

WHY IS A MODERATE CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH NECESSARY TO ANALYSE EUROPEANIZATION OF FOREIGN, SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICIES?

Zerrin TORUN*

Abstract

Europeanization refers to the impact of the European Union polity and policy-making on the national level. This article argues that a moderate (modernist) constructivist approach is necessary to analyse Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies of EU member states. This is because this approach attributes constitutive and transformative roles to the social and ideational factors that emerge as a result of interaction in institutions. Furthermore, the intergovernmental and consensual nature of the foreign, security and defence policy-making within the EU do not lead to adaptation to rules, regulations and directives as tangible as the economic aspects of integration.

Keywords: *Europeanization, constructivism, foreign, security and defence policies*

Dış Politika, Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikalarının Avrupalılaşmasını İncelemek İçin Neden İlmli Bir Konstrüktivist Yaklaşım Gereklidir?

Özet

Avrupalılaşma kavramı olarak Avrupa Birliği siyasetinin ve siyaset üretme sürecinin ulusal düzeydeki etkisini ifade eder. Bu makale, AB üye ülkelerinin dış politika, güvenlik ve savunma politikalarının avrupalılaşmasını incelemek için ilimli (modernist) inşacı yaklaşımın gerekli olduğunu savunmaktadır. Sebebi, bu yaklaşımın kurumlar içerisindeki etkileşim sonucunda ortaya çıkan sosyal ve fikri faktörlere yapıcı ve dönüştürücü roller atfetmesidir. Üstelik, AB'nin dış politika, güvenlik ve savunma politikalarını oluşturma süreci hükümetler arası ve tam uzlaşmaya dayalı doğası gereği, bütünleşmenin ekonomik yönlerini düzenleyen kurallar, yönetmelikler ve direktifler sonucunda olduğu kadar gözle görülür bir uyum sürecine yol açmamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Avrupalılaşma, inşacılık, dış, güvenlik ve savunma politikaları*

* Department of International Relations, Middle East Technical University

** Makalenin Gönderilme Tarihi: 15 Haziran 2016, Kabul Edilme Tarihi: 28 Ekim 2016

Introduction¹

Europeanization refers to the process of adaptation induced by the dynamics of the European Union, including its policy-making processes and policies at the national level, in other words, to the impact of the EU level on the national level. As is obvious from the title, this article argues that a moderate or modernist constructivist approach is necessary to analyse Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies for a couple of reasons. First, constructivist assumption on the interest and preference formation, which attributes a constitutive and transformative role to social and ideational factors, facilitates analysis of change. This, in turn, enables bringing the often underestimated impact of interaction in different social contexts, but mostly in institutions, into light. Second, the intergovernmental and consensual nature of the foreign, security and defence policy-making in the EU does not allow for the emergence of adaptation to the rules, regulations and directives as tangible as in the case of activities concerning the economic aspects of integration, which is suffused by supranationalism. As will be demonstrated, change or adaptation at the national level in the area of foreign, security and defence policies so far has mostly taken the form of mentality change, or revealed itself in the security identities (cultures) of EU member states, which can only be captured by the help of constructivist assumptions on the role and impact of social and ideational factors.

The article proceeds as follows. First, the definition of Europeanization and mechanisms leading to it which are identified in the wider literature on the EU policies as well as the particular literature on foreign, security and defence policies will be laid out. This section will clarify the characteristics of European cooperation in the area of foreign, security and defence policies and how these affect the national level by way of comparing two different contexts of EU policy-making, which are imbued with supranationalism and intergovernmentalism. Second, constructivist assumptions and literature will be juxtaposed with those of rationalists in order to highlight how their respective assumptions may or may not be conducive to analyse Europeanization. Laying out the core assumptions of moderate constructivism in comparison with rationalism² and the criticisms levelled

¹ This article is from unpublished PhD thesis of Zerrin Torun, *Constructivist Approach to Europeanization under the European Foreign, Security and Defence Policy Framework*, submitted to the University of Sussex, 2009.

² Reflectivists, such as postmodernists and critical theorists have not produced much empirical work on European integration or European foreign, security and defence

against constructivism in the literature will reveal strengths and weaknesses of these approaches. The following section on the applications of theoretical approaches to European foreign, security and defence policies will further substantiate the argument that the constructivist approach is suited better to analyse Europeanization in this realm by presenting various examples from the literature. As will become apparent, this is because constructivism takes the identities and the interests of the states as endogenous to the process or interaction with both other member states of the EU and its institutions.

Europeanization

Definitions of Europeanization are often delimited to a specific working paper or book chapter.³ However, these can be categorized in three clusters. Initially, scholars used 'Europeanization' to refer to the growing competence and authority of EU actors and institutions, in a way that is largely synonymous with conceptions of European integration. Lately, the concept has been used to refer to the impact of the EU on domestic policies, emphasising the adaptational pressures emanating from the EU. Third, interconnections and transfer mechanisms between European states, which may not be necessarily confined to the EU have been defined as Europeanization.⁴ Each of these types of 'Europeanization' have led to numerous studies, however, there has been a growing interest on the impact of the EU on the domestic level as Europeanization. This shift of focus seems natural, as the EU political system is in place, and impacts on domestic policies in various ways.⁵ A carefully nuanced and broad definition of Europeanization in this vein, incorporating both the tangible and less tangible aspects of the issue, was developed by Claudio Radaelli:

Europeanization consists of processes of a) construction b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms

policies. Postmodernism, with its emphasis on deconstruction and critical theory on emancipation, ask fundamentally different questions about European integration.

³ Johan P. Olsen, "The Many Faces of Europe", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 40, No 5, 2002, p. 921.

⁴ Ian Bache, "Europeanization, A Governance Approach", European Union Studies Association (EUSA) 8th Biennial Conference, Nashville, USA, 27-29 March 2003, p. 7. Accessed on 20 May 2008. <http://aei.pitt.edu/554/>

⁵ Simon Bulmer and Claudio Radaelli, "The Europeanization of National Policy?" *Queen's Papers on Europeanization*, Queen's University Belfast, 2004, p. 3. Accessed on 20 May 2008. <http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudiesandPhilosophy/FileStorage/EuropeanizationFiles/Filetoupload,38405,en.pdf>

which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies.⁶

This definition is particularly useful because it draws attention to two essential steps in Europeanization: adoption at the EU level and incorporation at the domestic level. This is what differentiates the studies concerned with European policy-making and Europeanization.⁷ Europeanization is mostly post-ontological, being concerned with what happens once EU institutions produce their effects.⁸ Contradicting this distinction which revolves around the ‘ontological’ stage, however, policy-makers may initiate reforms with the EU in mind, even in the absence of concrete institutionalisation and thus, guidance from the EU.⁹ Moreover, Europeanization also comprises bottom-up mechanisms as the outcomes of it can feed back into the process of EU policy reformulation as well.¹⁰ Thus, focus must be on the interaction between the national and the EU levels, and how each level feeds into the other, in order to differentiate between processes of European integration itself and Europeanization.

Europeanization has been used to refer to a number of different phenomena in international relations. For instance, the efforts to strengthen the European pillar within NATO or the involvement of European member states in international conflicts have been defined as Europeanization.¹¹ Europeanization as a process of domestic adaptation in the area of foreign policy became more frequently used in the late 80s, as the importance of European Political Cooperation grew and Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) developed.¹² However, there are relatively few studies

⁶ Claudio Radaelli, “The Europeanization of Public Policy”, K. Featherstone, and C. Radaelli (eds.), **The Politics of Europeanization**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 30.

