `industrialised´ countries such as the United States, Australia and Korea.

---

[110] General report (2001) p. 321
[111] General report (2001) p. 255-256
[112] General report (2001) p. 236

"Mr Patten represented the Commission at this meeting chaired by Tang Jiaxuan, Chinese Foreign Minister. In a joint statement, the participants affirmed their desire to strengthen and extend their cooperation and contribute to a multi-polar world which was more stable, harmonious, sustainable and respected human rights."[113]

In this part of the report, the EU representative talks to a Chinese representative about the importance of normative values such as human rights and further on discusses strengthening the EU´s image in China. This could imply that the EU´s image in China is negative or not visible in this country. The fact that the Union wishes to strengthen their image in this country also means that it cares about how it is perceived, probably because China is gaining importance in the world. The country is however left out of the group of industrialised states.

Relations between the EU and the **Middle East** are described briefly in the report. *"In February, it congratulated Mr. Sharon on his election as Prime Minister of Israel and called on him to keep up the momentum of the peace process "*[114] The EU congratulate him while caution him at the same time.

The section on the Unions relations with **Africa** is full of worlds like `condemn´, `urge´, `called´, `expressed´ and `welcomed´. These words are however very passive, no real action is taken, even though *"However, in October, it could only deplore the expulsion of the EU Presidency representative to Eritrea"*[115]. The impression is that the EU has no real power in this region. This is also strengthened by the fact that it is written `could only´, which implies that nothing else can be done.

"As regards Angola, in May the Union roundly condemned the attack by UNITA near the town of Caxito and the abduction of children, but was encouraged by some new developments which it considered positive"[116] The mentioning of the positive developments right after it brings up the incident with the abduction of children makes it seem less severe. Using the words `condemn´ and `encouraged´ in the very same sentence make this paragraph seem almost comical in an unfortunate way.

There is a section in the report describing the relations with **African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries and the overseas countries and territories (OCTs).** Instead of grouping

---

[113] General report (2001) p. 330
[114] General report (2001) p. 258
[115] General report (2001) p. 264
[116] General report (2001) p. 265

the overseas territories with the neighbors of the EU or the EU itself a distinction is made. They are not part of the Union, and they are not even considered neighbours.

The many countries of **Latin America** are not prominent within the report, they are grouped together by the EU**.** *"On 12 March, the Council adopted a decision (3) implementing Joint Action 1999/34/CFSP (4) on combating the accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean."*[117]This action indicates that these countries need help; they cannot manage these things by themselves.

The **Relations with international organization** are described in a quite long segment of the report with the most prominent international organisation being the United Nations. *"Mr Prodi's visit to Geneva on 24 and 25 January (3) made him the first President of the Commission to pay an official visit to the organisations of the United Nations."*[118] This is brought up to show that the Union is gaining importance in international relations.

> *"In its resolution of 6 September (3), Parliament, pointing to poor implementation of the conclusions of the World Education Forum in Dakar (4), spoke of the key role the European Union had to play in promoting basic education in the developing countries, fostering gender equality in schools, for example."*[119]

The nomination `developing countries´ makes an unspoken parallel with `developed countries´. The EU here tries to work as a norm entrepreneur, bringing forward normative values and promoting itself as capable of fostering the under-developed countries as part of their key role.

The concept of **human security** is not explicitly mentioned in the report, however, there is constant mention of development cooperation, food security and campaigning against anti-personnel landmines[120] --indicating that the features of that discourse are present. In 2001, the concept of human security was not yet in popular use, but it still seems like the EU is rather a fierce proponent of security for the individual rather than the state.

5.2 2011 –
The name of the foreign policy part in 2011 is `A stronger EU in the world´. When using the word stronger it indicates that in the past it used to be not as strong as it is now. This could

---

[117] General report (2001) p. 254
[118] General report (2001) p. 267
[119] General report (2001) p. 287
[120] General report (2001) p. 289, 291

also imply that it wishes to be even stronger. In the very first paragraph of the part about the Unions foreign policy it mentions the coming into force of the Lisbon treaty and the establishment of the European External Action service, meaning that this is what has changed. The EU consequently indicates, when using the word stronger, that it is stronger because it now has a High Representative of the Union for Foreign affairs and the EEAS to back her up.

