NUPI

Integration, Security and Associated Non-members

The EU as a Regional Security Provider

Pernille Rieker

NUPI Working Paper 802

Department of International Politics

Integration, Security and Associated Non-members

The EU as a Regional Security Provider

Pernille Rieker

Abstract

This article analyses the relationship between EU security, integration and associated members, using insights from security studies and the literature on Europeanization. While much recent literature emphasizes either the EU's insignificance as a security actor or its importance as a normative and global actor, I investigate its role as a security actor in its own region, arguing that the EU is primarily a regional security actor. I make two general claims: (1) it is the development of common rules and values in various policy areas that constitutes the basis for the EU as a security actor; (2) it is the successful projection of these rules and values beyond EU borders that will determine the impact of the EU as a security actor. The aim is therefore to show how the EU promotes security and stability through the externalization of rules and values through various processes, association agreements and neighbourhood policies.

Introduction

With this article I emphasize the value of the European Union as an important *regional security actor*. While this is nothing new, most of the recent literature on the EU as a security actor seems to either neglect or take for granted this crucial aspect, instead evaluating its performance as a global or international security actor. There is a sizeable literature that discusses whether the EU is a security actor as well as what kind of security actor the EU may be. While some have characterized the EU as a new global superpower (McCormick 2007; Moracscik 2010) or normative power (Manners 2002, 2006; Sjursen 2006), others see it as an insignificant security actor (Hill 2007; Hoffmann 2000; Hyde-Price 2006, 2008; Kagan 2003) or a small power (Toje 2011). I argue that we should re-examine the relationship between regional integration and security in order to be able to comprehend the role of the EU as a security actor.

This is based on the idea that the integration process must be understood as primarily a peace project. While this view builds on familiar theories of democratic peace, complex interdependence and security communities, my discussion of the more specific mechanisms of how this peace project evolves and spreads beyond the borders of the community (or the union) builds on insights from the literature on European governance and Europeanization. This article aims to combine the two fields more explicitly than previously, in order to show how and to what extent the EU has become a successful security actor on the European continent and in its near abroad. I make two general claims: First, that it is the development of common rules and values that constitutes the basis of the EU as a security actor. Second, that it is the successful projection of these rules and values beyond EU borders through various processes, such as the enlargement process, together with various association agreements and neighbourhood policies, that will determine its impact as a security actor.

To what extent does the EU manage to promote security and stability through the externalization of rules and values in its neighbourhood? While there is general agreement that both the enlargement process and the ENP can be seen as security policy processes, and natural extensions of the integration process, also EU policy towards the EFTA countries is built on a similar logic, namely the interest 'of creating an environment as similar as possible to the Union, in legal terms, through export of its norms' (Hillion 2011). In fact, the successful export of the EU acquis to third countries – whether defined as candida-

tes, ENP states or neither of the two, like the EFTA states – implies that the distinction between insiders and outsiders is becoming increasingly blurred. This tendency is further accentuated by differentiated membership, whereby EU member states are unequally integrated with various EU policies.

In this article I discuss the relationship between the integration process and regional security, examining how this security dynamic is transferred to various categories of non-members or associated countries. In order to get a comprehensive understanding of how the EU functions as a regional security actor, I look into its policies towards four categories of associated non-members EEA countries, candidate countries, ENP partner countries in the East, and ENP partner countries in the South. I argue that the EU's impact as a regional security actor will depend on the level of integration between the neighbouring countries and the Union. In turn, the level of integration will depend on: (1) *the scope* of the association agreements; (2) the *level of participation* in EU policies; and (3) the *level of Europeanization* or adaptation to EU rules, norms and values. High scores on all dimensions will indicate a high level of integration. I then discuss these theoretical foundations of these three dimensions, and conclude by investigating how one or two countries from each of the four groups mentioned above score on these three dimensions.

