

Julian Bergmann and Arne Niemann (2015)
Chapter 11: Theories of European Integration

In: *The SAGE Handbook of European Foreign Policy*

This is a preliminary version of the chapter, which has been published in final form at

<http://www.uk.sagepub.com/books/Book241829/toc>

Chapter 11: Theories of European Integration

Julian Bergmann and Arne Niemann

Introduction¹

The study of European Foreign Policy (EFP) has been dominated by descriptive empirical accounts – for example of policy-making, decision-making and regional or issue-based case studies – while (explicitly) theoretically guided research has been rare (Tonra and Christiansen 2004: 4; Knodt and Princen 2003). This lack of theoretical work notwithstanding, European integration theory (EIT) – alongside traditional foreign policy analysis (FPA) and International Relations (IR) theory – constitutes one of the major research traditions through which European Foreign Policy has been analysed and conceptualised (cf. Smith 2008: 177). European integration theory, however, does not comprise one homogenous research agenda, but encompasses a wide range of theoretical approaches that differ with regard to their epistemological underpinnings, ontological assumptions and their analytical focuses. Classic integration theories such as neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism which emerged in the 1950s and 1960s mainly sought to explain the outcome of the integration process. Since the 1980s, the research interest of integration scholars has to some extent shifted towards analysing the system of governance that originated from the European integration process. In terms of ontology and epistemology, approaches that are largely based on rationalism and a positivist conception of science, such as intergovernmentalism and neofunctionalism², were for quite a long time seen as the dominant points of reference in European integration theory. The post-positivist turn in International Relations theory in the 1980s and 1990s, however, also contributed to the rise of constructivist and critical approaches to European integration and thus to a diversification of epistemological and ontological assumptions that has resulted in a varied mixture of theoretical approaches and conceptual lenses in European integration theory (cf. Diez and Wiener 2009: 3; 6-11).

While the study of regional integration initially focused on security issues, and in particular on the question whether regional organisations are more capable to settle conflicts between neighbouring states than universal organisations (cf. Börzel 2013), the emergence of the European integration process in the 1950s shifted the attention

¹ The authors would like to thank the editors of this volume and Rebecca Adler-Nissen for very helpful comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this chapter as well as Immanuel Benz, Lisa Hehnke and Jonas Schwendler for their valuable research assistance.

² Having said that, the degree of positivism and rationalism of neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism has probably been exaggerated in the literature that commented on these approaches. For example, although neofunctionalism, seems to have assumed largely rational and self-interested actors (Haas 1970: 627), these actors (nevertheless) have the capacity to learn and change their preferences. Years later, Haas retrospectively described the neofunctionalist ontology as 'soft' rational choice (Haas 2001: 22-24).

of many scholars towards the economic dimension of regional integration³. Consequently, and not very surprisingly, theories of European integration in the early years of the discipline focused mainly on issues of technical, economic cooperation. For example, Haas and Lindberg developed the theory of neofunctionalism mainly as a response to the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Community (EC) (Niemann 2006: 12). To the extent that the European integration process was considered as the interaction of national foreign policies (e.g. by early intergovernmentalists such as Hoffmann 1966), foreign policy has been a key aspect in European integration theory (EIT) right from the beginning. Concerning integration dynamics in security and defence issues and the emergence of a common European foreign policy towards the extra-European world, however, European integration theorists remained relatively silent. The fact that early attempts of integration in the field of foreign and security policy such as the European Defence Community (EDC) had failed, further contributed to a lack of significant attention to this domain. The establishment of the European Political Cooperation (EPC) in 1970 spurred quite a number of mainly descriptive accounts of European Foreign Policy (von Geusau 1974; Taylor 1979; Twitchett 1976). The end of the Cold War and the changing international environment as well as the establishment of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) by the Maastricht Treaty triggered a wave of studies that provided some conceptual accounts of European Foreign Policy (see for example Ginsberg 1989, 1999; Hill 1990, 1993, 1998; Peterson and Sjørnsen 1998; Rhodes 1998), some of them (implicitly) drawing on theories of European integration (Bulmer 1991; Nuttall 1992; Soetendorp 1994). Yet, as Roy H. Ginsberg noted at the end of the 1990s, 'theoretical work on EFP has been meagre compared to work on the internal aspects of integration' (Ginsberg 1999: 432). Since then, however, there has been a significant boost of work on European Foreign Policy from a European integration perspective, partly due to the creation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) / Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and the relatively fast pace of integration dynamics within CFSP in general (Tonra and Christiansen 2004: 1f.), partly because of the extension of policy fields in which externalities of internal policies have led the EU to position itself more explicitly in the international arena, such as environmental policy, energy policy or migration policy. Furthermore, the emergence of new theoretical approaches towards European integration such as liberal intergovernmentalism, the new institutionalisms and the governance approach reinforced this trend.

In this chapter, we aim to provide the reader with a comprehensive overview of the application of European integration theory to the domain of European Foreign Policy. More specifically, we seek to answer the following question: In what ways have integration theories been applied to the field of European Foreign Policy and what is the added value of an EIT perspective on this policy field? To answer this question, our overview proceeds in the following manner. First, we investigate the contribution

³ A certain exception to this trend is the classic intergovernmentalist account of European integration by Stanley Hoffmann, who dedicated some extent of his writings to the analysis of postwar European foreign policy (Hoffmann 1964; 1966: 889-908).

of the following theoretical approaches to the study of EFP: Federalism, Neo-functionalism, Intergovernmentalism, the governance approach and policy network analysis. Applications of new institutionalism and social constructivism to the study of EFP as well as the Europeanization literature, which are typically taken as being part of the 'mosaic of integration theory' (Diez and Wiener 2009: 19) are discussed in separate chapters in this volume and have therefore been purposely left out here. Second, based on our review we identify some general patterns within the literature and discuss the added value of taking a European integration theory perspective on EFP. Finally, we point to the need of further improvement in terms of the development of middle range theories of European Foreign Policy.

Theories of European integration and their application to the field of European Foreign Policy: an overview

Our overview of European integration theory and its application to the field of European Foreign Policy comprises five main theoretical approaches in a chronological order: Federalism, Neo-functionalism, Intergovernmentalism, the governance approach and policy network analysis. Each section on these theoretical approaches includes two main elements: a brief introduction into the central assumptions of the theory and a more detailed stock-taking of the most important works focusing on European Foreign Policy within this theoretical tradition.

Federalism

Although federalism tends to mean different things to different people in different contexts at different times (Burgess 2009: 25), a number of common traits can be identified in federalist theory that has been applied to European integration. First, federalism tends to be normative rather than analytical, in the sense that it is more a discussion of why sovereign states should form a federation rather than an explanation of why they might do so. Second, federalists broadly agree that 'the nation states have lost their property rights since they cannot guarantee the political and economic safety of their citizens' (Spinelli 1972: 68). Third, a federation – characterized by a division of power between two or more levels of government, a federal core and its constituent units, where the central authority operates directly upon the citizens – must come into being as the result of the voluntary transfer of powers from constituent members rather than through the use of force. Hence, federalism has generally been viewed as a way of bringing together previously separate, autonomous territorial units to constitute a new form of union with a central authority, in which the units retain some powers.