In 2011, the report is full of positive adjectives used to enhance the confident and forceful image of the **European Union**. `Major player´, `swift capacity´, `a single voice´ and `active´ are words used to describe the EU in the introduction of the foreign policy section of the 2011 report.[121] The EU is also describing itself as generous[122] when acting in Africa, and in the section describing how the EU will achieve to live up to the millennium development goals, there are clear parallels to the human security discourse, as well as the normative power discourse; *"There is particular concern about the lack of progress in certain countries and regions (notably in sub-Saharan Africa) and against some of the MDGs (notably maternal and child health)".* [123] Here, the EU is trying to act as a norm entrepreneur when promoting the millennium goals in this region.

That the EU wants to be considered as a normative power is clear in the entire foreign policy section of the report. Some examples of this are:

> *"'A new response to a changing neighbourhood' represents a major overhaul of the manner in which the European neighbourhood policy is implemented both towards the south and the east and includes overall strategy, accompanied by a large number of proposals addressing the whole of the EU neighbourhood (i.e. those countries and territories stretching from Morocco to Syria and from Azerbaijan to Belarus) to support those partners in delivering on reform, building 'deep democracy' and ensuring sustainable and inclusive economic development"[124].*

The EU neighbourhood is defined and normative power values are mentioned in relation to this. Economic progress also seems to be important within the neighbourhood.

> *"The renewed ENP is based on mutual accountability and a shared commitment to the universal values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. It will involve a much*

---

[121] General report (2011) p. 107
[122] General report (2011) p. 143
[123] General report (2011) p. 143
[124] General report (2011) p. 107

higher level of differentiation, allowing each partner country to develop its links with the EU as far as its own aspirations, needs and capacities allow. For those southern and eastern neighbours able and willing to take part, this vision entails closer economic integration and stronger political cooperation on governance reforms, security and conflict resolution matters, including joint initiatives in international fora on issues of common interest"[125].

Normative values seem important, but also in relation to the economy.

The EU also describes itself as a normative power primarily towards Africa, Latin America and the Arab world[126]. However, it is not so much in relation to economic gain, but there is a sense of obligation to do so[127].

When it comes to the EU acting as a smart power some interesting paragraphs have been found, for example;

"The initiative lies with the partner and EU support will be tailored accordingly. Increased EU support to its neighbours is conditional. It will depend on progress in building and consolidating democracy and respect for the rule of law. The more and the faster a country progresses in its internal reforms, the more support it will get from the EU".[128]

The EU uses conditional support, hard power, and soft power, aid initiatives, to reach normative values. This quote clearly illustrates how economic incentives are used both as hard and soft power, (see Cross)[129].

"The challenge of bringing the EU's foreign policy under one roof presents its procedural hurdles, in aligning the various different funding sources for its operations and harnessing all its tools — diplomacy, political engagement, development assistance, civil and military crisis management — in support of conflict prevention and poverty reduction, security and stability and the promotion of human rights around the world"......"in the EU's three military and 17 civilian missions around the world"[130]

---

[125] General report (2011) p. 109
[126] General report (2011) p. 111, 125 and 145
[127] General report (2011) p. 140-141
[128] General report (2011) p. 110
[129] Cross (2011)
[130] General report (2011) .p 108

The EU´s foreign policy capacity is described, for example, as combining diplomacy with conflict prevention. The EU is involved in many more civilian missions than military ones, however, just the presence of the EU can be regarded as hard power.

Concerning the **Neighbouring countries** of the Union, they are mentioned as seeing the EU as very appealing*: "The eastern partners view the EU as a magnet and a catalyst for reform — as an economic opportunity and a close political partner." ..."An allocation of additional resources (of up to €130 million) for the period 2012–13 will benefit partners committed to reforms."[131]* Who says that they view the EU as a magnet? The EU wants to be a norm entrepreneur and a normative power towards this region. The use of words like `magnet´, `catalyst´, `opportunity´ and `close´, to describe how the Eastern countries view the EU, strengthens the positive image of the actor. The EU makes its economic support conditional, but it's unclear what sort of reform is necessary to become a recipient. The objective of the Eastern partnership, however, is to strengthen economic ties with this region, as well as helping them on their way to becoming more democratic. [132]

It is not specified in the report what countries are termed **Third countries,** but the EU´s relations with them are nevertheless described.