Security and the externalization of norms, rules and values

There are reasons to believe that greater integration makes the EU more effective as a regional security actor. However, in order to understand better how the EU actually functions as a security actor in the region, we need to know how rules, norms and values in various policy areas are externalized to several categories of third countries. Here I present three factors or micro-mechanisms that are important for these countries' level of integration with the EU, and inquire into the security implications of differences with regard to: (1) the scope of the various association agreements; (2) the degree of involvement or participation; and (3) the degree of adaptation to EU standards.

The scope of association agreements

The need to study the *scope of association agreements* builds on the assumption that the broader the scope of the association is – in terms of comprehensiveness (the policy areas it covers) and dynamism – the more integrated will the associated country be. In turn, this can be expected to have positive effects on security and stability in the region. This is similar to the basic neoliberal argument of the relationship between interdependence and security, or that a high degree of interdependence leads to greater interstate cooperation and is therefore a force for stability (Keohane and Nye 1977).

To some extent, the interdependence argument is also at the basis of the integration process. After all, it was precisely the wish for lasting peace and stability among the countries of Europe after two disastrous world wars that made the integration process so important. Also other factors have contributed to peace and stability in this part of the world, but there can be little doubt that stronger economic integration has been an important instrument for creating peace in Europe. Still, the European integration process moves somewhat beyond the interdependence logic (Sæter 1998). According to Buzan et al., the 'European Security Complex' is characterized by centralization with the EU as the core. They do not consider a reversal of this process likely, since any form of fragmentation of the European integration process would have negative security policy consequences (Buzan 1991; Buzan and Wæver 2004; Buzan et al. 1998).

This means that even in times of serious crisis in the EU (such as the current economic, social, and financial crisis), fragmentation of the Union is not very likely. On the contrary, there is still a will and possibly a functional need to externalize this logic by making it valid also beyond EU borders. The enlargement process, and more recently the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) should be recognized as a continuation of this idea (Epstein and Sedelmeier 2008; Kelly 2006; Lavanex 2004; Lavanex and Schimmelfenning 2009; Rieker 2012; Sæter 2003). This understanding of European security is based on a wide security concept where it is the very process of development of common rules and values within various policy areas, as well as the successful projection of these rules and values beyond EU borders, that constitutes the basis of the EU as a security actor.

In this sense, the EU has developed towards what Adler and Barnett have referred to as a 'tightly coupled security community' (Adler and Barnett 1998; Rieker 2006). Whereas a loosely coupled security community has a low degree of political integration, a tightly coupled one is characterized by a high degree of political integration. Here we should note that this is not to be understood as a dichotomous relationship, but rather a continuum with varying degrees of loose or tight coupling. The EU, being the result of an integration process and thus something in-between an international organization and a federal state, has gradually evolved and moved along this continuum, towards becoming a more tightly coupled security community

While relations between the EU and the associated members can also be characterized by interdependence, the asymmetry between the two makes it fruitful to supplement this approach with insights from what is often referred to as the theory of *hegemonial stability* (Ikenberry and Kupchan 1990; Krasner 1976; Pedersen 2002). Whereas complex interdependence may create peace and stability, regional stability is often dependent upon a hegemon that can establish norms and rules and then superintend their functioning by enlightened use of its capability to encourage other members to comply with these norms and rules. In the literature on European integration, these processes are often referred to as 'Europeanization' (Featherstone 2002; Olsen 2002; Radaelli 2000). While this literature is primarily interested in uncovering the mechanisms through which such processes of norms are transferred or compliance takes place, there has also been an increased interest in studying the externalization of these norms beyond the EU as such (Lavanex 2004; Lavanex and Schimmelfenning 2009). This article investigates the scope of the different kinds of associationagreements based on the assumption that more areas these agreements cover and the more binding or committing they are, the more important is the EU as a regional security actor.