Concerning the European project there was quite some agreement among federalists what the result should be: ultimately a federal state or a European federation was supposed to be a sovereign state in which central government incorporates regional

units in its decision-making procedure. Federalists have differed considerably on the methods for achieving a federal European state. Classic federalists tended to favour a rapid constitutional approach: from this perspective integration is seen as a dramatic act of constitutional revolution, initiated by political elites and decided through formal rules. For Spinelli and Rossi (2006 [1944]) – as stipulated in the Ventotene Manifesto – integration should be cultivated as a broad popular movement. This was considered necessary to put pressure on elites to transfer power to a higher authority. Without such popular pressure the federal government would lack legitimacy. In Monnet's 'incremental' or 'functional' federalism, integration is not the result of radical change, but a gradual process of forging functional links between states in areas where national sovereignty was not challenged (cf. Burgess 2009: 31-33).

Federalist theory of European integration has been relatively silent on the topic of European foreign policy. However, some assertions have been made by scholars working in the federalist tradition, or can be inferred from their theoretical tenets. First, the achievement of a common foreign, security and defence policy constitutes a fundamental goal for the federalist project. These policies are generally reserved for the central government, as a federation needs to have ultimate control over the instruments of security and violence in order to preclude conflict among the units (Andreatta 2011: 24). It is thus not surprising that the failure of the pioneering project for a European Defence Community (alongside a European Political Community) in 1954 to some extent weakened the federalist movement, although assertions that the movement petered out thereafter have been rebuffed (cf. Burgess 2009: 31). Federalist theorists have generally interpreted the steps taken from European Political Cooperation (EPC) via the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) towards the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) optimistically as moves towards a (more) federal Europe (e.g. Pinder 1995; Burgess 1996).

In terms of enlargement policy, federalism has emphasized the challenge of maintaining unity and diversity in both EU policies and institutions. A potential over-accentuation of diversity should be counterbalanced through the protection of the *acquis communautaire* as well as further shifts of competence to the Union's institutions (Burgess 2009: 40). There is little explicit empirical work from a federalist perspective that focuses particularly (and at length) on European foreign policy. One of the few exceptions is the study by Kampfer (2010). He depicts this policy field as one that is extensively intertwined between the national and supranational level and which goes much beyond a classical forum for diplomatic coordination; for him this constitutes a sign of a federal state in the making.

One of the criticisms that can be leveled against federalist theory is its excessive focus on the end product of integration, without sufficiently expanding on the means of how to get there.

Neo-functionalism

This lack of a substantial account of the dynamics of integration was bridged by neo-functionalists scholars (e.g. Haas 1958; Lindberg 1963). The basic neofunctionalist assumptions can be summarized as follows: (1) integration is understood as a process. Implicit in the notion of process is the assumption that integration processes evolve over time and take on their own dynamic. (2) Regional integration is characterised by multiple, diverse and changing actors, especially supranational ones, who also build coalitions across governments/bureaucracies (Haas 1964: 68ff). (3) Decisions are taken by rational and self-interested actors, who have the capacity to learn from their experiences in co-operative decision-making and also change their preferences (Haas 1958: 291; Haas 1970: 627). (4) Incremental decision-making is given primacy over grand designs where seemingly marginal adjustments are often driven by the unintended consequences of previous decisions.

The neofunctionalist conception of change is succinctly encapsulated in the notion of 'spillover'. Three types of spillover have generally been identified: functional, political and cultivated spillover (Tranholm-Mikkelsen 1991). *Functional spillover* pressures come about when an original objective can be assured only by taking further integrative actions (Lindberg 1963: 10). The basis for the development of these pressures is the interdependence of policy sectors and issue areas. Individual sectors and issues tend to be so interdependent in modern polities and economies that it is difficult to isolate them from the rest (Haas 1958: 297, 383). Functional pressures thus encompass the various endogenous interdependencies, i.e. the tensions and contradictions arising from within, or which are closely related to, the European integration project, and its policies, politics and polity, which induce policy-makers to take additional integrative steps in order to achieve their original goals. *Political spillover* encapsulates the process whereby (national) elites come to perceive that problems of substantial interest cannot be effectively addressed at the domestic level. This should lead to a gradual learning process whereby elites shift their expectations, political activities and – according to Haas – even loyalties to a new European centre. Consequently, national elites would come to promote further integration, thus adding a political stimulus to the process. Haas (1958: chs 8 and 9) in particular focused on the pressures exerted by non-governmental elites. Lindberg (1963 chs. I and IV), for his part, attributed greater significance to the role of governmental elites and socialisation processes, which tended to foster consensus formation among member governments. This would eventually lead to more integrative outcomes. *Cultivated spillover* concerns the role of supranational institutions that, concerned with increasing their own powers, become agents of integration, because they are likely to benefit from the progression of this process. Once established, they tend to take on a life of their own and are difficult to control by those who created them. Supranational institutions may foster the integration process by various means: for example by acting as policy entrepreneurs, or through promotional brokerage lifting agreements beyond the lowest common denominator (e.g. Haas 1961, 1964).

The neofunctionalists themselves focused rather little on integration in the foreign policy domain. Haas (1958: 297-299) did talk about the need for cooperation among the member states in international economic institutions, such as the GATT and the OEEC. He identified spillover pressures stemming from the customs union, internal (ESCE and EC) integration more generally as well as specific rules/norms of the international institutions in question. Haas was more skeptical when it came to integration spilling over to military and defence questions, which 'have not displayed a close affinity to integration unless the issue involves the related question of saving and allocating resources for welfare measures' (Haas 1961: 368). Later Schmitter formulated a more general neofunctionalist rationale for external policy cooperation among member states. Once a regional integration project has got under way and developed common policies 'participants' will find themselves compelled – regardless of their original intentions – to adopt common policies *vis-à-vis* non-participant third parties. Members will be forced to hammer out a collective external position (and in the process are likely to rely increasingly on the new central institutions to do it)' (Schmitter 1969: 165). Schmitter points to the incentive of forging common positions and policies to increase the collective bargaining power of the Community *vis-à-vis* the outside world as well as involuntary motives such as the demands of the extra-Community environment reacting to successful developments within the regional integration project. Schmitter's externalization hypothesis was taken further and expanded by Niemann (2006: ch. 1) and termed 'exogenous spillover'.