> *"The key objectives are to contribute to the strategic partnership between the Union and such third countries; to share the benefits of the EU's long experience in how regional policy promotes growth, sustainable development and cooperation across borders; and to contribute to improved understanding of European values, basic principles, delivery structures and policies."[133]*

European values, as mentioned here, seem to be sound economic development as well as normative values. That is not however explicitly mentioned. The word strategic would imply that economic cooperation is important in the relation with these countries.

The relationship with the candidate country **Turkey** is described thusly:

> *"Turkey continued to make progress in alignment with the EU acquis in most areas. Significant further efforts are required to guarantee fundamental rights, in particular*

---

[131] General report (2011) p. 115
[132] European Union website. Eastern partnership (2012). http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/index_en.htm Accessed: 2012-03.12
[133] General report (2011) p. 122

freedom of expression, where the number of court cases against writers and journalists and the restrictions on access to the Internet raised serious concerns."[134]

The EU still focuses on the positive efforts made by Turkey to come closer to becoming members but a normative value, the freedom of speech, is used to illustrate that they are not there yet and the words `significant further efforts´ to reinforce that.

Under the heading `Strengthening strategic alliances´ relations with the US, Russia, China, Japan, Brazil, India and South Africa are brought up and termed strategic and major partners. This section is no longer called relations with developed or industrialized countries as it did in 2001. Some of the countries have changed, but the same things are prominent in the discourse when talking about these countries; foremost economic ties. [135]

The EU´s near relationship with **the United States** is clearly illustrated in this quote:

"The close working relationship between the US administration and the EU has facilitated joint approaches on many foreign policy issues. This has been the case, for example, with the coordinated imposition and lifting of sanctions on Libya, as well as sanctions and simultaneous statements on Syria and concerted approaches in the Balkans, notably Bosnia and Herzegovina. The EU and US have worked especially closely as co-members of the Quartet coordinating international approaches to the Middle East peace process and on orchestrating an international response to Iran's nuclear development programme"[136]

It would seem the EU and the United States run the world as equals. They have a shared responsibility for the world. The words `joint´, `close´ and `orchestrating´ are employed in the discourse to describe the special relationship between the EU and the United States.

There is no mentioning of normative values in the section describing the EU´s relations with **China**, except sustainable development[137]. That would indicate that normative values are not talked about with China or that the EU fails in negotiating these things. There is a paramount difference compared to the 2001 report. It is apparent that economy is more important than human rights within the EU-China relationship discourse in 2011.

---

[134] General report (2011) p. 136
[135] General report (2011) p. 117
[136] General report (2011) p. 117
[137] General report (2011) p. 119

The relationship with **India, South Africa and Brazil** is described in this way by the EU:

"The partnerships with Brazil, India and South Africa reflect the growing importance of these countries both in regional affairs and in global governance (through the G20 and other fora). The growth of these countries represents an opportunity for the EU to develop new partnerships on key multilateral issues and to deepen political, security and economic relations. To ensure the EU takes advantage of this opportunity, work continued on negotiations for a far-reaching free trade agreement with India, on the relaunched negotiations for an association agreement with the Mercosur region (including Brazil) and on fostering regional integration in southern Africa by the completion of negotiations on an economic partnership agreement between the EU and the Southern African Development Community"[138].

These countries have a much more prominent place in the EU´s foreign policy discourse in the 2011 report, compared to 2001. The reason for this is almost stated overtly—they have grown as economic powers.

Concerning the EU-**Asia** relationship, it is written in the report that**:** *"… ministers considered non-traditional security challenges as the main theme of the dialogue…climate change, food and energy security and the fight against piracy featured high on the agendas"[139].* Regular (state) security used to be the most important thing, now it is more focused on human security.