Degree of participation

Closely linked to this is the *degree of involvement or participation* in the various EU policies. The level of integration and thus also interdependence and stability depends not only on the scope of the agreement, but also on the level of involvement or participation of the associated country in various EU policies. The higher the degree of participation in EU policies and the more committed a country is, the more likely will it be to develop a security community built on a common understanding or identity. Writing in the 1950s, Karl Deutsch developed the concept of a 'security community', which he saw as a form of international cooperation that, under certain circumstances, could lead to integration (Deutsch 1957). Deutsch argued that a security community was formed by participating actors when their people, and their political elites in particular, shared stable expectations of peace in the present and for the future. Deutsch's perspective represented an important break with previous perspectives on macro-politics. His approach was more oriented towards the actual practices of the participating states and how these practices contribute to develop a common identity and a 'we-feeling'.

According to Pouliot, however, it is *diplomacy* that could be characterized as a practice that may lead to the establishment of a security community (Pouliot 2008, 2010). He actually develops a theory of practice of security communities in which he argues that peace exists in and through practice when the practical sense of security officials makes diplomacy the self-evident way to solve interstate disputes. Frédéric Mérand has applied such a perspective on a study of the development of the European Security and Defence Policy (Mérand 2010). He concludes that the diplomatic practices in that instance followed neither a rational nor a structural pattern, but rather a haphazard, creative and combinational one – which indicates that diplomats and security officials may often end up with something completely unlike what they had planned.

This participation or involvement may take various forms. On the one hand, the associated country may participate actively in specific EU policies, contributing various forms of (human, economic or technical) resources. On the other hand, the participation may be more passive, like being invited to attend meetings as observers. However, the more active the participation in EU policies, the more important is the EU as a stabilizing force.

Degree of adaptation/Europeanization

In addition to the scope of the agreements and the level of participation, the degree of adaptation in terms of adjustment made to EU rules, norms and values at the national level is also important in evaluating the EU as a regional security actor. As well as determining the *degree of adaptations to EU rules* (or *Europeanization*), such an analysis may also be able to uncover whether these adaptations are effective – whether they are real, or mere window dressing.

In a special issue of *Journal of European Public Policy* from 2009 this topic is examined precisely in relation to the EU's various categories of neighbours. In their introductory article, Lavanex and Schimmelfennig discuss the concept of 'external governance', which seeks to capture the expanding scope of EU rules beyond EU borders. The article looks into the theoretical foundations of the concept and identify various institutional modes through which this external governance is the most effective (Lavanex and Schimmelfennig 2009). They distinguish between three sets of factors –institutions, power and domestic structures – and argue that differences in these factors may explain why the degree of adaptation to EU standards varies among the categories of 'neighbourhood' countries. According to an institutionalist explanation, the modes and effects of external governance are 'automatically' shaped by internal EU modes of governance and rules. By contrast, the power-based explanation focuses on the extent to which the EU has the power to enforce compliance in one way or the other. This power will exist only if there is perceived interdependence between the EU and the country in question. While such a power structure has existed in the relationship between the EU and candidate countries, it is not necessarily present in relation to the neighbourhood countries. Finally there might be differences in the domestic structures of the neighbouring countries that facilitate compliance to varying degrees.

In addition to these factors that may facilitate or constrain Europeanization beyond EU borders, this Europeanization process may assume a range of forms. Lavanex and Schimmelfennig distinguish between three basic institutional forms: hierarchy, networks and market. Hierarchical governance takes place in a formalized relationship of domination and subordination exerted through legislation, as with the EEA agreement between the EU and some EFTA countries (currently Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein). In contrast to hierarchy, a network constellation delineates a relationship in which the actors are formally equal. This does not preclude the possibility of power asymmetries, but it means that, in institutional terms, the actors have equal rights. Some elements of the ENP Action Plans may be taken as examples of such network constellations. Finally, the market model is linked to the

principle of mutual recognition rather than common rules. The bilateral agreement with Switzerland may be seen as an example of this form of Europeanization. Lavanex and Schimmelfennig also argue that the degree of Europeanization varies among policy sectors to a greater extent than the case in relation to the enlargement process.