⁷ Bulmer and Radaelli, *The Europeanization*, p. 5.

⁸ Radaelli, *The Europeanization*, p. 33.

⁹ Bastien Irondelle, “Europeanization without the European Union? French Military Reforms 1991-1996”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 10, No 2, April 2003, pp. 208-226.

¹⁰ Tanja A. Börzel, “Pace-Setting, Foot-Dragging and Fence-Sitting, Member State Responses to Europeanization”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 40, No 2, 2001, p. 193.

¹¹ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanization, The Return of Architectural Debate”, **European Security**, Volume 9, No 3, Autumn 2000, p. 1-20; Marius Vahl, “Europeanization of the Transnistrian Conflict”, CEPS Policy Brief, No 73, Centre for European Studies, May 2005.

¹² Kevin Featherstone, “Introduction, In the Name of Europe”, K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.), **The Politics of Europeanization**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 10.

dealing with the Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies, compared with the literature on economic aspects of integration.¹³ This may be due to the weak institutionalisation and strong intergovernmental character of the EU cooperation in these areas, which presupposes a limited impact on domestic foreign policy choices.¹⁴

Underlining the intergovernmental nature of EU foreign, security and defence policy, for instance, Robert Dover argued that the Europeanization of British defence policy defies the definition of the process as top-down, as member states uploaded their preferences to the EU.¹⁵ Nonetheless, in a softer way, British way of doing politics has been influenced by the EU as well, since it has been forced to recognize a European way of working.¹⁶ Reuben Wong's analysis of Europeanization of French foreign policy similarly draws attention to bottom-up or horizontal mechanisms, as he defines Europeanization as a process of change manifested as foreign policy convergence; the amplification of national policies as EU policy and identity reconstruction towards a European identity. However, Wong also identifies a less tangible impact of the EU; an undeniable shift in mentality towards incorporating notions of the collective European good into the Gaullist "France first" foreign policy.¹⁷

Scholars may draw attention to bottom-up mechanisms, however, delimiting the definition of Europeanization to the impact of the EU on the national level also seems to be gaining hold in the literature on foreign, security and defence policies. Examples include Lisbeth Aggestam (1999); José Torreblanca (2001); Ben Tonra (2001); Pernille Rieker (2006) and Reuben Wong (2006).¹⁸ These studies demonstrate that participation in the

¹³ Claudia Major, "Europeanization and Foreign and Security Policy –Undermining or Rescuing the Nation State?" *Politics*, Volume 25, No 3, 2005, p. 182.

¹⁴ Simon Hix and Klaus H. Goetz, "Introduction, European Integration and National Political Systems", *West European Politics*, Volume 23, No 4, 2000, p. 6.

¹⁵ Robert Dover, *Europeanization of British Defence Policy*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2007, p. 1.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹⁷ Reuben Y. Wong, *The Europeanization of French Foreign Policy, France and the EU in East-Asia*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p. 205.

¹⁸ Lisbeth Aggestam, "Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Foreign Policy", *Arena Working Papers*, 99/8, University of Oslo, 1999. Accessed on 20 May 2008.

http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/working-papers1999/papers/wp99_8.htm; José I. Torreblanca, "Ideas, Preferences and Institutions, Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy", *Arena Working Papers*, WP 01/26, University of Oslo, 2001. Accessed on 20 May 2008. www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp01_26.htm; Ben Tonra, *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001; Pernille Rieker, *Europeanization of National Security Identity, The EU and the Changing Security Identities of the Nordic States*, London and New York, Routledge, 2006.

CFSP feeds back into member states' systems and reorients their foreign policy cultures along similar lines. This is a result of the norms within the EU which lead states toward a 'problem-solving' approach, through appeal to common interests and the use of ostracism or peer-pressure to sanction potential defectors.¹⁹ As Michael E. Smith points out as well, major indicators of national adaptation include elite socialization, bureaucratic restructuring, constitutional changes and changes in public perceptions about the desirability of this cooperation.²⁰

There is also the work of Christoph Meyer, who, using a constructivist approach explores the emergence of a strategic culture in the EU. For Meyer, learning from US-led interventions in Kosovo and Iraq has led to a European consensus on maximum restraint against civilian targets and a preference to exhaust non-military means first.²¹ Meyer observes normative convergence in the "de-prioritization of territorial defence, the legitimacy of intervention for humanitarian ends, international authorization by the UN and a growing attachment to the EU as the appropriate framework for defence cooperation."²²

It appears that Europeanization in the realm of foreign, security and defence policies is characterised by distinctively soft mechanisms, involving social and ideational factors. Thus, as Christopher Knill and Dirk Lehmkuhl note, the approach required to explain the process may vary with the specific Europeanization logic underlying the European policy that is being analysed. Europeanization through the rules, regulations and policies that member states have to comply with, mostly in the area of economic aspects of integration, are characterised by positive and negative integration processes. However, as demonstrated by the studies above, there is another process of Europeanization consisting of soft mechanisms, which change the beliefs and expectations of domestic actors and strengthen the overall support for European reforms.²³ Since the decision-making is intergovernmental in

¹⁹ Michael E. Smith, "Conforming to Europe, The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Volume 7, No 4, October 2000, pp. 614- 615.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 617.

²¹ Christoph Meyer, "Convergence Towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms", *European Journal of International Relations*, Volume 11, No 4, p. 544.

²² It must be stated, however, that Meyer does not analyze Europeanization, although he explores elements of a burgeoning strategic culture through a constructivist approach. Ibid, p. 545.

²³ Positive integration refers to a process whereby European policy-making may trigger domestic change by prescribing concrete institutional requirements with which member

foreign, security and defence policies and requires consensus, focusing on softer mechanisms seems more conducive for analysing the impact of EU on the national level in this area. This draws attention to the necessity of using the moderate constructivist approach which allows for the impact of social and ideational factors during interaction within institutions, as will be clarified below.

The focus on the impact of European integration and national adaptation highlights the importance of divergence, incongruence or the misfit between the domestic structures and the European models. Some scholars argued that a misfit between European policies and regulations and domestic practices is necessary for adaptational pressure and domestic change to take place.²⁴ However, others suggested that ‘goodness of fit’ best applies to cases of positive integration, as it assumes a clear, vertical, chain of command. Moreover, there are cases in which one can not talk about fit or misfit.²⁵ Thus, the concept may be mostly useful in the literature dealing with the interaction between the national and the European level, where the supranational elements of the decision-making stimulates decreasing divergence. However, the case of foreign, security and defence policies once again differs in the sense that the system hardly produces tangible benchmarks for the member states to follow. Second, even if adaptational pressures may emerge, as seen in the studies mentioned above, these are of social and ideational nature and it is totally up to the member states to take action in line with these. For instance, during the establishment of military crisis-management capability under ESDP, the contribution of the member states were voluntary and based on their existing areas of expertise.²⁶

states must comply. Negative integration comprises old regulatory policies directed at liberalization and deregulation such as, removing barriers to trade, investment, freedom of establishment, and free circulation of people. Christoph Knill and Dirk Lehmkuhl, “How Europe Matters: Different Mechanisms of Europeanization”, *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)*, Volume 3, No 7, 1999, pp. 1- 10. Accessed on 20 May 2008.