The section dealing with relations with the **Middle East** is much larger than it was in 2011**.** More space is dedicated to various conflicts in the region. *"In Libya and Syria the EU decided on economic sanctions, with trade embargos, asset freezes and visa bans"*[140]. The EU uses more hard power towards these troubled regions.

"With regard to mobility, partnership dialogues on migration mobility and security have been offered to Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt, covering legal migration, the fight against illegal migration and readmission, visa facilitation and asylum. This approach

---

[138] General report (2011) p. 121
[139] General report (2011) p. 120
[140] General report (2011) p. 111

was endorsed by the European Council of 24 June 2011. The first of these dialogues —
with Tunisia and Morocco — were launched in October 2011" [141]

The EU´s willingness to help these countries manage the problems with illegal migration is probably related to the EU´s own border security. In the discourse the EU claims that the concepts of security and migration are linked together, making one a threat to the other.

When it comes to **Africa** some of the countries are mentioned in relation to tackling piracy[142] and some under the heading `Fighting food insecurity´, under the larger heading of reaching the millennium development goals. South Africa is however mentioned in relation to strategic alliances, making the other African countries backgrounded.

> *"The European Union has committed over €440 million since 2008 for agriculture and*
> *food security in the Horn of Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Kenya and Somalia),*
> *helping to feed the most vulnerable people, improve nutrition and encourage*
> *sustainable agriculture. Over the past decade, the EU has been progressively setting up*
> *a comprehensive approach to the Horn of Africa, including long-term development*
> *interventions aimed at creating security, building peace and improving democratic*
> *governance in the region. To date, the EU is the biggest donor to Somalia."*[143]

In 2001 the EU representative got kicked out of Eritrea, so the relationship with this region has changed dramatically. Whether the EU has grown stronger, or this region weaker, is a question that comes to mind.

Most of **Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Pacific and central Asia** is mentioned under the `Achieving the millennium development goals´ heading giving them no part in the rest of the report, they are only associated with problems related to the MDG´s and how the EU is helping these countries tackle them. Normative values are prominent within this relationship, with the EU functioning as the donor of aid and the recipient countries being reduced to silent receivers.

The **Overseas territories** of the EU are still mentioned in the same part of the report as the Pacific and Caribbean regions. *"inclusive growth"*[144] is however mentioned as a priority for

---

[141] General report (2011) p. 112
[142] General report (2011) p. 129
[143] General report (2011) p. 143
[144] General report (2011) p. 145

this region, where using the word inclusive would indicate that the OCT should form closer ties with the rest of the EU.

Regarding **Latin America** the focus on normative values such as good governance and respect for human rights is prominent. The EU is also still active in fighting drug and organized crime problems in this region of the world. [145]

The **Relations with international organisations** in 2001 is dominated by relations with the UN. *"Historic moment: President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, addressed the UN General Assembly — the EU speaks with one voice to the world."* [146] The relationship with the UN is changing, in 2001 the first Commission President visited them and now in 2011 the Council President speaks to them for the first time. Here, it becomes clear that the EU wants the world to see them as one actor, this was not, as previously mentioned, the case in 2001. The proud declaration that the EU now speaks with one voice to the world is mentioned as an historical event to reinforce the importance of this occasion.

Regarding the **Human security** agenda of the EU in 2011, there is much importance placed on border security in the Middle East. The Union suddenly becomes very interested in asylum, security and migration policy and Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt are to be guided by the EU in this important area. Not really because of their own border security, but because they are countries that are part of the European neighbourhood and consequently the influx of immigrants into these countries have an effect on the EU. Nevertheless, in all other parts of the foreign policy report the EU seems to focus more on security for the individual than the state. Theory also supports this finding, that the EU, as a civilian and normative actor, would promote human security over state security. [147]

5.3 Physical differences between the reports

Some of the most noticeable physical differences between the actual two reports are presented here.