In the subsequent literature neofunctionalism has *not* been used extensively in order to conceptualise and/or explain European foreign policy. Often neofunctionalism was drawn upon or recognized (as providing useful theoretical underpinnings) rather implicitly in the literature. This can be seen, for instance, in the early literature on European Political Cooperation (EPC). A substantial part of the EPC literature seems to iterate neofunctionalist insights in terms of socialization and 'engrenage'. Authors noted for example 'complex inter-bureaucratic networks' (Wessels 1982: 13), 'talking incessantly' (Nuttall 1992: 12), a strong *esprit de corps* among the Political Directors (Nuttall 1992: 16), 'habits of cooperation' (Wessels 1980: 23), a 'coordination reflex' as a phenomenon that quickly became a substantial factor in the definition of national positions and in the search for common European positions (von der Gabletz 1979; Tonra 2001), resulting in deliberations 'beyond the lowest common denominator' (von der Gabletz 1979: 691; Nuttall 1992). The particular neofunctionalist insight into such phenomena has rarely been acknowledged (but see: Soetendorp 1994; Øhrgaard 1997).

Similarly, a number of studies have indicated the importance of supranational agency in EU foreign policy without, however, making the link to cultivated spillover or neofunctionalist theory more generally (e.g. Krause 2003; Mayer 2008; Davies 2011). They show that supranational agents, especially the Commission, may be able to contribute significantly in shaping EU policy. In addition, some authors also did relate supranational entrepreneurship to neofunctionalism (Tesseem 2008; Niemann 1998).

The concept of functional spillover has been picked up explicitly by a number of authors who argued that EU foreign policy is more and more intertwined with other policy areas, as a result of which integration in traditional policy fields may require further integration in the Union's external policies. For example, the customs union has been directly linked to trade policy and development policy as access to the Community's market could only be decided commonly (Peters and Wagner 2005: 236; Niemann 2012). Similar (functional) linkages have been identified between development policy and democracy promotion, or between the internal dimension of technology and environmental policy and their foreign and security policy dimension (Keukeleire and MacNaughtan 2008: 332-333).

Political spillover in terms of non-governmental elites has been largely ignored as a factor in European foreign policy, which seems to be indicative of its relevance in this broader policy area. The lesser involvement of interest groups, which have spurred the European integration process in the (internal) economic fields, in the policy-making process of EU foreign policy has been taken as one explanation for why foreign policy integration has generally been lagging behind the process of integration in other policy fields (cf. Wagner and Hellmann 2003: 584).

Few authors have applied, illustrated or probed neofunctionalism as an entire theory to (certain fields of) European foreign policy. Pre-accession, enlargement and neighbourhood policy has been the area where neofunctionalism has been employed most frequently (Niemann 1998, Özen 1998; Renner 2009; Macmillan 2009). In addition, neofunctionalism has found isolated application to trade policy (Niemann 2012) and defense policy (Collester 2000). Some of these accounts have treated the neofunctionalist approach rather 'heuristically' (Özen 1998; Collester 2000). The applicability of neofunctionalist theory to these policy areas has generally been viewed rather optimistically (but see Özen 1998), even if in some instances a somewhat revised neofunctionalist framework has been probed (Niemann 2006, 2012).

Intergovernmentalism

Intergovernmentalists hypothesise that the development of European integration is determined by states' interests and the outcomes of EU bargaining. Integration only takes place if there is a permanent excess of gains and losses for nation-states. It is thus viewed as strengthening the nation-state since it takes place according to its 'rules' (Hoffmann 1966, 1982; Milward 1992). While for intergovernmentalists governments are *the* paramount actors, the role of supranational institutions is downplayed. Governments only transfer sovereignty to institutions where potential joint gains are large, but efforts to secure compliance by other governments through decentralised means are likely to be ineffective (Moravcsik 1998: 9). Supranational institutions are denied any significant independent entrepreneurship and are subject to amendment by member governments. In his liberal intergovernmentalist account

(LI), Moravcsik (1993, 1998) has developed the intergovernmentalist approach. He departed from 'classic' intergovernmentalism which sees national interests arising in the context of the state's perception of its relative position in the states system. Instead, Moravcsik views national preferences arising in the context provided by the domestic politics of the state. Preferences emerge from dynamic political processes in the domestic polity. However, the primary source of integration lies in the interests of the states themselves and the relative power each brings to the bargaining table. Hence, further integration is possible, when (the most powerful) member states see their interest best served through such undertaking.

In terms of European foreign policy, 'classic' intergovernmentalists have been very sceptical concerning the prospect of integration because this policy area was considered 'high politics', i.e. close to the heart of national sovereignty (Hoffmann 1966: 882). 'When the functions are concerned with the ineffable and intangible issues of *Grosspolitik*, when grandeur and prestige, rank and security, domination and dependence are at stake, we are fully within the realm of traditional interstate politics' (Hoffmann 1964: 88; cited in Koenig-Archibugi 2004: 139). Effective cooperation depends on the convergence of national interests, but in the area of foreign policy such convergence was seen as rather unlikely, as states tend to have very different interests in this policy area (e.g. stemming from diverging geopolitical and systemic embeddedness), as a result of which Hoffmann sees a 'logic of diversity' at play in the domain of European foreign policy⁴. During the Cold War the member states of the Community pursued different foreign policy interests with regard to European security and defence. While de Gaulle sought to challenge American tutelage, the other member states were not prepared to test US hegemony and thus risk losing its protective power (Hoffmann 1966: 890). This situation changed after the iron curtain was lifted and the demand for US protection substantially weakened. As a result, the fundamental security and defence policy preferences among the member states, including those of Britain, Germany and France, substantially converged, thus making somewhat closer cooperation in this domain possible (Hoffmann 2000).

Liberal intergovernmentalism suggests that sector-specific welfare interests of dominant interest groups determine member governments' utility function in terms of cooperation/integration. In terms of foreign policy, this utility function is difficult to ascertain given the lesser involvement of influential (economic) interest groups (Moravcsik 1998: 28-30). As a result, the original LI thesis has been somewhat modified. Subsequently, it has been argued that in areas where economic/welfare interests are not substantially affected, member governments tend to favour further integration when they do not have (credible) unilateral alternatives for action (Moravcsik 1998; Moravcsik and Nicolaidis 1999). Moravcsik and Nicolaidis (1999)

⁴ In a similar vein, French political scientist Raymond Aron (1966) argues that integration in the economic domain will not necessarily lead to integrative steps in the foreign policy field due to a diversity of political history and national interest: 'the system of obligations created by the institutions of Europe (...) will not create a common will among French, Germans, Italians to be henceforth autonomous as Europeans and no longer as members of historical nations' (Aron 1966: 748).

thus argue that, during the intergovernmental conferences leading to the Treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam, Britain and France were the strongest opponents of a supranational CFSP because they possessed other (unilateral) foreign and security policy alternatives, while Germany lacked such alternatives and thus favoured a more supranational CFSP.