<http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1999-007a.htm>

²⁴ Thomas Risse et al., “Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction”, Maria Green Cowles et al., (eds.), **Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change**, New York, Cornell University Press, 2001, p. 2.

²⁵ Bulmer and Radaelli, *The Europeanization*, p. 8.

²⁶ “At the 1999 European Council in Cologne, EU Heads of State and Government decided that the Union would develop a capability to prevent and respond to conflicts by deploying civilian and military personnel in peace-support operations. At that time, it was also decided that the capability would be based on national resources. These are voluntarily placed at the disposal of the Union when a consensus decision is taken to carry out an operation.” See Government Offices of Sweden, “The EU Battlegroup Concept and the Nordic Battlegroup”, 8 January 2008. Accessed on 2 June 2009.

There is a challenge in the Europeanization literature, the problem of identifying causality.²⁷ The problem arises because neither the EU nor the member states are static, and Europeanization is a matter of reciprocity between moving features. Second, isolation of the impact of the EU, or the attribution of domestic change to the EU is not always easy.²⁸ Changes in government, domestic interest groups, globalisation, systemic change (the end of the Cold War), other international institutions (NATO) and events (the wars in the Balkans and 9/11) may result in changes at the national level.²⁹ In the realm of foreign, security and defence policies, another challenge is how to explore the effects of the EU security identity on nation state security identities or how to assign a direct link between the identity of actors and their political preferences. When the issue at stake is inter-subjective, like identities, norms, shared beliefs, the impact is constitutive and not necessarily causal. These influence action by helping to frame and define social situations and actors.³⁰ Furthermore, this is an impact which is hardly taken into account by rationalist approaches.

However, systematic observation and interpretation may resolve these challenges. First, tracing the process by which norms, ideas and beliefs influence behaviour may help determining the origins of factors behind change. A detailed chronological order or process tracing would help identify these factors and isolate the impact of the EU.³¹ Second, one can analyse the discourses that characterizes the interactions among specified actors, as the development of a new vocabulary through which an identity is articulated is the surest sign of identity change. Another way to determine the existence and constitutive power of a certain social identity is to analyse whether the individual or group behaviour is consistent with their identities.³²

To conclude, studies analysing Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies have increased recently. It is striking that most of these studies use constructivism or sociological institutionalism, which makes it possible to discern the subtle influence of inter-subjective understandings, such as formal and informal rules, shared beliefs and ways of doing things

<http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/9133/a/82276;jsessionid=a1Cr-JF98ROf>

²⁷ Adrienne Héritier and Christoph Knill, "Differential Responses to European Policies, A Comparison", A. Héritier et al., (eds.), **Differential Europe, The European Union Impact on National Policymaking**, Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield, 2001, p. 289.

²⁸ Bulmer and Radaelli, *The Europeanization*, p. 3.

²⁹ Major, *Europeanization*, pp. 183-184.

³⁰ Rieker, *Europeanization*, pp. 18-19.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

developed at the European level. As will be clarified below, constructivist approaches are interested in what is taken for granted in approaches based on rationalism; the content and the source of state interests and identity. Thus, they are better placed to identify the driving forces in the political process or in specifying an alternative set of micro-foundations to that of the rational choice/interest based model, when analysing Europeanization.³³

Moderate Constructivism

The debate around the uses of constructivism and rationalism has been the focus of attention during the 1990s for the International Relations academic community. Lately, the popularity of constructivism has similarly attracted scholars of European Studies.³⁴ However, there is no one social constructivism and it is not easy to define what constructivism is.³⁵ Constructivists are mainly divided between modernists and postmodernists.³⁶ Moreover, moderate constructivists can be distinguished by their differing preferences for ontology over epistemology and methodological preferences as well as degrees of differentiation from rationalist and reflectivist positions. Nonetheless, they claim to theorise the 'middle ground' and are engaged in research questions that seek to identify a communicative bridge between rationalism and reflectivism. Furthermore, the interest in the influence and role of soft institutions, such as ideas, norms and rules, and/or socio-cultural factors, such as identity, discourse, and language is shared among constructivists.³⁷

³³ Helene Sjurson, "Understanding The Common Foreign and Security Policy: Analytical Building Blocks", Michèle Knodt and Sebastiaan Princen (eds.), **Understanding European Union's External Relations**, London and New York, Routledge, 2003, p. 43.

³⁴ See the special issue of **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999.

³⁵ Steve Smith, "Social Constructivisms and European Studies: A Reflectivist Critique", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, p. 690. On the problem of defining what constructivism is see Maja Zehfuss, **Constructivism in International Relations, The Politics of Reality**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 1-10.

³⁶ Christian Reus-Smit, "Constructivism", Scott Burchill et al. (eds.), **Theories of International Relations**, 2nd Edition, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001, p. 216. There are constructivists who use discourse theory, like the postmodernists. However, moderate constructivists generally share the assumption of a reality that is inter-subjectively accessible, which is not acceptable from the perspective of postmodernism or poststructuralism. Zehfuss, *Constructivism*, pp. 261-262.

³⁷ Antje Wiener, "Constructivism and Sociological Institutionalism", Michelle Cini and Angela K. Bourne (eds.), **European Union Studies**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 41-43. There are epistemological disagreements between modernist constructivists. Some follow scientific realism and analyse causal and/or constitutive explanations of social phenomena, like Wendt (1999). Others establish causality by a

Constructivists believe that the identities, interests and behaviour of political agents are socially constructed by collective meanings, interpretations and assumptions about the world.³⁸ Thus, constructivists point out that the environment, in which agents take action, is social as well as material. Moreover, material structures or resources are given meaning only by the social context through which they are interpreted.³⁹ A good example of this is the fact that although both Canada and Cuba are medium powers, the simple balance of military power cannot explain that the former is a close American ally, whereas the latter is an enemy.⁴⁰

Furthermore, constructivists emphasise a process of interaction between agents and structures or, in other words, mutual constitution, where neither unit of analysis is reduced to the other. Thus, agent interests emerge from, and are endogenous to, interaction with institutional structures.⁴¹ A change in definition of interests depends on a change in the definition of identities.⁴² Constructivists argue that understanding how actors develop their interests is crucial to explaining a wide range of international phenomena. However, neorealists and neoliberals, based on rationalism, believe that actors' interests are exogenously determined. In other words, rationalism argues that actors encounter one another with a pre-existing set of preferences.⁴³ Since constructivists argue that human agents do not exist independently from their social environment, they differ from rationalist approaches which are based on methodological individualism. Whereas rationalists take the individual human action as the elementary unit of social life, constructivists insist on the mutual constitutiveness of (social) structures and agents.⁴⁴ The focus on

process of successive interrogative reasoning between explanans and explanandum, such as Ruggie 1998. Some embrace a particularising positivist strategy like Katzenstein (1996), while others, like Checkel (2000) agree with positivism's generalizing or covering-law strategy. However, several things unite many constructivists in a way that collides with positivism. Constructivists agree that explaining causal processes requires the interpretive practice of uncovering inter-subjective meanings and generally engage in descriptive inferences using traditional quantitative and qualitative methods and causal or constitutive inferences using historical narratives. Emanuel Adler, "Constructivism and International Relations", Walter Carlsnaes et al. (eds.), **Handbook of International Relations**, London, Sage, 2003, p. 101.