The report of **2001** is very heavy to read, the text is written in large sections with a plethora of long numbers used to identify different joint actions etc. There are no pictures and a black and white color scheme, with the exception of the first page where blue is used as background and a picture of all the flags of the EU Countries with a larger EU flag behind them. This report is

---

[145] General report (2011) p. 145-146
[146] General report (2011) p. 123
[147] Martin and Owen (2010)

clearly meant to be read only by people working with these issues, with an existing understanding of the EU´s foreign policy.

Number of pages: 580 (Role of Union in the world: p. 249-351)

The **2011** report is much easier to read with much smaller sections of text, it is airier and it has pictures and colors. One is given the impression that the EU is really trying to make their communication with their citizens more effective and accessible. It's meant to be read and understood by everyone. Pictures (for example starving people in Africa that the EU is helping or the Japanese prime minister applauding Herman Van Rompuy) are used to enhance this and give you a positive image of the European Union. This report has a nautical theme, on the first page there is a picture of a boat sailing on an ocean and each section has pictures of other things related to ships and sailing, like a compass and a rudder, on the first page. Number of pages: 184 (A stronger EU in the World: 106-149)

When looking only at the physical reports there are no similarities.

5.4 Content of the reports, difference and similarities

5.4.1 Similarities:
Regarding language, British English is used in both reports, not American English.

The regions and countries that are brought up in the reports are pretty much the same; they are however given different attributes and names in the two reports.

The discourse on economy, trade and money is very prominent in the parts of the reports that have been the focus of this thesis, even though the selected parts where ones not dealing with trade and economic cooperation specifically.

Noticeable in both reports is the discourse on human security, but as previously mentioned, not explicitly stated. It is there, but it doesn't make overt references to it. Perhaps the human security norms have reached the stage of norm acceptance, internationalization, in 2011, where it's no longer contested. Or perhaps it's an out of date concept that is no longer popular to use. Nevertheless, it seems like the EU tends to focus on security for the individual rather than security within or outside of the state, the most prominent exception to this being the Union assisting the countries in the southern parts of the EU neighbourhood with border security, asylum policy and immigration.

5.4.2 Differences:

In 2001, the subsections are named for example; ´Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)´ and `International Organizations and Conferences´ or `Relations with the western Balkans´. In 2011 the sections are named for example; `Promoting peace, security and human rights around the globe´, `Investing in development – the EU as the world's largest donor´ or `Strengthening strategic alliances´. The sections in 2001 are named in a much more straightforward way; they are what they say they are. In 2011, the sections are probably named after what the EU wants to be or already has accomplished in different areas, and it uses these subsections to communicate positive images of the Union.

In 2001 the report mentions different EU institutions; such as specifying the Commission's or EP's specific actions. Instead, in 2011 there is a more unified picture of the EU as one actor performing various tasks. In 2001 other organisations and countries that work together with the EU are mentioned more often than in 2011.

Again in 2001 the report simply describes the actions of the various bodies, not so much why it has taken action or the subsequent added value of the actions. In contrast, the 2011 report is full of references to how, why and with how much money the Union has contributed to different world events.

The words used to describe what has happened in foreign policy has also changed, in 2001 the words are quite passive ones, like `condemn´, `expressed´[148] or welcome, however, they indicate if the EU is positive or negative towards the occurrences. In 2011 the discourse describes more action, like `reacted promptly´[149] or `mobilising´.[150] The use of negative or positive words when describing certain world events is however something that can be found in both reports. This development is probably related to the fact that the EU is involved in many more actual civilian and military operations now, than it was in 2001.

The report frequently mentions the amount of money given to different regions in the world in 2011, and to a lesser degree in 2001. Could this be to demonstrate to citizens that it is actually doing something or to make the EU budget spending's more transparent? The economic crises probably have had some impact in this regard.

---

[148] General report (2001) p. 253
[149] General report (2011) p. 155
[150] General report (2011) p. 107

There are, as previously mentioned, a lot of pictures in the 2011 report, for example one of President Obama saying something and Barroso and Van Rompuy listening[151], this picture contrasts very much to the one of Van Rompuy talking and the Japanese Prime minister applauding[152]. In the parts of the report dealing with the millennium developments goals and the EU as the world largest donor the pictures are portraying people planting trees and suffering from drought.[153]. Since this thesis focuses on written discourse, and the fact that there are only pictures in the 2011 report, these pictures are disregarded in the analysis.