In terms of enlargement, Moravcsik (1998) only analysed the issue of British membership in the 1960s. LI explained that the British bargaining position was weak because Britain was more dependent on the EC than the other way round. France managed to extract substantial concessions (especially with regard to the CAP) in return for giving up its veto since it had little economic interest in UK membership (1998: 219-224). Moravcsik and Vachudova (2002) apply LI to Eastern enlargement and argue in a similar manner. The bargaining power of EU member states was significantly greater than that of the applicant countries given the latter's dependence on Western European investment and market access. As a result, the candidate countries decided to accept the EU membership conditions rather than being excluded from the Union.

Koenig-Archibugi (2004) has argued – based on his LI informed account – that member governments cooperate in European foreign policy because a realisation of their preferences at EU level provides them with support *vis-à-vis* national opposition and societal groups, and because economic interdependencies between states gradually increase, as a result of which particular economic interests can only be realised through enhanced cooperation at European level. Also based on LI, some authors have expanded Moravcsik's two-level approach to three-level or multi-level bargaining accounts (e.g. Patterson 1997; Collinson 1999; Knodt and Princen: 2003 4).

Apart from these rather explicit applications of classical and liberal intergovernmentalism to European foreign policy, many authors seem to have viewed EFP, and especially the CFSP/ESDP, from an intergovernmentalist perspective, at least implicitly. Notions of the 'lowest common denominator', the importance of 'national interests', 'member state control', and the 'intergovernmental design' of large parts of European foreign policy have, for a long time, perhaps been the mainstream account in this policy area. Intergovernmentalism has been used very heuristically and rather descriptively – i.e. without probing or applying the basic intergovernmentalist tenets/theses explicitly or systematically – by many authors (e.g. Gillespie 2011). In addition, 'intergovernmentalism' has been the semantic, if not conceptual, point of departure for the coining of a multitude of hybrid terms and concepts, such as 'Brussels-based intergovernmentalism' (Allen 1998), 'supranational intergovernmentalism' (Horworth 2010), 'deliberative intergovernmentalism' (Puetter 2003; cf. Sjursen 2011), 'democratic intergovernmentalism' (Sjursen 2011), or 'rationalised intergovernmentalism' (Wessels and Bopp 2008).

The Governance Approach

While the concept of 'governance'⁵ was first brought up in the field of Public Administration Studies and thus does not represent an European integration theory per se, concepts such as 'multi-level governance' (Marks 1993; Marks et al. 1996;) 'external governance' (Lavenex 2004; Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009) and 'network governance' (Kohler-Koch and Eising 1999;) as well as the 'Europeanization'⁶ approach today figure among the "mainstream" of theoretical approaches in European integration studies.

Since the beginning of the 1990s the *governance approach* has been frequently adopted to analyze and explain the process of policy formulation and implementation in the European Union (EU) (Jachtenfuchs 2001; Kohler-Koch and Rittberger 2006; Stephenson 2013). Despite a great variety of different theoretical threads and a diverging range of areas of application, most of the theoretical frameworks that are based on the governance approach share two common features: first, the main analytical focus lies on investigating the impact of the EU's political system on the decision-making and policy-implementation processes on the European and domestic level. While in classic integration theory the Euro-polity is the dependent variable, the governance approach treats it as the independent variable (Jachtenfuchs 2001: 245). Second, the governance approach takes on an agency-oriented perspective that shifts away from a state-centric view of international and European politics to a perspective that also takes into account the role of non-state actors in policy formulation and implementation processes. The relationship between state and non-state actors is characterized as non-hierarchical and mutually dependent (Hix 1998: 39; Jachtenfuchs 1997: 40).

With regard to politics in the European Union, the concept of multi-level governance (Hooghe and Marks 2001; Marks 1993; Marks et al. 1996) assumes that decision-making competences and power are not exclusively held by the governments of EU member states, but also shared by supranational institutions (such as the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice) and diffused over different levels (supranational, national and regional/local level).

As the main focus of EU governance research initially lay on what was called "first-pillar" issues until the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, studies investigating European foreign policy from a governance perspective were rather the exception than the norm until the beginning of the 2000s. Although the role of supranational actors in many fields of European foreign policy is still not as significant as in other

⁵ While there still is no consensus among social scientists about an adequate definition of 'governance', most scholars agree on that governance refers to 'steering capacities of a political system without making any assumption as to which institutions or agents do the steering' (Gamble 2000: 110). In a similar vein, Peters and Pierre (2009: 92) conceptualize governance as 'an extremely complex process involving multiple actors pursuing a wide range of individual and organizational goals, as well as pursuing the collective goals of the society'.

⁶ See the separate chapter on 'Europeanization' by Ben Tonra.

policy domains, there is a growing body of literature that takes on a governance perspective to describe and analyse both decision-making and implementation processes in European foreign policy.

Smith (2004), for example, demonstrates the applicability of the concept of *multi-level governance*⁷ to the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Multi-level governance is defined as the sharing of authority 'across an institutionalized, hierarchically structured set of actors with varying degrees of unity/coherence, commitment to EU norms, and power resources' (Smith 2004: 743). Smith refers to the multi-level governance of CFSP as an ideal type and specifies the conditions under which decision-making approximates this ideal type. In particular, he stresses four main conditions that influence the propensity for "optimal" multi-level governance: 1) the inherent characteristics of the policy issue under consideration, in particular the time frame and the degree of violence involved, 2) the stages in the CFSP policy-making cycle, 3) the novelty of the policy decision, i.e. whether the possibility is given to rely on established permanent working groups, and 4) general characteristics of EU member states (e.g. government ideology, government unity) and specific situations at the domestic level (e.g. major political events, scandals and crises). As a consequence, the author concludes that due to the interplay of numerous variables both at the European and domestic level, 'as an ideal type, multi-level governance in the CFSP certainly is difficult to pursue' (Smith 2004: 754). Nevertheless, the major contribution of Smith's study is the development of a theory of EU foreign policy-making that provides a plausible explanation for the increasing change of domestic foreign policy practices as a direct effect of national participation in EU foreign policy and the emergence of a problem-solving attitude and several key norms such as regular communication and consultations within CFSP, phenomena that intergovernmentalist approaches fall short to capture adequately.

In a similar vein, Joachim and Dembinski (2011) argue that EU foreign policy-making is no longer as state-centric as intergovernmentalism assumes. Studying the possibilities and limits of political participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in CFSP from a governance perspective, the authors demonstrate that NGOs have contributed to the establishment of specific rules and norms within CFSP. As their analysis of the institutionalization of the European Code of Conduct on Arms Export reveals, NGOs played an important role in setting the issue of an European-wide arms exports control regime on the agenda of EU foreign ministers as well as in specifying the Code's provisions once it was adopted. Through the mechanisms of information sharing, symbolic action and rhetorical entrapment, NGOs also contributed to holding member state governments accountable and

⁷ In its original formulation, Marks (1993: 392) defined 'multi-level governance' as a 'system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers – supranational, national, regional, and local – as the result of a broad process of institutional creation and decisional reallocation that has pulled some previously centralized functions of the state up to the supranational level and some down to the local/regional level'. For an excellent overview of the wide variety of uses of this concept in social science literature, see Stephenson (2013).

encouraged them to increase the transparency of their arms deals with third countries.