How then can we investigate the effectiveness of Europeanization or 'external governance' in relation to the neighbourhood countries? This is a pertinent question, as it can link in with our assessment of the effectiveness of the EU as a regional security actor. I am less concerned with how compliance takes place, which is the focus of most of the existing literature. Instead, I focus on whether such Europeanization takes place at all, and whether it has a positive effect on stability and security. One important indication that the adaptation is real (and not simply window dressing) is if there are shared interests, cooperation and eventually trust, mutual understanding and few conflicts, and not a relationship characterized by disputes, distrust, suspicion and conflicts. I will assume that the higher degree of real adaptation, the more important is the EU as a regional security provider.

The EU as a comprehensive security actor

The EU must be understood as a comprehensive security actor. This argument is based on the fact that the Union is characterized by high level of regional integration over a broad range of policy areas. Whereas the integration process in itself is a peace-promoting process that originates from the idea that economic interdependence leads to peace and stability, this integrating mechanism has gradually spilled over to other policy areas more directly concerned with various potential and/or actual security policy challenges, such as the development of coordinated or common policies within the area of justice and home affairs and of foreign, security and defence policy. Based on the idea that the EU has indeed become a comprehensive security actor, the three main policy areas – economic integration, justice and home affairs and foreign, security and defence policy – will be the main focus here.

Let us now turn to how these policy areas are covered in the association agreements between the EU and four groups of associated countries, by focusing on the three dimensions or micro-mechanisms presented above.

Illustrative case studies

In order to simplify the analysis, I distinguish between four groups of EU-associated countries in the European region: EEA countries, candidate countries, ENP partner countries in the East and ENP partner countries in the South. There are reasons to assume that there will be a decreasing level of integration when we move from EEA countries to candidate countries and then to ENP partner countries in the East and finally to the ENP partner countries in the South. This has to do with the level of integration and how closely the countries are linked to EU security community. While the member states are tightly coupled, the others are gradually more loosely coupled to the integration process.

Ideally, the analysis should cover all of these states as well as the current EU member states, as that would provide a better basis for drawing conclusions about the functioning of the EU as a regional security actor. However, as such an analysis is beyond the scope of this article, I offer a more limited analysis of the relationship between the EU and five selected countries from these categories: Norway, as an EEA state; Turkey and Croatia, as candidates; Ukraine, as a key ENP partner state in the East; and Morocco, as a key ENP partner state in the South. Two of the candidate countries have been chosen for study because Turkey, otherwise an obvious choice when dealing with European security, is a very special representative of this group, as it has few real prospects of EU membership in the near future. I have therefore added Croatia, which has signed an agreement on accession in July 2013.

These countries all have a special status within their category. Norway is the most integrated non-member and one of the 'great powers' of EFTA. Being a founding member of NATO and an integrated part of the transatlantic security community, Norway is not a trouble spot for European security. However, with its borders to Russia and its energy resources, it is an important strategic partner for the EU. In addition, analysing the EEA in a security perspective may show the value of this model also for other countries – especially now that the enlargement process is approaching its end point.

Both Croatia and Turkey are candidate countries for EU membership, but with considerable differences. While Croatia is now poised on the threshold, it is uncertain whether Turkey ever will be a member. In any case, both countries are important for European security. Croatia is the first victim of the Balkan wars to become part of the EU. Sym-

bolically this is important, as the Balkan wars of the 1990s often are seen as resulting from the EU's failure to function as a security actor. The war has in many ways been perceived as the bad conscience of the Union. Thus, the integration of these countries into the EU is a way of making amends for this failure and for further stabilizing the region.

Also Turkey is important for European security, not least as a potential bridge between the Christian and the Muslim worlds. This might prove crucial in a period with popular uprisings in northern Africa and the Middle East. Turkey has been a member of NATO since 1952 and has had an association agreement with the EC/EU since 1963. While Turkey also applied for membership already in 1987 and was granted EU candidate status in 1999, its prospects for actual membership remain uncertain.