5.5 Conclusions:

In this last segment of the thesis the questions and aims of this thesis are answered and discussed. Some concluding remarks regarding the overall purpose and future contributions to the field of study are also made.

Firstly, some comments on the discourse as such; the most central actor to this discourse is not surprisingly the European Union itself. Even if a person reading the report should be unaware of what type of document it is it would still be apparent to them that it's the EU that has produced it. The positive image of the European Union is enhanced by using positive adjectives and in 2011 by pictures showing the impact the EU has had on regional conflicts etc. In the 2011 report, it uses the objective of reaching normative values to explain to the reader why certain measures are taken. The European Union defines rightness and justifies its action by referencing normative values, along with sound economic development. Even though the texts used as data in this thesis are not very argumentative in their natures this rightness defined by the EU is very easy to detect. The report is very Eurocentric with the EU separating itself from the rest of the world as a very influential actor.

How are the EU´s power projections constructed in 2001 and 2011?

It uses nominations such as `generous´ and `readiness to help´[154] to strengthen the image of itself as a force for good, a donor of aid and a normative power in the world. There is some evidence of traces of the EU using smart power, especially in the 2011 report, but to say that the EU is a smart power would be to take it too far. Perhaps it could be a smart power in the future, if it can and wants to use more hard power.

---

[151] General report (2011) p. 117
[152] General report (2011) p. 120
[153] General report (2011) p. 145
[154] General report (2001) p. 311

How has the EU´s power projections changed between 2001 and 2011?

There are definitely more of both normative and smart power projections in the 2011 report than in 2001.The EU project an image of being a normative power, however, one is left wondering if normative values are used as a pretext for what it actually wants to accomplish. In the relations with China, a country with serious issues when it comes to human right, the EU chooses not to mention any normative values, except sustainable development. It seems as though as important as economic ties were for the EU in 2001, they are even more important in 2011. The rise of the BRIC´s as well as the economic crisis could perhaps explain this. There is a difference between the two reports regarding what kinds of words that are used to describe certain events in foreign policy, in 2011 more active verbs that indicate action are used. In comparison, passive verbs are much more common in the 2001 report. This shows the reader that the EU is now more involved in global affairs.

What kinds of power features are employed by the EU in the material?

The EU uses mostly normative power features, especially towards `weaker´ regions and states. But also some features of smart power towards countries such as Afghanistan in 2001 and towards its neighbours in 2011. However, there was also clear use of hard power towards the Middle East in 2011.

Does the EU use different types of power towards different regions in the world?

Yes, in the material the EU uses different types of powers features towards different countries. This is probably due to different relationships with the various countries. The relationship with China is perhaps the one that has undergone the most dramatic shift, from being an actor where the EU tried to promote normative values, to being articulated as a major and strategic partner.

Africa is nothing more than a recipient of aid in 2011, but a little less so in 2001. Eritrea also signifies an interesting example of how the EU´s power projections have changed, in 2001 the EU representative was removed from the country and in 2011 they are only mentioned as aid recipients.

The USA is treated as an equal both in 2001 and in 2011. As mentioned this is strengthened by words like `joint´ etc. The United States are also referred to as strategic and major partners in 2011.

The EU also creates categories (or in- and out-groups) of countries and regions delineating the actors found inside them, this is apparent both in the 2001 and the 2011 report. In 2001, it labeled the Central & Eastern European countries as former-Soviet states and other states industrialized; and in 2011 some countries are strategic partners and others are only mentioned under the `Achieving the millennium development goals´ heading.

5.6 Discussion

Even though a separation between foreign policy and trade policy has been attempted, economic and trade policies are mentioned frequently in both reports. Could this discourse be used by the EU to strengthen the normative power discourse, or is it the other way around? Is economy more important than normative values? Economic incentives seem to be behind many initiatives, but it's not overtly stated. This is apparent in the description of relations with for example the BRICs and the United States.