³⁸ Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground, Constructivism in World Affairs", **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 3, No 3, 1997, p. 324.

³⁹ Joseph Jupille et al., "Integrating Institutions, Rationalism, Constructivism, and the Study of the European Union", **Comparative Political Studies**, Volume 36, No 7, 2003, p. 14.

⁴⁰ Reus-Smit, *Constructivism*, p. 217.

⁴¹ Jupille et al., *Integrating*, p. 14.

⁴² Adler, *Seizing*, p. 337.

⁴³ Reus-Smit, *Constructivism*, 217.

⁴⁴ Thomas Risse, "Social Constructivism and European Integration", Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), **European Integration Theory**, Oxford, Oxford University, 2004, pp. 160-161.

the impact of norms, identities and institutions, as well as collective identity formation, makes constructivism advantageous in terms of explaining change. The main contribution of constructivism to the discipline of international relations and/or European studies comes from the fact that through its focus on ideational and social factors, it has provided the means to explain phenomena that the rationalist approach cannot, such as the end of the Cold War, analysis of Europeanization and the EU enlargement.⁴⁵

Constructivists focus on the role of routinized practices and the unintended and intended consequences of institution-building by analysing the impact of socialization, social learning, communication exchanges, argumentation and persuasion. Socialization is the process by which actors internalise the norms, which then influence their identities and interests. Norms have 'constitutive' effects in this sense.⁴⁶ The norm-governed behaviour is explained by the term "logic of appropriateness", which means that actors would take actions that are appropriate given their particular role or identity. Agents would find the answers to questions such as "What kind of situation is this? What should I do now?" with the help of norms. Hence, norms constitute states/agents, because they provide the agents with the understandings of their interests.⁴⁷ Emphasis on norm-guided behaviour and constitutive rules does not mean that actors never violate norms. Even if a norm is violated, we can infer from the communicative practices of actors whether they consider the norm as legitimate or not. This highlights the importance of communicative and discursive practices in constructive approaches.⁴⁸ Based on these concepts and assumptions, constructivists believe that there are possibilities for institutions to have transformative effects on basic actor properties.

The rationalist approach, on the other hand, starts from the assumption that agents are instrumentally rational, motivated by the logic of consequentiality. This suggests that actors decide on the best course of

⁴⁵ Rey Koslowski and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Understanding Change in International Politics, The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System", **International Organization**, Volume 48, No 2, Spring 1992, pp. 215-247; Karin M. Fierke and Antje Wiener, "Constructing Institutional Interests, EU and NATO Enlargement", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, pp. 721-742.

⁴⁶ Thomas Risse and Antje Wiener, "'Something Rotten' and the Social Construction of Social Constructivism: A Comment on Comments", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, p. 778.

⁴⁷ Jeffrey T. Checkel, "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory: Review Working paper", **World Politics**, Volume 50, No 2, 1998, p. 326; James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders", **International Organization**, Volume 52, No 4, Autumn 1998, pp. 951-952.

⁴⁸ Risse, Social, p. 164.

action on the basis of means-ends calculations. In other words, actors are utility maximizers and they behave strategically to attain their objectives.⁴⁹ According to this consequentialist perspective, bargaining, negotiation, coalition formation and exchange are the defining characteristics of politics.⁵⁰ Even norm compliance is seen as a result of crafted, calculative reasoning and expected future benefits.⁵¹ State interests are given a priori and exogenously; the content of these interests, typically are material goods, such as, power and wealth. Norms and social structures at most would have constraining effects on the choices and behaviour of self-interested agents.⁵² In other words, institutional environments do not lead to learning or cause endogenous preference change. Rationalists argue that any loyalty toward the institutions or the rules is a function of the benefits that these provide for the actors.⁵³ To give brief examples, the liberal intergovernmentalist approach assumes that actors' preferences remain fixed during the processes of interaction and bargaining.⁵⁴ Similarly, neorealism rejects the notion of institutional impact on national interests and behaviour, while neoliberal institutionalism focuses on the benefits of cooperation in institutions by reducing mutual suspicions and increasing predictability.⁵⁵ Thus none of these adequately addresses the problem of institutional impact on national interests. In other words, rationalist approaches may be particularly helpful in explaining states' decisions to establish and maintain international institutions in the first place, but they cannot go beyond the institution's regulatory effects on state behaviour.⁵⁶

There are two major criticisms against moderate constructivist approach. Constructivists tend to combine a positivist position on

⁴⁹ Jupille et al., *Integrating*, p. 12.

⁵⁰ March and Olsen, *The Institutional*, p. 950.

⁵¹ Jeffrey Lewis, "Institutional Environments and Everyday EU Decision Making, Rationalist or Constructivist?" *Comparative Political Studies*, Volume 36, No ½, February/March 2003, pp. 102, 101.

⁵² Checkel, *The Constructivist*, p. 327.

⁵³ Lewis, *Institutional*, 105.

⁵⁴ Thomas Risse-Kappen, "Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 34, No 1, March 1996, p. 56.

⁵⁵ Jakob C. Øhrgaard, "International Relations or European Integration: Is the CFSP *Sui Generis*?" Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004, p. 35.

⁵⁶ Wolfgang Wagner, "Why the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy Will Remain Intergovernmental: A Rationalist Institutional Choice Analysis of European Crisis Management Policy", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Volume 10, No 4, August 2003, pp 577, 590.

epistemology with an inter-subjective ontology.⁵⁷ They share an epistemological commitment to truth-seeking and a belief that causal generalization in the form of middle range theories is possible with rationalists.⁵⁸ From a reflectivist perspective, moderate constructivism holds an untenable position by trying to combine ‘understanding’ and ‘explaining’ accounts. Thus, the middle ground appears as an attempt to find a way of dealing with interpretive accounts in a way that preserves causal analysis, in other words it treats reasons as causes.⁵⁹

In a way that responds to this criticism, Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit argue that constructivism is valuable in examining “the ways that interpretive ‘how’ questions of possibility relate to more conventional ‘why’ questions of causal explanation.” For instance, Richard Price (1997) attempts to answer “how is it that among the countless cruel technological innovations in weaponry of humankind, chemical weapons stand out as a weapon that has come to be stigmatized as morally illegitimate”. However, the answer to this question also contributes to a convincing explanation about why chemical weapons were not used in World War II or the Gulf War, in a way that is directly at odds with materialist accounts.⁶⁰ Thus, the middle ground that constructivists claim may be subject to constant (de-)construction by both perspectives, but because of either shared ontology or epistemology, they can engage in conversation with both rationalism and reflectivism.⁶¹ Moreover, this narrow definition of social construction “may simply mean that constructivism may well turn out to be the most powerful (if limited) ‘alternative’ to rationalism”.⁶²

Another criticism against moderate or modernist constructivism is the inconsistency between invoking logic of appropriateness as the theory of action and the claim that structures and agencies are mutually constitutive (structuration). According to Ole Jacob Sending, logic of appropriateness assumes that the very recognition of the norm is sufficient to explain action.

⁵⁷ Thomas Christiansen et al., “The Social Construction of Europe”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, p. 534.

⁵⁸ Risse and Wiener, ‘Something Rotten’, p. 776.

⁵⁹ Steve Smith, “International Theory, European Integration”, Morgen Kelstrup and Michael C. Williams (eds.), **International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community**, London and New York, Routledge, 2000, p. 39.

⁶⁰ Price (1997) cited in Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism”, **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 4, No 3, 1998, p. 277.