Ukraine is a main partner country in the EU's Eastern neighbourhood, and has also negotiated some of the most far-reaching association agreements with the Union. A close relationship between the EU and Ukraine is important since Ukraine has the potential also of serving as a bridge between Russia and the rest of Europe. Moreover, it is an important transit country for Russian gas to the EU.[1]

Finally, Morocco is an interesting partner in the South, and indeed is the only partner country in this region that has applied for EU membership (in 1987). Its relationship with the EC/EU dates back to early 1963, when it signed a commercial agreement. Today it is the association agreement from 2000 and the adoption of the ENP Action Plan in July 2005 that regulate relations between Morocco and the EU. Morocco also occupies a special position in the ENP South, as the only ENP country to have been granted 'Advanced Status' on deepening ties and cooperation in Rabat. This also makes it a pioneer in the European Neighbourhood Policy. Obviously, it is of security policy interest to have good relations to neighbours in the South, as has become increasingly evident with recent developments such as the 'Arab spring'.

In the following I will study the association agreements/arrangements between the EU and these five countries in the three policy areas and with regard to the three main mechanisms, dimensions or variables presented above. I will also investigate to what extent the agreements in the different policy areas are seen as a whole, or whether they are considered as independent agreements.

---

[1] See special issue of *European Security* for more on this topic (19[4]2010).

We need to study countries with differing degrees and types of association to the EU in order to gain a comprehensive understanding how the EU functions as a regional security actor. If some of the agreements get high scores on all dimensions, that will be an indication of the EU as an important security policy actor in the region. If not, the impact of the EU can be said to be less important.

Integration, security and the EEA Countries

The Agreement on the European Economic Area, which entered into force on 1 January 1994, brings together the 27 EU member states and the three EFTA States — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — in a single market, the Internal Market. The EEA Agreement also states that if a country becomes a member of the European Union, it shall also apply to become party to the EEA Agreement (Article 128), thus leading to an enlargement of the EEA.

The EEA Agreement provides for the inclusion of EU legislation covering the four freedoms — the free movement of goods, services, persons and capital — throughout the 30 EEA states. In addition, it covers cooperation in other important areas such as research and development, education, social policy, the environment, consumer protection, tourism and culture – collectively known as 'flanking and horizontal' policies. The Agreement guarantees equal rights and obligations within the Internal Market for citizens and economic operators in the EEA.[2]

Example: NORWAY

Norway has held two referenda, on joining the European Community (in 1972) and the European Union (in 1994), with negative results in both cases. The question of whether to apply yet again for EU membership has been regularly raised in the past few years in the national Norwegian policy debate, but with a large majority of the population being against membership, this is not likely to happen any time soon. In any case, Norway is as integrated in European policy and economy today as any non-member can be.

Scope of the agreement, level of participation and adaptation

Norway's relations with the EU are governed mainly by the 1994 EEA Agreement, which extends the Single Market legislation (except for agriculture and fisheries), from the EU member states to Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein. Through the EEA Agreement, Norway also participates, without voting rights, in a range of EU agencies and programmes, covering, *inter alia,* enterprise, environment, education and

---

2   http://efta.int/eea/eea-agreement.aspx

research programmes. Along with its EEA/EFTA partners, Norway also contributes financially to social and economic cohesion in the EU/EEA. This means that Norway is very closely integrated in or tightly coupled to the EU in the economic field. The EEA Agreement is dynamic in the sense that it is continuously updated to correspond to the EU *acquis*. The level of participation and the contribution of resources are relatively high. Norway has emerged as an extremely adaptive non-member that complies with most of the EU directives in this policy area (Sverdrup 2000).