Trade and aid is traditionally considered soft power, but economic incentives can be used as hard power too, which can be clearly seen in the example when the EU made aid towards their neighbours conditional, depending on how they advanced towards democracy.

In the 2001 report they mention a disagreement between the US and the EU concerning the Kyoto Protocol, but either this relationship has changed or the EU now chooses to focus on issues that are positive and projects the relationship between them to be amicable and equal. In 2011, no such disagreements between the two actors are mentioned.

One of the most evident changes one comes across when looking at these reports is how they communicate with the reader. In the latter report there is a much more cohesive, positive and unified image of the Union. This could, of course, be due to a number of reasons, but headings like `A stronger EU in the world´ also gives the reader an idea of a Union trying to promote itself as a major player in the world, something it also states that it already is.

Placing this study within the social constructivism realm entails accepting that reality is subjective. We should not underestimate the power that language and different forms of communication have on our perceived reality, and this appears to be something that the EU is increasingly aware of. Our reality is constantly constructed through interaction with other people as well as through written communication. This is also what the method chosen for this thesis aims to uncover—the relationship between reality, power and discourse.

As stated in the introduction, the aim of this thesis is observe projections of power, not action. The EU projects normative power, but is it really a normative power in the world? We cannot know if what is written in the General report is what it really does. It is also impossible for us to know it is the Union's intentions for a world where normative values rule, that causes them to act in international politics. As mentioned in the literature overview, many realists criticize the EU on exactly this issue, referring to the capabilities-expectation gap where the EU´s actions and what it says do not match. Acting as and projecting normative power towards `weaker´ states, such as African states, is also easier than it is towards `strong´ states like the United States or China.

As Ferreira Nunes also discovered[155] the roles, normative and smart power are hard to detect as separate, they are intertwined and found in relation to beliefs expressed in the discourse as well as in the decisions reached and in the Unions resources in foreign policy.

Regarding the EU´s role as a norm entrepreneur, Manners[156] states that if the Union is present in a country, the inhabitants should become less susceptive to norms. If we assume that is true the EU´s military and civilian presence that is growing in the world would enable them, according to Manners, to become less and less of a norm entrepreneur. In the discourse studied in this thesis the EU´s self-acclaimed role as norm entrepreneur seems to be foremost towards their eastern neighbours. The EU wants their Eastern partners to view them as a catalyst for reform, this is also apparent towards poorer countries, where the EU tries to promote norms like education and child and maternal health.

Cross[157], maintains that the EU used hard power very rarely in compliment with long periods of soft power, something that, when scrutinizing the discourse, seems to be true. On very few occasions is `pure´ hard power used, and almost always the EU uses normative values to justify why this action was necessary. Soft power, such as aid, is clearly what the EU emphasizes in its foreign policy discourse.

Concerning the research done by Pace[158] who claims that the EU´s normative power is the power to project its norms to states in the neighbourhood of the Union, she concludes that being regarded as a normative power along with economic and political interests are the reasons for the EU´s regional policy towards, primarily, its southern neighbours. The findings

---

[155] Ferreira Nunes (2011)
[156] Manners (2006)
[157] Cross (2011)
[158] Pace (2007)

in this thesis very much support her conclusions and therefore strengthen the probability that the answers to the research questions posed are valid.

5.7 Outlook

I hope that the contributions to the field of research made in this thesis are ones that can help to deepen our understanding of the European Union. I also hope that I have provided the reader with two snapshots of the EU´s foreign policy power discourse that they found to be interesting and rewarding to read about.

Regarding future research, I am confident that my thesis has inspired readers to go beyond what my conclusions can say and ask further questions regarding the self-understanding of the EU and the power it projects in the world.

6. Literature

Articles and Books

Bergström, Göran, & Boréus, Kristina (Eds.). (2005). *Textens mening och makt: Metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Cross, Mai´a K Davis (2011) Europe, a smart power? *International Politics vol 48 Issue* 6

European council (2003) *European Security Strategy*. Brussels

Ferreira Nunes, Isabel (2011) 'Civilian, Normative, and Ethical Power Europe: Role Claims and EU Discourses' *European Foreign Affairs Review* vol 16 pp. 1–20

Finnemore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn (1998) "International norm dynamics and political change". *International Organization 52 (autumn): 887-917.*

Galen Carpenter, Ted (2008) *Smart Power: Towards a prudent foreign policy for America.* Cato Institute. Washington.