⁶¹ Risse and Wiener, ‘Something Rotten’, p. 776.

⁶² Smith, International, pp. 49-50.

This is why the logic of appropriateness is heavily structuralist or holist, leaving no room for actors' reflection and violation of the norm. The assumption of internalisation and constitutiveness of the norm excludes the possibility of actors acting in non-conforming ways.⁶³ Since the structuration theory stipulates that the actor is always in a position to reflect upon and choose among the rules and actions, the constructivist approach that appeals to both the logic of appropriateness and structuration theory is inconsistent. This means that the logic of appropriateness cannot account for the process by which certain actors advocate, disseminate and in some way get others to accept and internalize new norms.⁶⁴

In response to this criticism, constructivists may have to acknowledge existence of theories of action other than logic of appropriateness. A solution could come through reconciliation of rationalism and constructivism and achieving a theory synthesis.⁶⁵ Or constructivism and rationalism can be used sequentially.⁶⁶ Third, egoistic instrumental rationality and social rationality could be seen as two points along a continuum. Densely institutionalized social settings may change the nature of rational decision-making and lead to social rationality, which is defined in terms of conformity to the social norms of the group rather than satisfying egoistic instrumental utility.⁶⁷

As presented above, moderate constructivism is distinguished from reflectivists by their positivist position on epistemology and from rationalists by their acceptance of the constitutive role of social and ideational factors, and an inter-subjective ontology. Holding a middle ground between these perspectives, constructivists attempt to deal with interpretive accounts in a way that preserves causal analysis, thus they share a commitment to truth-seeking and a belief in causal generalization with the rationalists. However, their problematization of interest formation and emphasis on the role of social and ideational factors in definition of interests distinguish them from rationalists and provide this approach with the tools to analyse the impact of interaction, hence Europeanization. Rationalist assumptions deny a

⁶³ Ole Jacob Sending, "Constitution, Choice and Change, Problems with the 'Logic of Appropriateness' and its Use in Constructivist Theory", *European Journal of International Relations*, Volume 8, No 4, 2002, pp. 453-454.

⁶⁴ Ibid, pp. 458, 459.

⁶⁵ James Fearon and Alexander Wendt, "Rationalism V. Constructivism", Walter Carlsnaes et al. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, London, Sage, 2003, pp. 52-72.

⁶⁶ Jupille et al., *Integrating*, pp. 22-23.

⁶⁷ Michael E. Smith, "Institutionalization, Policy Adaptation and European Foreign Policy Cooperation", *European Journal of International Relations*, Volume 10, No 1, 2004, pp. 99-100.

transformative role to the social and ideational factors which emerge and get reinforced during interaction within institutions, which will be demonstrated by examples below.

Application of Theoretical Approaches in the Literature on European Foreign, Security and Defence Policy

The aim of this section is to demonstrate that the assumptions of theoretical approaches based on rationalism do not facilitate analysis of how the inter-subjective understandings, norms, or shared beliefs developed within the EU influence and shape national interests and identities. These approaches, which include (neo)realism, (neo)liberalism, liberal intergovernmentalism, and rational-choice institutionalism, generally fail to take the impact of the interaction into account due to their assumptions.

Throughout the history of international relations as a discipline, the central debate was between Realism and Liberalism. Realism highlights the intergovernmental nature of European foreign, security and defence policy cooperation and stresses that the ultimate decision-making power belongs to the sovereign nation state. Thus, states pursue their national self-interest through a rational calculation of costs and benefits with the aim to maximise state power. The general realist response to European integration was to see it as a means for some European nation-states to compensate for their loss of position and as a balance of power mechanism to contain Germany.⁶⁸ For instance, inspired by realism, Alan Milward argued that European integration has rescued the nation state by providing a framework for nation states to pursue their interests.⁶⁹ However, whether the state indeed needed 'rescuing' by the time supranational arrangements were adopted within the European Community is doubtful. 1950s was a period when the achievements of reconstruction and social welfare reform had probably endowed the nation state with the highest adherence level among its population.⁷⁰

Under the rubric of liberalism, neofunctionalists argued that as a result of ongoing political integration, European elites and decision-makers will shift their loyalties toward a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the nation states. Original neofunctionalist theory

⁶⁸ Tonra, *The Europeanization*, pp. 20, 24.

⁶⁹ Alan S. Milward, **The European Rescue of the Nation State**, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1992.

⁷⁰ Richard T. Griffiths, "The Creation of European Supranational Institutions", Knud E. Jørgensen (ed.), **Reflective Approaches to European Governance**, London, Macmillan, 1997, p. 100.

assumed that European integration is driven by the instrumental self-interests of actors. However, it offered no theory to explain the transition from self-interest to integration, namely, the spill-over effect. Moreover, neofunctionalism kept the distinction between “low” and “high” politics (as in intergovernmentalism or realism), to argue that it is easier to integrate economic policies than foreign policies.⁷¹ However, this distinction hardly helps anymore, since the EU has recently affected too many areas of high politics, by the introduction of Qualified Majority Voting to some areas of Justice and Home Affairs and the establishment of European Monetary Union (EMU).⁷²

Finally, while realists could not explain the fact that the EU was both something more than the nation state and something less than a super-state, liberals could not come to terms with the resilience of the nation state and the co-existence of supranational and intergovernmental dimensions within the EU.⁷³ Since the 1980s, the debate between realism and liberalism has turned into a debate within rationalism, in which neorealists and neoliberals agreed that states are the main actors and utility-maximizers, and that anarchy is the main force shaping their behaviour. Their differences revolve around whether international institutions can mitigate anarchy or whether states pursue relative or absolute gains.⁷⁴

During the post-Cold War era, neorealists, for instance, John Mearsheimer argued that the end of the bipolar international system decreased the possibilities of further European cooperation. Since cooperation between states is limited by the relative gains problem, which posits that they will always be concerned about the benefits others would gain as a result of cooperation.⁷⁵ However, the development of EMU and further EU cooperation in other issue areas in the early 1990s defied this argument. In an attempt to answer why a balance of power system did not emerge in Europe after the Cold War, Joseph Grieco aimed at revising neorealism to accommodate the importance of institutions so that it can account for the European integration process. For Grieco, the EU provides the states, including the weaker ones, with a chance to express their views

⁷¹ Risse-Kappen, *Exploring*, p. 56.

⁷² Thomas Risse, “Neofunctionalism, European Identity, and the Puzzles of European Integration”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Volume 12, No 2, April 2005, pp. 301-302.

⁷³ Tonra, *The Europeanization*, p. 26.

⁷⁴ John G. Ruggie, **Constructing the World Polity, Essays on International Institutionalisation**, London and New York, Routledge, 1998, pp. 9-10.

⁷⁵ John Mearsheimer, “Back to the Future, Instability in Europe after the Cold War”, *International Security*, Volume 15, No 4, 1990, pp. 5-56.