This high level of integration is not limited to the economic field: Norway also cooperates extensively in the field of justice and home affairs. It joined the Schengen cooperation in 2001, and applies the Schengen *acquis* in full. Even though Norway, as a non-member, has no access to the decision-making process it participates together with other third countries (Iceland and Switzerland) in what is known as a Mixed Committee. Norway is also represented in the Management Board of the European Borders Agency, Frontex, which aims to coordinate the management of the common external borders. In addition, Norway has agreements with the EU concerning cooperation in various areas, including the Dublin cooperation on asylum applications,[3] Europol and Eurojust as well as a surrender agreement based on the European Arrest Warrant and an agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance. Furthermore, Norway and the EU have an agreement on enhanced police cooperation in the common endeavour to combat terrorism. This means that Norway also scores high on the scope of the agreement, the levels of participation and adaption in relation to this policy area as well.

Finally, Norway is closely associated with EU's CFSP/CSDP. It has had close political dialogue with the EU since 1994 and had followed the unofficial policy of signing on to EU statements wherever possible. Norway has also contributed and contributes with personnel and equipment to the ESDP Rapid Reaction Force and to the EU Nordic battle group. Norwegian officials participate in many of the CFSP working groups, and the country has participated 10 of the 24 CSDP operations undertaken by the EU so far. Since the end of 2004, there have been operative agreements with the EU establishing a framework for Norway's participation in EU crisis management operations as well as an agreement on security procedures for the exchange of classified information. Moreover, Norway is the only non-member to have signed a cooperation agreement with the European Defence Agency. While that agreement does not open up for consultations at the political level, it makes it possible for Norwegian officials to participate in

---

3   The Dublin convention establishes criteria and mechanisms for determining which state is responsible for dealing with an asylum application

all projects and programmes of the Agency. Norway is currently engaged in a wide range of projects within all the directorates, with most extensive cooperation in R&D, where it is involved in 25 projects (Rieker 2006, Forthcoming). Also here, Norway hold a unique position as a non-member with regard to the scope and levels of participation and compliance (Rieker 2006).

The scope of Norway's agreements with the EU is thus broad, and the level of participation and contribution is relatively high. Norway is seen as an adaptive non-member in most policy areas and as a valuable partner for the EU on the international stage, with frequently shared policy priorities.

Preliminary conclusions on Norway
Norway today is as closely integrated into the EU as is possible for a non-member. It stands as an integrated part of the tightly coupled European security community – indeed, more so than most candidate countries. The main difference between an EEA country like Norway and an EU member state is that the latter in addition has access to the decision-making processes.

Integration, security and the candidate countries
Currently there are five countries with the status as candidate countries: Croatia, Iceland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey. Being a candidate country means that membership will be accorded when the necessary requirements are met (and if the decision is ratified by the candidate and the member states). Here I take a closer look at two candidate countries, Croatia and Turkey, which represent two extremes: the former is very close to EU membership, and the latter is very far.

Example 1: CROATIA
Croatia's declaration of independence in 1991 was followed by four years of war and a decade of authoritarian nationalism under President Franjo Tudjman. By early 2003 it had made enough progress in shaking off the legacy of those years to apply for EU membership, becoming the second former Yugoslav republic (after Slovenia) to do so. In 2001 Croatia signed a Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU, which entered into force in February 2005.

Croatia was granted candidate status for the EU in mid-2004, and the entry into negotiations as well as the screening process began in October 2005. The negotiation process was stalled for 10 months in 2008/2009 when Slovenia blocked Croatia's EU accession due to an unresolved border issue between the two countries. In June 2010, Slo-

venia voted to accept the ruling of international arbitrators on the dispute, thereby removing this obstacle. Croatia's EU accession talks were also held up until the country's most prominent war crimes suspect, General Ante Gotovina, was arrested in 2005. He was finally convicted by the UN War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague in April 2011. Shortly thereafter, Croatia successfully completed its EU accession negotiations, on 30 June 2011.