In terms of European security and defence policy, there is a growing body of literature that makes use of the concept of 'security governance' (Christou et al. 2010; Kirchner 2006; Krahnemann 2003b; Norheim-Martinsen 2010; Mérand et al. 2011; Webber et al. 2004). More specifically, 'security governance' is conceptualised as comprising five main features: heterarchy, the interaction of multiple actors, formal and informal institutionalization, the existence of collectively held norms and ideas that structure the relationships between actors, and a collective purpose (Webber et al. 2004:4f.; Norheim-Martinsen 2010). To empirically assess the applicability of the concept of 'security governance' to CSDP, Mérand et al. (2011) analyze cooperation patterns through the method of network analysis⁸. Indeed, the authors find that cooperation patterns within CSDP are characterised by a modest level of heterarchy (though national actors such as PSC ambassadors play an important role as gatekeepers) and a close interaction between the European and domestic level. Regarding the role of non-state actors, however, their study reveals that the influence of interest groups and think tanks on policy-formulation in CSDP is rather marginal compared to the influence of Brussels-based state actors working within the permanent CSDP structures. In other words, 'to shape CSDP, state actors have moved from Paris or London to Brussels, but even in this new field of interaction, they continue to rule' (Mérand et al. 2011: 140).

The use of the governance approach as a theoretical lense in European foreign policy studies is not limited to the study of CFSP and CSDP. In the context of the EU's enlargement and neighbourhood policy, the concept of 'external governance' is used to describe and explain the expansion of EU rules and norms beyond its formal borders (Filtenborg et al. 2002; Freyburg et al. 2009, 2011; Friis and Murphy 1999; Gänzle 2009; Lavenex 2004; Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009). External governance is conceptualised as the extension of legal, institutional, geopolitical, cultural or transactional boundaries that define the rights of participation in EU policy-making (Gänzle 2009: 1718). According to Lavenex (2004: 686), two main determinants of the emergence of EU external governance are identifiable: perceptions of interdependence and threat, and the institutional context, comprising the EU's own conception of its responsibilities as well as its control over resources and competences that enable it to become involved in rule expansion beyond its borders. Although further refinements of the conceptualisation of external governance have been undertaken, for example by distinguishing different modes of EU external governance and by specifying the dimensions and operationalization of external governance effectiveness (Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009), external governance remains a useful analytical concept rather than a substantial and coherent theory.

⁸ Mérand and co-authors use network analysis only as a method and not as an analytical concept based on network theory (Mérand et al. 2011: 125).

Policy Network Analysis

Related to the governance approach is the analysis of policy networks (Peterson 1995, 2009; Peterson and Bomberg 1999; Rhodes and Marsh 1992), which shares the governance approach's basic assumption about the non-hierarchical and polycentric nature of the EU's political system. According to Peterson (1995: 391), policy networks can best be defined as

'an arena for the mediation of the interests of governments and interest groups. The term 'network' implies that a cluster of actors representing multiple organisations interact with one another and share information and resources. 'Mediation' implies that the networks usually are settings for the playing for positive sum games; they facilitate reconciliation, settlement or compromise between different interests which have a stake in outcomes in a particular policy sector'.

Consequently, the term 'network' refers to a loosely bound and non-hierarchical formation of actors which serves as a platform for the exchange of information and decision-making in a particular policy area. The main underlying assumption of policy network analysis is that policy-making outcomes cannot be fully explained by referring to the constellation of states' preferences, but rather by pointing to the internal structure of those policy networks which have been provided with decision-making competencies in a specific policy sector (Rhodes and Marsh 1992; Provan and Kenis 2007).

In the field of European foreign policy studies, policy network analysis is rarely applied as a theoretical approach and often only in combination with other theoretical perspectives (see for example Filtenborg et al. 2002). Krahmman (2003a) adopts a multilevel networks perspective to analyze European foreign policy, which she defines rather broadly as 'the decisions and actions of core European states and their multilateral organizations' (Krahmann 2003a: 3). To enhance the explanatory power of the British policy network approach (Rhodes and Marsh 1992), Krahmman modifies it by adding a relational conceptualisation of power and a rational choice approach to explain the behavior of network actors. In particular, Krahmman argues that the outcome of the decision-making process within networks across transnational and transgovernmental boundaries is determined by the ability of utility-maximizing actors to change the preferences of their counterparts in a way that favors their strategic interests. In three thoroughly conducted case studies on specific policy issues in the foreign policies of the European Union, the transatlantic community and the United Kingdom, she convincingly demonstrates the usefulness of this approach to understand the process of making European foreign policies.

Focusing on processes of agenda-setting, decision-making and implementation within CFSP, Winn and Lord (2001) illustrate the added value of policy network

analysis to understand CFSP joint actions⁹. In particular, in the case of the European Union Administration of Mostar (EUAM), the authors demonstrate that in all stages of the policy cycle policy experts and specialists from a wide range of different institutions such as the General Affairs Council, the Commission, European Parliament, the member states, OSCE and NATO, shaped the decision-making process and contributed to the provision of resources needed to implement decisions taken by the EU. Furthermore, the Mostar case was characterized ‘a web-like non-stratified policy process characterized by non-hierarchical decision-making’ (Winn and Lord 2001: 170), which is a typical feature of governance in policy networks.

Conclusion

The research field of European Foreign Policy is characterized by a great variety of theoretical approaches and conceptual lenses (EIT, FPA, IR theory). In the same manner, this is also true for the literature that investigates European Foreign Policy from a European integration theory perspective. Although to considerably varying degrees, all the major theoretical perspectives discussed in this chapter have been applied to the study of EFP. As a tentative finding of our analysis, however, we would also argue that intergovernmentalism has been the dominant explicit reference point within the academic study of EFP from the 1960s/1970s until the mid/late 1990s, when the dynamic advances within the EU’s CFSP and ESDP/CSDP started to indicate that intergovernmentalism’s skepticism about the prospect of integration in the foreign policy domain was at least partly unjustified. Since then, we observe a flourishing of studies that draw on the governance approach and new institutionalist theory (see chapter by Tom Delreux) to analyze European Foreign Policy in all its aspects, but we have also seen a partial revival of neofunctionalist approaches.

Beside federalism, which tends to discuss European integration more from a normative perspective, the theories and approaches presented here share a focus on explaining processes and outcomes of cooperation in the field of EFP (instead of focusing on its effectiveness and impact). In other words, EFP is first and foremost treated as the dependent variable, in particular by neo-functional and intergovernmentalist accounts as well as by policy network analysis and new institutionalism. The governance approach, in particular the literature on ‘external governance’ may be an exception from this observation, as it also focuses on how the construction of the EFP governance system influences EU-external actors and processes.