(voice-opportunities thesis), to encourage compliance of stronger partners and to address any unequal distribution of gains which may arise during the cooperation.⁷⁶ However, this approach neglects the impact of European integration on the nation state since it does not allow for the emergence of common interests or norms, which might change definitions of state interests. In Grieco's conceptualization, in line with the rationalist tradition, state interests exist before cooperation and independent of it.⁷⁷

A more sophisticated analysis with a focus on the emergence and dynamics of ESDP through neo-realism has been developed by Adrian Hyde-Price. For Hyde-Price, ESDP is a result of the characteristics of the international system; global unipolarity and regional multipolarity. However, Hyde-Price makes major amendments to neorealism by including strategic learning, grand strategy, role conceptions, milieu-shaping and second-order normative concerns and a definition of power in terms of a number of attributes rather than just military capabilities.⁷⁸ In this approach, the EU and ESDP are instruments for collective milieu-shaping or provision of soft governance and constitute the institutional repository of the second-order normative and ethical concerns of its member states, such as the support for human rights.⁷⁹ Thus, Hyde-Price incorporates social and ideational factors even if these are categorised as second-order concerns, reflecting the old "high and low politics" distinction. However, how this version of neorealism helps understand the peculiar nature of the ESDP, particularly its impact on the EU member states' security cultures is unclear. Since the impact of interaction on the national foreign, security and defence policies within the EU is left out of the picture. Nonetheless, this approach could be celebrated for combining ideational factors and material power as explanatory factors.

Another approach is Andrew Moravcsik's liberal intergovernmentalism, which combines a liberal theory of how economic interests influence national interests and an intergovernmentalist theory of international negotiation to analyse European integration. While Moravcsik accepted the rationality assumption of neorealism, he tried to open the black-box of state interests by assuming that these emerge through domestic political conflict

⁷⁶ Joseph M. Grieco, "State Interests and Institutional Rule Trajectories: A Neorealist Reinterpretation of the Maastricht Treaty and European Economic and Monetary Union", Benjamin Frankel (ed.), **Realism, Restatements and Renewal**, London, Frank Cass, 1996, pp. 304, 288.

⁷⁷ Markus Jachtenfuss, "Conceptualizing European Governance", Knud E. Jørgensen (ed.), **Reflective Approaches to European Governance**, London, Macmillan, 1997, pp. 40-41.

⁷⁸ Adrian Hyde-Price, **European Security in the Twenty-First Century, The Challenge of Multipolarity**, London and New York, Routledge, 2007, p. 169.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113, 110.

between different domestic social groups.⁸⁰ However, this approach underestimates the impact of interaction within the EU because it assumes that interests are formed outside the interaction within European integration and that this interaction only affects behaviour.⁸¹ Therefore, liberal intergovernmentalism shares the failure to take into account the role of social and ideational factors, which influence and change interests and even identities of states as a result of interaction within institutions with other approaches based on rationalism.

Neo-institutionalism(s) developed in the 1980s and early 90s, and focused on the role of institutions and how they matter in the study of politics.⁸² Variants of neo-institutionalism differ in terms of their conceptions the roles of institutions, as well as theories of social action. While rational-choice institutionalism and sociological institutionalism offer two different views, historical institutionalism adopts an eclectic approach.⁸³ Rational-choice institutionalism assumes that actors have fixed preferences and behave instrumentally to achieve or maximize their preferences. Actors cannot pursue a collectively-superior course of action due to the lack of institutional arrangements that would guarantee other actors' complementary behaviour. Thus, the role of institutions is functional in this approach, as institutions reduce uncertainty about the other's behaviour and offer better gains.⁸⁴ In contrast with this, sociological institutionalism emphasises that interests and identities are endogenous to the processes of interaction within institutions. Thus, sociological institutionalism has clear affinities with the constructivist approach. Some scholars use both terms interchangeably,⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Andrew Moravcsik, "Preferences and Power in the European Community", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 31, No 4, December 1993, pp. 474, 481.

⁸¹ Alexander Wendt, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State", *American Political Science Review*, Volume 88, No 2, June 1994, p. 384.

⁸² Mark A. Pollack, "International Relations Theory and European Integration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 39, No 2, June 2001, p. 227.

⁸³ Historical institutionalism emphasises the effects of institutions on politics over time and rejects a functionalist explanation for institutional design. Historical institutionalists tend to see social causation as 'path dependent' and focus on the logic of unintended consequences. However, they have to pay more attention to specify the precise causal chain through which the institutions are affecting the behaviour they are meant to explain. The vagueness in the formulation of causality often leads scholars to use historical institutionalism in combination with other approaches. Mark Pollack, "The New Institutionalisms and European Integration", Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 139; Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, London, Macmillan, 2000, pp. 117, 118; Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms", *Political Studies*, Volume 44, No 5, 1996, pp. 941, 950.

⁸⁴ Hall and Taylor, *Political*, pp. 944-945.

⁸⁵ Pollack, *The New*, p. 153.

while others consider sociological institutionalism as one among the many constructivist approaches.⁸⁶ Sociological institutionalists argue that institutions perform a symbolic guidance function as they contribute to actors' sense of who they are and what their interests must be.⁸⁷ Organizations or actors adopt those institutional arrangements which confer them legitimacy or social appropriateness.⁸⁸

The problem with rational-choice institutionalism is similar to other approaches presented above. By operating on a restrictive set of assumptions about the nature of actors and institutions, this approach neglects the constitutive and transformative effects of the institutions on the preferences and identities of the actors.⁸⁹ By its emphasis on functionality, rational-choice institutionalism may explain why some institutions persist, since the persistence of an institution depends on the benefits it provides. However, when it comes to the origins of and change in institutions, rational-choice institutionalism fails to provide a full explanation.⁹⁰

This brings us to the way the constructivist approach has been utilized in the analyses of European foreign, security and defence policies. As pointed out above, constructivism seeks to account for what approaches based on rationalism assume: identities, and interests. To repeat, it attributes constitutive and transformative roles to social and ideational factors, such as culture, norms, and ideas. Moreover, the constructivist approach has been mostly used in analysing Europeanization of these policies, mainly, the domestic impact of the EU level of foreign, security and defence policy-making. For instance, Ben Tonra, in his analysis of the Europeanization of Dutch, Danish and Irish foreign policies, concludes that the nature of domestic and international politics goes beyond simple, rationalistic calculations of cost and benefit. Member states do not look at European Foreign and Security Policy (EFSP) and count the occasions on which they have 'won' or 'lost' collective foreign policy arguments. Perceptions of the process partly revolve around how member states see themselves in Europe and in the world. Moreover, the formulation and output of national foreign policies has changed as a direct result of participation in this process. The foreign policies of these smaller member states are both constrained and empowered by their participation in EFSP.⁹¹ Pernille Rieker, on the other

⁸⁶ Sjursen, *Understanding*, p. 43.

⁸⁷ Rosamond, *Theories*, p. 119.

⁸⁸ Hall and Taylor, *Political*, p. 948.

⁸⁹ Pollack, *The New*, p. 155.

⁹⁰ Hall and Taylor, *Political*, pp. 952-953.