While the signing of the Accession Treaty took place the 9th of December 2011, the Croatian referendum will be heldthe 22nd of January 2012. The ratification process, by the Parliaments of all 27 EU member states, is expected to be concluded by the end of June 2013, and the entry into force and accession of Croatia to the EU is expected to take place on 1 July 2013. Croatian public opinion has been generally supportive of the EU accession process, despite some tendencies to Euroscepticism. For instance, this was the case in April 2011 due to the association of The Hague tribunal with the EU.[4]

Scope of the agreement, level of participation and adaptation

Before starting negotiations with Croatia, the *acquis* was divided into 35 chapters. Following the opening of accession negotiations on 3 October 2005, the process of screening was completed on 18 October 2006. The Stability and Association Agreement has been instrumental in preparing Croatia for membership. In relation to the EU economy and the internal market, Croatia is not yet taking part, but according to the last progress report it has met the criteria set by the EU and is thus prepared to become an integrated part of the internal market (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 17).

Also as regards the chapter on Justice, Freedom and Security, Croatia has made substantial progress. Its asylum system has been significantly improved and the Asylum Commission strengthened, but attention needs to be paid to integrating persons granted protection in Croatia and to protecting minors amongst irregular migrants. Good progress has been made in the field of visas, with the introduction of the uniform visa format and the setting-up of the Croatian visa database. However, alignment with the *acquis* on visas needs to continue. Progress has been made as regards external borders, notably in terms of staffing of the Border Police. However, several aspects of the IBM Action Plan need to be amended and the upgrading of equipment needs to be stepped up. Significant progress has been made in the field of judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, notably with the amendments to the legal framework which will allow implementation of the European arrest warrant with effect from accession and with the

---

4   http://www.europost.bg/article?id=1583

signature of an extradition agreement with Serbia. Progress has continued in counter-narcotics policy as well, but results in investigations and prosecution of the drug cases could still be improved (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 46-54).

Concerning Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), Croatia has reached a high level of alignment in the foreign, security and defence policy. It has been an actively participant in the Barcelona Process – Union for the Mediterranean. Croatia has further developed its administrative capacity to work within the EU CFSP structures. The post of Political Director in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and European Integration is being established. Croatia has also participated/participates in several EU CSDP missions. It has been participating in the EU operation off the Somali coast (EU NAVFOR Somalia – ATALANTA), and has continued to provide logistical support to the EUFOR Althea mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The country remains committed to participating in the EU battle groups. Administrative capacity-building measures have continued, including training for and participation by Croatian officials in relevant forums with EU counterparts. Croatia continues to support EU civilian missions. It is participating in the EU rule of law mission (EULEX) in Kosovo and the EUPOL mission in Afghanistan with a total of five police officers and three judicial and administrative officials. The 2010 progress report notes that there is some room for improvement in this policy area. For instance, Croatia needs to continue strengthening the implementation and enforcement of arms control, including the transparency of arms-related information (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 64).

Preliminary conclusions on Croatia

Croatia seems set to become a member of the EU and thus an integrated part of the EU as from July 2012. At present, as an associated member and a candidate country, however, it is tightly coupled in some policy areas and less in other. However, the prospects for integration are real, and conditionality seems to work (Freyburg and Richter 2010; Subotic 2011). This is why Croatia should be seen as tightly coupled to the European security community. The scope of the agreements is broad, as all policy areas are covered, and dynamic, as they are continuously being updated to reflect the EU *acquis*. Croatia's level of participation is currently rather low with regard to the internal market and internal security, but there are good prospects of full participation as soon as the membership issue is concluded. Croatia participates well in CFSP and CSDP and has even contributed to several operations. As to adaptation, Croatia scores very well, having completed the negotiations with regard to all chapters. All in all, a candidate country like Croatia, with good prospects of becoming a full

member in the near future, must be considered to be tightly coupled to the European security community.

Example 2: TURKEY
In many ways, Turkey is already well integrated into the European security complex. It has been a member of NATO since 1952, an associated member of the EU since 1963 (the Ankara accession agreement) and a candidate country to the EU since 1999. Since 2005, the EU has even opened membership negotiations with Turkey. However, Turkey has a long way to go before it complies with the EU *acquis* and thereby fulfils the requirements for membership, so it is still rather loosely coupled to the EU as a security community.