In contrast to classic theories of FPA and IR as well as some intergovernmentalist accounts of European integration, the majority of European integration theories

⁹ Apart from policy network analysis, Winn and Lord (2001) also investigate the explanatory power of a rational actor model and a ‘garbage can’ model to understand EU joint actions in the cases of the EU’s administration of Mostar, the implementation of the Dayton Agreement and the EU’s Policy towards the Caucasus.

(strongly) emphasizes the importance of distinctly European-level factors such as supranational entrepreneurship (Tessem 2008; Niemann 1998), specific European decision-making structures and governance systems (Kirchner 2006; Krahmman 2003a; Winn and Lord 2001) or the existence of collectively held European norms and ideas (Norheim-Martinsen 2010; Smith 2004; Webber et al. 2004). While European integration theory (with the partial exception of classical intergovernmentalism) prioritizes endogenous factors (i.e. actors and processes) for explaining outputs and outcomes of EFP, IR theories, such as for example neorealism, tend to explain EFP by pointing to exogenous factors such as power constellations in the international environment (Art 2004; Cladi and Locatelli 2012).

What added value may a European integration theory perspective on European foreign policy provide compared to IR and FPA approaches? First, it seems that European integration theories provide us with substantial insights when it comes to explaining the evolution of European Foreign policy cooperation over time. As our literature review has shown, European integration theories mainly focus on the *politics* aspect of European foreign policy, i.e. on analysing processes of decision-making and policy formulation. As a consequence, EIT is capable of providing an answer to the question why European foreign policy cooperation has developed in a specific historic way and not another (cf. Keukeleire and MacNaughtan 2008: 330-333). Second, and related to the first point, European integration theories contribute to our understanding of what actors drive integration processes in the foreign policy domain and through what channels and mechanisms they do so. In particular the governance approach, policy-network analysis as well as neofunctionalism go beyond intergovernmentalist conceptualisations of foreign policy-making as a purely state-dominated process and highlight the involvement of non-state actors across different levels in decision-making processes. Consequently, they provide a more nuanced picture of the complex reality of European foreign policy-making. However, the empirical results of the studies that base their arguments on these theoretical approaches also point to the fact that the multiplicity of relevant actors across different levels does not preclude that nation-states still play a decisive role in the formulation and implementation of European foreign policies (see e.g. Mérand *et al.* 2011; Krahmman 2003a). Third, EIT, mainly through intergovernmentalist theory, also has the potential to explain European foreign policy non-decisions and inaction.¹⁰ Notions of 'sovereignty consciousness' and 'domestic constraints' may be derived from the works of Hoffmann (1966) and Moravcsik (1998) respectively to account for status-quo-like or disintegrative outcomes (cf. Niemann 2006: 48-49).

Concerning suggestions for future research, European integration theories could be more explicitly drawn upon to understand how policy developments in different fields of European foreign policy - such as development policy, external economic policy, migration policy or security policy - are intertwined and mutually influence each other.

¹⁰ Ginsberg (2001) has pointed to the importance to account for non-decisions and inaction in EFP.

Concepts such as functional spillover, issue linkage or network governance could provide useful starting points for theorizing the mechanisms through which cross-sectoral interdependencies are established and how they (tend to) develop.

On some questions that more recently dominated the EFP research agenda – such as those regarding (1) the actorness, effectiveness and performance of the EFP and (2) what kind of EFP actor the EU is – European integration theory has added little value. Here, useful mid-range concepts and theories have started to develop, for example concerning EU presence (Allen and Smith 1990), EU actorness (Jupille and Caporaso 1998), EU effectiveness (Ginsberg 2001), EU performance (Jørgensen et al. 2011), civilian power Europe (Duchene 1972), normative power Europe (Manners 2002), transformative power Europe (Grabbe 2006), among others. One potential shortcoming can be identified in terms of theory development in that respect: European integration theory may have been somewhat neglected for the development of the above-mentioned mid-range concepts. Hence, a question that we would intuitively answer negatively, but which should be subject to future research is, whether broader theories of European integration have really been sufficiently exploited for the formulation of mid-range theories? Not only may European integration theory help fine-tune existing mid-range theories¹¹, European integration theories themselves may have the potential for mid-range theorizing – as the use of various spillover concepts has indicated – taking these very approaches as the point of departure for such endeavor.

References

- Allen, D. (1998) 'Who speaks for Europe? The search for an effective and coherent external policy', in J. Peterson and H. Sjursen (eds.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 41-58.
- Allen, D., Smith, M. (1990) 'Western Europe's Presence in the Contemporary International Arena', *Review of International Studies*. Cambridge University Press, 19-37.
- Andreatta, F. (2011) 'The European Union's International Relations: A Theoretical View', in C. Hill and M. Smith (eds.), *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 21-43.
- Aron, R. (1966) *Peace and War. A Theory of International Relations*. New York: Doubleday & Company.

¹¹ For example the governance approach may provide useful insights for conceptualizing EU effectiveness. (cf. Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009: 800-801). Furthermore, European integration theories could be more substantially drawn upon to further conceptualise EU actorness. For example, Groenleer and van Schaik (2005, 2007) use new institutionalism, although as such not an EIT, for analysing different elements of EU actorness (cohesion, authority, autonomy and recognition). In addition, insights from neofunctionalism may help specify the notion of autonomy within the broader concept of actorness.