⁹¹ Tonra, *The Europeanization*.

hand, analyses the impact of the EU's security dimension on the security identities of the Nordic countries. Even though only Sweden has gone through an identity change, the others (Finland, Denmark and Norway [a non-EU member]) seem to be moving in the same direction as Sweden. Thus, the level of Europeanization varies according to the degree of participation in the EU and different security policy traditions and historical experiences may reduce or strengthen the impact of the EU.⁹² Finally, Lisbeth Aggestam argues that Europeanization of foreign policy has taken place, even among the larger states. The instinctive consultation and cooperation and the attempts to arrive at a common approach within the EU, which are emphasised by senior British policy-makers, attest to a change in the actors' perceptions and beliefs. Hence, the change is more than a mere adaptation to the institutional environment. This is a learning process and it is the intensity of integration in this area that leads to it. Central features of the CFSP are: transparency, consultation and compromise.⁹³

These studies also suggest that a norm of consultation and an expectation that individual interests must be curbed and occasionally give way to common positions have developed within the CFSP framework. This seems to confirm that CFSP has a transformatory capacity *vis-à-vis* national foreign policies. Furthermore, constructivism appears as the approach which can provide an account of why member states seem to take increasingly into account the common interest and not only the national interest when formulating policies and explain the mechanisms of change.⁹⁴ Thus, the constructivist focus on social and ideational factors seems to have proven useful in analysing the Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies of EU member states, drawing attention to the difference the EU made. However, as can be seen, constructivist studies tend to underestimate the importance of the distribution of capabilities and rationalist studies, that of ideational and social factors. Rationalist approaches, on the other hand, which attempt to incorporate the ideational and social factors, tend to limit their role to causal and regulative, denying these a transformative role. Constructivists, however, draw more attention to the constitutive role of ideational and social phenomena and acknowledge their role in change as a result of interaction within institutions. Thus, the constructivist approach,

⁹² Rieker, Europeanization.

⁹³ Aggestam, Role.

⁹⁴ Helene Sjursen, "Understanding the Common Foreign and Security Policy: Analytical Building Blocks" Arena Working Papers, 9/03, University of Oslo, 2003, p. 7-8. Accessed on 7 September 2008.

http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/working-papers2003/papers/wp03_9.pdf

with its emphasis on ideational and social factors and mechanisms such as socialization and social learning appears to be better placed to address the Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies and reveal the influence of both the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) on the member states' identities and interests as an impact of interaction within this institution.

Conclusion

In this article, attention has been drawn to a comprehensive definition of Europeanization, as processes of a) construction b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ways of doing things and shared beliefs and norms.⁹⁵ It has become apparent that the literature on the Europeanization tend to characterise the process as bottom-up, top-down and horizontal.

Subsequently, a detailed analysis of the assumptions of moderate constructivism and the criticisms levelled against it has been presented. It has been shown that moderate constructivism is differentiated from rationalist approaches by its acceptance of the constitutive role of social and ideational factors in addition to their causal role and from post-structural or reflectivist approaches by its acceptance of possibility of truth-seeking.

In addition, the literature on applications of theoretical approaches to European integration and Europeanization in foreign, security and defence policies has been reviewed. As has been demonstrated, studies focusing on the Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies tend to utilize the constructivist approach. As was mentioned before, this appears to be due to the fact that CFSP and CSDP of the EU are based on intergovernmentalism. Therefore, member states will hardly be forced to adopt European regulations, directives or policies, as is the case in the economic aspects of integration. However, the literature points toward an influence of both CFSP and CSDP on the member states' identities and interests and changes in these as a result of the interaction within the EU, even if the process does not play out in a clear-cut cause and effect fashion. Therefore, in comparison with a rationalist approach, the constructivist approach, with its emphasis on the constitutive role of ideational and social factors and mechanisms such as socialization and social learning appears to be better placed to address the Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies.

⁹⁵ Radaelli, *The Europeanization*, p. 30.

To conclude, this article has argued that a moderate (modernist) constructivist approach is necessary to analyse Europeanization of foreign, security and defence policies of EU member states. This is firstly because constructivist assumption on the interest and preference formation, which attributes a constitutive and transformative role to social and ideational factors, facilitates analysis of change. This, in turn, enables bringing the often underestimated impact of interaction in different social contexts, but mostly in institutions, into light. Second, the intergovernmental and consensual nature of the foreign, security and defence policy-making in the EU does not allow for the emergence of adaptation to the rules, regulations and directives as tangible as in the case of activities concerning the economic aspects of integration, which is suffused by supranationalism. Change or adaptation at the national level in the area of foreign, security and defence policies so far has mostly taken the form of mentality change, or revealed itself in the security identities (cultures) of EU member states, which can only be captured by the help of constructivist assumptions on the role and impact of social and ideational factors.

References

- Adler, Emanuel "Seizing the Middle Ground, Constructivism in World Affairs", **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 3, No 3, 1997, pp. 319-363.
- Adler, Emanuel "Constructivism and International Relations", Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, Beth A. Simmons (eds.), **Handbook of International Relations**, London, Sage, 2003, pp. 95-118.
- Aggestam, Lisbeth "Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Foreign Policy", **Arena Working Papers**, 99/8, University of Oslo, 1999. Accessed on 20 May 2008. http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/working-papers1999/papers/wp99_8.htm
- Bache, Ian "Europeanization, A Governance Approach", European Union Studies Association (EUSA) 8th Biennial Conference, Nashville, USA, 27-29 March 2003. Accessed on 20 May 2008. <http://aei.pitt.edu/554/>
- Börzel, Tanja A. "Pace-Setting, Foot-Dragging and Fence-Sitting, Member State Responses to Europeanization", **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 40, No 2, 2001, pp. 193-214.
- Bulmer, Simon and Claudio Radaelli, "The Europeanization of National Policy?" **Queen's Papers on Europeanization 1**, Queen's University Belfast, 2004. Accessed on 20 May 2008. <http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudiesandPhilosophy/FileStore/EuropeanizationFiles/Filetoupload,38405,en.pdf>

- Checkel, Jeffrey T. "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory: Review Working paper", **World Politics**, Volume 50, No 2, 1998, pp. 324-348.
- Checkel, Jeffrey "Social Learning and European Identity Change", **International Organization**, Volume 55, No 3, 2000, pp. 553-588.
- Christiansen, Thomas Knud Erik Jørgensen and Antje Wiener, "The Social Construction of Europe", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, pp. 528-544.
- Croft, Stuart "The EU, NATO and Europeanization: The Return of Architectural Debate", **European Security**, Volume 9, No 3, Autumn 2000, pp. 1-20.
- Dover, Robert **Europeanization of British Defence Policy**, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2007.
- Fearon, James and Alexander Wendt, "Rationalism V. Constructivism", Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, Beth A. Simmons (eds.), **Handbook of International Relations**, London, Sage, 2003, pp. 52-72.
- Featherstone, Kevin "Introduction, In the Name of Europe", K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.), **The Politics of Europeanization**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 3-26.
- Fierke, Karin M. and Antje Wiener, "Constructing Institutional Interests, EU and NATO Enlargement", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, pp. 721-742.
- Government Offices of Sweden, "The EU Battlegroup Concept and the Nordic Battlegroup", 8 January 2008. Accessed on 2 June 2009. <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/9133/a/82276;jsessionid=a1Cr-JF98ROf>
- Grieco, Joseph M. "State Interests and Institutional Rule Trajectories, A Neorealist Reinterpretation of the Maastricht Treaty and European Economic and Monetary Union", B Frankel (ed.), **Realism, Restatements and Renewal**, London, Frank Cass, 1996, pp. 261-305.
- Griffiths, Richard T. "The Creation of European Supranational Institutions", Knud E. Jørgensen (ed.), **Reflective Approaches to European Governance**, London, Macmillan, 1997, pp. 87-106.
- Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms", **Political Studies**, Volume 44, No 5, 1996, pp. 936-957.
- Héritier, Adrienne and Christoph Knill, "Differential Responses to European Policies, A Comparison", A. Héritier, D. Kerwer, C. Knill, D. Lehmkuhl, M. Teutsch and A-C. Douillet (eds.), **Differential Europe, The European Union Impact on National Policymaking**, Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield, 2001, pp. 257-294.