Hokanson Hawks, Jane (1991) Power: a concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* vol. 16, 754-762

Howarth, David, R. and Torfing, Jacob (2005) *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance*. Palgrave MacMillan

Hyde-Price, Adrian. (2006) 'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique *Journal of European Public Policy* 13:2: 217–234 Routledge

Jorgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2002*). Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Löfgren, Johan and Pettersson, Teodor (2006) EU: en fortsatt normativ makt? En studie om EU: s möjliga framtid i internationell politik

Magone, José (2011) *Contemporary European Politics, A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Routledge

Manners, Ian (2002) "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?" *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies Volume 40, Issue 2, pages 235–258*

Manners, Ian (2008) "The normative ethics of the European Union" *International Affairs Volume 84, Issue 1, pages 45–60.*

Manners, Ian, (2006). `Normative power Europe reconsidered: Beyond the crossroads´. *Journal of European Public Policy vol 13, nr 2,*

Marshall, Catherine and Rossman, Gretchen B (2011) *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. Fifth Edition.

Martin, Mary and Owen, Taylor (2010) The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience *International Affairs* 86: 1 Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs

Matlary, Janne, Halaand. (2009). *European Union Security Dynamics, In the New National Interest*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Moravcsik, Andrew (2010) "Europe: The Second Superpower," *Current History ISSN 0011-3530, 03/2010, Volume 109, Number 725, pp. 91 – 98*

Nagy Hesse-Bibier, Sharlene and Leavy, Patricia (2011).*The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. Second Edition.

Nugent, Neill (2010) The government and politics of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan

Nye, Joseph, Samuel (2004) *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, Public Affairs

Nye, Joseph, Samuel (2009) Smart Power: It's a Blend of Soft and Hard *Leadership Excellence,* Feb

Pace, Michelle (2007) "Norm shifting from EMP to ENP: the EU as a norm entrepreneur in the south**?**" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs 20:4, 659-675 Routledge* p. 659

Reisigl, Martin, and Wodak, Ruth. (2009). The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Ruggie, John .Gerard. (1998). *Constructing the World Polity.* London: Routledge. P 30-34

General reports

European Commission (2001) General report on the activities of the European Union SEC(2001) 1000 final ISBN: 92-894-1953-9

European Commission (2011) General report on the activities of the European Union 2011. ISBN: 978-92-79-22258-0

Treaties

European Union (2008) Consolidate version of The Treaty on European Union (TEU) 9.5.2008 Official Journal of the European Union C 115/13

European Union (2010). Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) *Official Journal C 83 of 30.3.2010*

Internet

Cheetham, Andrew (2012) http://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/06/the-eu-in-foreign-policy-a-military-or-civilian-power/ Accessed: 2012-01-17

European Union External action service (2011) *Overview of the missions and operations of the European Union April 2011*.
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=268&lang=en Accessed: 2011-11-12

European Union website. Eastern partnership. http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/index_en.htm Accessed:2012-03-12

European Union website. General report on the Activities of the European Union.
http://europa.eu/generalreport/index_en.htm. Accessed: 2012-03-10

Hardwick, Daniel (2011) Is the EU a Normative Power? http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/03/is-the-eu-a-normative-power/ Accessed: 2012-03-16

Kagan, Robert (2002) Power and Weakness - Why the United States and Europe see the world differently. http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/7107 Accessed: 2012-01-10

Speeches

Rehn, Olli (2008) Europe's smart power in its region and the world SPEECH/08/222 EU Speech at the European Studies Centre, St Antony's College, University of Oxford.
http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/222&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en Accessed: 2011-11-24

Solana, Javier, (2005) EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy at the 40th Commanders Conference of the German Bundeswehr.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/discours/86523.pdf Accessed:2012-03-01