- Art, R.J. (2004) 'Europe Hedges its Security Bets', in T.V. Paul, J. Wirtz and M. Fortmann, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Börzel, T.A. (2013) 'Comparative Regionalism: European Integration and Beyond', in W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse and B.A. Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd edition, SAGE Publications, 503-530.
- Burgess, M. (ed.) (1996) 'Federalism and the European Union', Special Issue of *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 26 (4), 1-162.
- Bulmer, S. (1991) 'Analyzing European Political Co-operation: The Case for Two-Tier Analysis', in M. Holland (ed.) *The Future of European Political Co-operation: Essays in Theory and Practice*, New York: St. Martin's.
- Burgess, M. (2009) 'Federalism', in A. Wiener and T. Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory*. Oxford University Press, pp. 25-44.
- Christou, G., Croft, S., Ceccorulli, M. and Lucarelli, S. (2010) 'European Union security governance: putting the "security" back in', *European Security*, 19(3): 341-359.
- Cladi, L. and Locatelli, A. (2012) 'Bandwagoning, Not Balancing: Why Europe Confounds Realism', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 33 (2), 264-288.
- Collester, J. B. (2000) 'How Defense 'Spilled Over' into the CFSP: Western European Union (WEU) and the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI)', in M. Green Cowles and M. Smith (eds.), *The State of the European Union: Risks, Reform, Resistance, and Revival*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 369-89.
- Collinson, S. (1999) "Issue systems", "multi-level games" and the analysis of the EU's external commercial and associated policies: a research agenda', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6 (2): 206-224.
- Davies, C. M. (2011) 'Backseat Driving: European institutions and crisis management in Moldova', *Romanian Journal of Political Sciences*, 2: 129-153.
- Diez, T. and Wiener, A. (2009) 'Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory', in T. Diez and A. Wiener (eds), *European Integration Theory*, 2nd Edition, Oxford, 1-22.
- Duchêne, F. (1972) 'Europe's Role in World Peace, in R. Mayane (ed.) *Europe Tomorrow: Sixteen European Look ahead*. London: Fontana, 32-47.
- Filténborg, M.S., Gänzle, S. and Johansson, E. (2002) 'An Alternative Theoretical Approach to EU Foreign Policy: "Network Governance" and the Case of the Northern Dimension Initiative', *Cooperation and Conflict* 37(4): 387-407.
- Freyburg, T., Lavenex, S., Schimmelfennig, F., Skripka, T. and Wetzel, A. (2009) 'EU promotion of democratic governance in the neighbourhood', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(6): 916-934.
- Freyburg, T., Lavenex, S., Schimmelfennig, F., Skripka, T., Wetzel, A. (2011) 'Democracy promotion through functional cooperation? The case of the European Neighbourhood Policy', *Democratization* 18(4), 1026-1054.
- Friis, Lykke and Murphy, Anna (1999) 'The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Governance and Boundaries', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37(2): 211-232.
- Gamble, A. (2000) 'Economic Governance', in J. Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance. Authority, Steering and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 110-137.

- Gänzle, S. (2009) 'EU Governance and the European Neighbourhood Policy: A Framework for Analysis', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 61(10): 1715-1734.
- Gillespie, R. (2011) 'The Union for the Mediterranean: An Intergovernmentalist Challenge for the European Union?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(6): 1205-1225.
- Ginsberg, R.H. (1989) *Foreign Policy Actions of the European Community: The Politics of Scale*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Ginsberg, R.H. (1999) 'Conceptualizing the European Union as an International Actor: Narrowing the Theoretical Capability-Expectations Gap', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37 (3), 429-454.
- Ginsberg, R.H. (2001) *The European Union in International Politics: Baptism by Fire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Grabbe, H. (2006) *The EU's Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haas, E. B. (1958) *The Uniting of Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haas, E. B. (1961) 'International integration: the European and the universal process', *International Organization*, 15(3): 366-392.
- Haas, E. B. (1963) 'International integration'. In *Limits and Problems of European Integration*. Springer Netherlands: 6-36.
- Haas, E. B. (1964) *Beyond the Nation State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haas, E.B. (2001) 'Does Constructivism Subsume Neo-functionalism?', in T. Christiansen, K.E. Jørgensen and A. Wiener (eds.), *The Social Construction of Europe*, London: SAGE Publications, 22-31.
- Hill, C. (1990) 'European Foreign Policy: Power Bloc, Civilian Model, or Flop?', in R. Rummel (ed.) *The Evolution of an International Actor: Western Europe's New Assertiveness*, Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hill, C. (1993) 'The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31 (3), 305-328.
- Hill, C. (1998) 'Closing the Capability-Expectations Gap?', in J. Peterson and H. Sjursen (eds.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP*, London: Routledge, 18-38.
- Hix, S. (1998) 'The study of the European Union II: the "new governance" agenda and its rival', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5(1): 38-65.
- Hoffmann, S. (1964) 'The European Process at Atlantic Crosspurposes', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 3 (2), 85-101.
- Hoffmann, S. (1966) 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe', *Daedalus*, 95 (3): 862-915.
- Hoffmann, S. (2000) 'Towards a Common European Foreign and Security Policy?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38 (2): 189-198.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001) *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*. New York.
- Howorth, J. (2010) 'The Political and Security Committee: A Case Study in "Supra-national Inter-governmentalism"?'', in *Cahiers Européens* (Paris: Sciences Po).

- Jachtenfuchs, M. (1997) 'Conceptualizing European Governance', in K.E. Jørgensen (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 39-50.
- Jachtenfuchs, M. (2001) 'The Governance Approach to European Integration', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39(2): 245-264.
- Joachim, J. and Dembinski, M. (2011) 'A contradiction in terms? NGOs, democracy, and European foreign and security policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18(8): 1151–1168.
- Jørgensen, K.E., Oberthür, S., Shahin, J. (2011) 'Introduction: Assessing the EU's Performance in International Institutions – Conceptual Framework and Core Findings', *Journal of European Integration*, 33 (6), 599-620.
- Jupille, J. and Caporaso, J.A. (1998) 'States, Agency and Rules: The European Union in Global Environmental Politics', in C. Rhodes (ed.) *The European Union in the world community*, Boulder, CO: Rienner, 213-229.
- Kampfer, G. K. (2010) *Die Europäische Union auf dem Weg zu einem Bundesstaat? Von der föderalen Struktur der Europäischen Union und der Europäisierung der Außenpolitik*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Keukeleire, S. and MacNaughtan, J. (2008) *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kirchner, E.J. (2006) 'The Challenge of European Union Security Governance', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(5): 947–968.
- Knodt, M. and Princen, S. (2003) 'Introduction: Puzzles and prospects in theorising the EU's external relations', in M. Knodt and S. Princen (eds.), *Understanding the EU's External relations*, London: Routledge, pp. 1-18.
- Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2004) 'Explaining Government Preferences for Institutional Change in EU Foreign and Security Policy', *International Organization*, 58(1): 137-17.
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Eising, R. (1999) *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Rittberger, B. (2006) 'Review Article: The 'Governance Turn', in EU Studies', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(1): 27-49.
- Krahmann, E. (2003a) *Multilevel Networks in European Foreign Policy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Krahmann, E. (2003b) 'Conceptualizing Security Governance', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38(1): 5-26.
- Krause, A. (2003) 'The European Union's Africa Policy: The Commission as Policy Entrepreneur in the CFSP', *European foreign affairs review*, 8(3): 221-237.
- Lavenex, S. (2004) 'EU external governance in "wider Europe"', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(4): 680-700.
- Lavenex, S. and Schimmelfennig, F. (2009) 'EU rules beyond EU borders: theorizing external governance in European politics', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(6): 791-812.
- Lindberg, L. N. (1963) *The political dynamics of European economic integration*. Stanford University Press.