- Hix, Simon and Klaus H. Goetz, "Introduction, European Integration and National Political Systems", **West European Politics**, Volume 23, No 4, 2000, pp. 1-26.
- Hyde-Price, Adrian **European Security in the Twenty-First Century, The Challenge of Multipolarity**, London and New York, Routledge, 2007.
- Irondelle, Bastien "Europeanization without the European Union? French Military Reforms 1991-1996", **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 10, No 2, April 2003, pp. 208-226.
- Jachtenfuss, Markus "Conceptualizing European Governance", K. E. Jørgensen (ed.), **Reflective Approaches to European Governance**, London, Macmillan, 1997, pp. 39-50.
- Jupille, Joseph James A. Caporaso and Jeffrey T. Checkel, "Integrating Institutions, Rationalism, Constructivism, and the Study of the European Union", **Comparative Political Studies**, Volume 36, No 7, 2003, pp. 7-40.
- Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), **The Culture of National Security, Norms and Identity in World Politics**, New York, Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Katzenstein, Peter "Introduction", Peter Katzenstein (ed.), **The Culture of National Security, Norms and Identity in World Politics**, New York, Columbia University Press, 1996, pp. 1-32.
- Knill, Christoph and Dirk Lehmkuhl, "How Europe Matters, Different Mechanisms of Europeanization", **European Integration Online Papers (EIOP)**, Volume 3, No 7, 1999. Accessed on 20 May 2008. <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1999-007a.htm>
- Koslowski, Rey and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Understanding Change in International Politics, The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System", **International Organization**, Volume 48, No 2, Spring 1992, pp. 215-247.
- Lewis, Jeffrey "Institutional Environments and Everyday EU Decision Making, Rationalist or Constructivist?" **Comparative Political Studies**, Volume 36, No 1/2, February/March 2003, pp. 97-124.
- Major, Claudia "Europeanization and Foreign and Security Policy –Undermining or Rescuing the Nation State?" **Politics**, Volume 25, No 3, 2005, pp. 175-190.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen, "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders", **International Organization**, Volume 52, No 4, Autumn 1998, pp. 943-969.
- Mearsheimer, John "Back to the Future, Instability in Europe after the Cold War", **International Security**, Volume 15, No 4, 1990, pp. 5-56.

- Meyer, Christoph “Convergence towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms”, **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 11, No 4, pp. 523–549.
- Milward, Alan S. **The European Rescue of the Nation State**, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1992.
- Moravcsik, Andrew “Preferences and Power in the European Community”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 31, No 4, December 1993, pp. 473-524.
- Olsen, Johan P. “The Many Faces of Europe”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 40, No 5, 2002, pp. 921-952.
- Øhrgaard, Jakob C. “International Relations or European Integration: Is the CFSP *Sui Generis*?” Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), **Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy**, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004, pp. 27-44.
- Pollack, Mark A. “International Relations Theory and European Integration”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 39, No 2, June 2001, pp. 221-244.
- Pollack, Mark A. “The New Institutionalisms and European Integration”, Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), **European Integration Theory**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 137-156.
- Price, Richard **The Chemical Weapons Taboo**, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Price, Richard and Christian Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism”, **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 4, No 3, 1998, pp. 259-294.
- Radaelli, Claudio “The Europeanization of Public Policy”, K. Featherstone, and C. Radaelli (eds.), **The Politics of Europeanization**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 27-56.
- Reus-Smit, Christian “Constructivism”, Scott Burchill, Richard Devetak, Andrew Linklater, Mathew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit, Jacqui True (eds.), **Theories of International Relations**, 2nd Edition, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001, pp. 209-230.
- Rieker, Pernille **Europeanization of National Security Identity, The EU and the Changing Security Identities of the Nordic States**, London and New York, Routledge, 2006.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas “Exploring the Nature of the Beast, International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Volume 34, No 1, March 1996, pp. 53-80.

- Risse Thomas and Antje Wiener, “‘Something Rotten’ and the Social Construction of Social Constructivism: A Comment on Comments”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, pp. 775-782.
- Risse, Thomas et.al., “Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction”, Maria Green Cowles et.al., (eds.), **Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change**, New York, Cornell University Press, 2001, pp. 1-20.
- Risse, Thomas “Social Constructivism and European Integration”, Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), **European Integration Theory**, Oxford, Oxford University, 2004, pp. 159-176.
- Risse, Thomas “Neofunctionalism, European Identity, and the Puzzles of European Integration”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 12, No 2, April 2005, pp. 291-309.
- Rosamond, Ben **Theories of European Integration**, London, Macmillan, 2000.
- Ruggie, John G. **Constructing the World Polity, Essays on International Institutionalisation**, London and New York, Routledge, 1998.
- Sending, Ole Jacob “Constitution, Choice and Change, Problems with the ‘Logic of Appropriateness’ and its Use in Constructivist Theory”, **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 8, No 4, 2002, pp.443-470.
- Sjursen, Helene “Understanding the Common Foreign and Security Policy: Analytical Building Blocks”, **Arena Working Papers**, 9/03, University of Oslo, 2003. Accessed on 7 September 2008. http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/working-papers2003/papers/wp03_9.pdf
- Sjursen, Helene “Understanding the Common Foreign and Security Policy: Analytical Building Blocks”, Michèle Knodt and Sebastiaan Princen (eds.), **Understanding European Union’s External Relations**, London and New York, Routledge, 2003, pp. 35-53.
- Smith, Michael E. “Conforming to Europe, The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 7, No 4, October 2000, pp. 613-631.
- Smith, Michael E. “Institutionalization, Policy Adaptation and European Foreign Policy Cooperation”, **European Journal of International Relations**, Volume 10, No 1, 2004, pp. 95-136.
- Smith, Steve “Social Constructivisms and European Studies: A Reflectivist Critique”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 6, No 4, 1999, pp. 681-691.
- Smith, Steve “International Theory, European Integration”, Morgen Kelstrup, and Michael C. Williams (eds.), **International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community**, London and New York, Routledge, 2000, pp. 33-56.

- Tonra, Ben **The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union**, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001.
- Torreblanca, José I. “Ideas, Preferences and Institutions, Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy”, **Arena Working Papers**, WP 01/26, University of Oslo, 2001. Accessed on 20 May 2008. www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp01_26.htm
- Vahl, Marius “Europeanization of the Transnistrian Conflict”, **CEPS Policy Brief**, No 73, Centre for European Studies, May 2005.
- Wagner, Wolfgang. “Why the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy Will Remain Intergovernmental: A Rationalist Institutional Choice Analysis of European Crisis Management Policy”, **Journal of European Public Policy**, Volume 10, No 4, August 2003, pp. 576-595.
- Wendt, Alexander “Collective Identity Formation and the International State”, **American Political Science Review**, Volume 88, No 2, June 1994, pp. 384-396.
- Wendt, Alexander **Social Theory of International Politics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wiener, Antje “Constructivism and Sociological Institutionalism”, Michelle Cini and Angela K. Bourne (eds.), **European Union Studies**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 35-55.
- Wong, Reuben Y. **The Europeanization of French Foreign Policy, France and the EU in East-Asia**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Zehfuss, Maja **Constructivism in International Relations, The Politics of Reality**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.