- Macmillan, C. (2009) 'The Application of Neofunctionalism to the Enlargement Process: The Case of Turkey', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47(4): 789–809.
- Marks, G. (1993) 'Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC', in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds.), *The State of the European Community*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp. 391-410.
- Marks, G., Hooghe, L. and Blank, K. (1996) 'European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-Level Governance', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(3): 341-378.
- Mayer, S. (2008) 'Path dependence and Commission activism in the evolution of the European Union's external energy policy', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 11: 251-278.
- Mérand, F., Hofmann, S.C. and Irondelle, B. (2011) 'Governance and State Power: A Network Analysis of European Security', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(1): 121-147.
- Milward, A. (1992) *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Moravcsik, A. (1993) 'Preferences and power in the European Community. A liberal intergovernmentalist approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31(4): 473-524.
- Moravcsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe. Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca, NJ: Cornell University Press.
- Moravcsik, A. and Nicolaidis, K. (1999) 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam: interests, influence, institutions', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37(1): 59-85.
- Moravcsik, A. and Vachudova, M. A. (2002) *National interests, state power, and EU enlargement*. Harvard University, Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies.
- Niemann, A. (1998) 'The PHARE programme and the concept of spillover: neofunctionalism in the making', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5(3): 428-446.
- Niemann, A. (2006) *Explaining Decisions in the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niemann, A. (2012) 'The Common Commercial Policy: From Nice to Lisbon', in F. Laursen (ed.) *The EU's Lisbon Treaty: Institutional Choices and Implementation*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 205-227.
- Norheim-Martinsen, P. M. (2010) 'Beyond Intergovernmentalism: European Security and Defence Policy and the Governance Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(5): 1351-1365.
- Nuttall, S. (1992) *European Political Cooperation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Øhrgaard, J. C. (1997) 'Less than supranational, more than intergovernmental': European political cooperation and the dynamics of intergovernmental integration', *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 26(1): 1-29.
- Özen, C. (1998) 'Neo-functionalism and the Change in the Dynamics of Turkey-EU Relations', *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, 3(3): 34-57.
- Patterson, L.A. (1997) 'Agricultural policy reform in the European Community: a three-level game analysis', *International Organization* 51(1): 135–65.

- Peters, B. Guy/Pierre, Jon 2009: Governance Approaches; In: Wiener, Antje/Diez, Thomas (Hg.): *European Integration Theory*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 91-104.
- Peters, D., and Wagner, W. (2005) Die Europäische Union in den internationalen Beziehungen. *Die Europäische Union. Theorien und Analysekonzepte*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Peterson, J. (1995) 'Policy Networks and European Union Policy-Making: A reply to Kassim', *West European Politics*, 18(2): 389-407.
- Peterson, J. (2009) 'Policy Networks', in A. Wiener and T. Diez (eds.): *European Integration Theory*, 2nd Edition, Oxford, pp. 105-124.
- Peterson, J. and Bomberg, E. (1999) Decision-Making in the European Union. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peterson, J. and Sjursen, H. (eds.) (1998) A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of CFSP. London: Routledge.
- Pinder, J. (1995) European Community: The Building of a Union. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Puetter, U. (2003) 'Informal Circles of Ministers: A Way Out of the EU's Institutional Dilemmas?', *European Law Journal*, 9(1): 109-124.
- Provan, K. G./Kenis, P. (2007) 'Modes of Network Governance. Structure, Management and Effectiveness', *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 18: 229-252.
- Renner, S. (2009) 'The Energy Community of Southeast Europe: A Neo-Functionalist Project of Regional Integration', *European Integration online Papers*, 13(1): 1-21.
- Rhodes, C. (ed.) (1998) The European Union in the World Community, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. and Marsh, D. (1992) 'New Directions in the Study of Policy Networks', *European Journal of Political Research*, 21: 181-205.
- Schmitter, P. C. (1969) 'Three neo-functional hypotheses about international integration', *International Organization*, 23(01): 161-166.
- Sjursen, H. (2011) 'Not so intergovernmental after all? On democracy and integration in European Foreign and Security Policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18(8): 1078-1095.
- Smith, M.E. (2004) 'Toward a theory of EU foreign policy-making: multi-level governance, domestic politics, and national adaptation to Europe's common foreign and security policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(4): 740-758.
- Smith, M.E. (2008) 'Researching European Foreign Policy: Some Fundamentals', *Politics*, 28 (3), 177-187.
- Soetendorp, B. (1994) 'The evolution of the EC/EU as a single foreign policy actor', *SAGE Modern Politics Series 34*, pp. 103-103.
- Spinelli, A. (1972) *The European adventure: tasks for the enlarged Community*. C. Knight.
- Spinelli, A. and Rossi, E. (2006 [1944]), *Il Manifesto di Ventotene*, Milan: Mondadori; online available at: http://www.altierospinelli.org/manifesto/manifesto_en.html

- Stephenson, Paul (2013) 'Twenty years of multi-level governance: "Where Does It Come From? What Is It? Where Is It Going?"', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 20(6): 817-837.
- Taylor, P. (1979) *When Europe Speaks With One Voice*, Westport: Greenwood.
- Tessem, N. K. (2008) *The energy power game of the European Commission: Neofunctionalism and European energy policy integration*. Master-Thesis. Oslo: Institutt for statsvitenskap.
- Tonra, B. (2001) *The Europeanisation of National Foreign Policy. Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Tonra, B. And Christiansen, T. (2004): 'The Study of EU Foreign Policy: Between International Relations and European Studies', in B. Tonra and T. Christiansen (eds.) *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1-9.
- Tranholm-Mikkelsen, J. (1991) 'Neo-functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC', *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 20(1): 1-22.
- Twitchett, K. (ed) (1976) *Europe and the World*. London: Europa.
- Von der Gablentz, O. (1979) 'Luxembourg revisited or the importance of European political cooperation', *Common Market Law Review*, 16(4): 685-99.
- von Geusau, F.A. (ed.) (1974) *The External Relations of the European Community: Perspectives, Policies and Responses*, Westmead: DC. Heath.
- Wagner, W. and Hellmann, G. (2003) 'Zivile Weltmacht? Die Außen-, Sicherheits-, und Verteidigungspolitik der Europäischen Union', in M. Jachtenfuchs and B. Kohler-Koch (eds), *Europäische Integration*, Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 569-596.
- Webber, M., Croft, S., Howorth, J., Terrif, T. and Krahnemann, E. (2004) 'The Governance of European security', *Review of International Studies*, 30(1): 3-26.
- Wessels, W. (1980) 'New Forms of Foreign Policy Formulation in Western Europe', in Feld, W.J. (ed.) *Western Europe's Global Reach, Regional Cooperation and Worldwide Aspirations*, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Wessels, W. (1982) 'European Political Cooperation: a new approach to foreign policy', in Wolfgang Wessels / David Allen and Reinhardt Rummel (eds.), *European Political Cooperation*. London: pp. 1-20.
- Wessels, W. and Bopp, F. (2008) 'The institutional architecture of CFSP after Lisbon Treaty – Constitutiona, break-through or challenges ahead?', *Challenge Liberty & Security*.
- Winn, N. and Lord, C. (2001) *EU Foreign Policy Beyond the Nation-State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.