Scope of the agreement, level of participation and adaptation
The Association Agreement (or the 'Ankara agreement'), signed in 1963, sought to integrate Turkey into a customs union with the EEC whilst acknowledging the final goal of membership. In November 1970, a further protocol called the 'Additional Protocol' established a timetable for the abolition of tariffs and quotas on goods traded between Turkey and the EEC. When Turkey submitted its application for formal membership in the European Community in 1987, the European Commission at that time responded by confirming Ankara's potential membership but also by deferring the matter to more favourable times – citing Turkey's economic and political situation, as well its poor relations with Greece and the conflict with Cyprus as creating an unfavourable environment with which to begin negotiations. This position was again confirmed in the Luxembourg European Council of 1997 in which accession talks were started with central and eastern European states and Cyprus, but not Turkey. In the meantime, Turkey proceeded with closer integration with the European Union by agreeing to a customs union in 1995 – an agreement that has led to an increase in its industrial production destined for export as well as increased EU-origin foreign investment in the country. Finally, the Helsinki European Council of 1999 proved a milestone, as the EU then recognized Turkey as a candidate.

While negotiations have been ongoing since 2005, it is still uncertain whether Turkey ever will become a member of the EU. Only 13 chapters have been opened, and only one (on science and research) of those has been completed. While the low level of compliance to the EU *acquis* is an important obstacle to membership, it is the issue of Cyprus that is the major problem. Since a divided Cyprus joined the EU in 2004, the conflict between Greece and Turkey has been lifted into a conflict between the EU and Turkey and also between NATO and the EU. Here we should note that with Cyprus the EU has a non-

NATO member state, 37% of whose territory is occupied by a candidate state, Turkey, that also happens to be a NATO member. Problems like this may limit the EU's possibilities of becoming a credible security actor. However, it is also possible that Cyprus' EU membership has had a certain stabilizing effect, in the sense that it makes it less likely for the conflict to escalate. So even though it creates problems for the EU in its ambitions of developing a common and effective European Security and Defence Policy, for instance, it may still strengthen the EU as a regional security actor. The EU has the possibility to put some pressure on Turkey. In fact, is was due to Turkey's failure to apply to Cyprus the Additional Protocol to the Ankara Agreement that, the Council decided in December 2006 that eight relevant chapters would not be opened and no chapter would be provisionally closed until Turkey has fulfilled its commitment. Those eight chapters are Free Movement of Goods, Right of Establishment and Freedom to Provide Services, Financial Services, Agriculture and Rural Development, Fisheries, Transport Policy, Customs Union and External Relations (TheEconomist 2007).

This has meant that the economic integration of Turkey into the EU is limited to the Custom Union that continues to contribute to the enhancement of EU–Turkey trade (some 80 billion Euro in 2009). Turkey is EU's seventh biggest trading partner while the EU is Turkey's biggest. However, several of Turkey's commitments on removing technical barriers to trade remain unfulfilled and the EU continues to urge Turkey to fully implement the Customs Union. The EU provides guidance through the Association partnership as well as financial assistance through the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 5-6).

The chapter on Justice, Freedom and Security has not yet been opened, so Turkey does not participate in this policy area and has not yet adapted to the EU *acquis* here. The EU has argued that considerable efforts will still be needed before this chapter can be opened. It is especially in relation to border control that the EU is expecting improvements.

As to the CFSP, the regular political dialogue covers international issues of common interest. According to the latest progress report issued by the European Commission, Turkey aligned itself with 74% of the relevant EU declarations and Council decisions (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 95). Like Norway, Turkey was an associated member of the Western European Union (since 1992) with a high level of participation. Both these countries were present at all meetings, but without voting rights. This changed with the launch of the ESDP and the gradual integration of the WEU into the EU. Even

though Turkey has lost this privileged status, it still contributes both to the EU-led military mission (EUFOR/Althea) and the police mission (EUPM) in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as the rule of law mission in Kosovo. However, the issue of EU–NATO cooperation that would involve all EU member states beyond the 'Berlin plus arrangements' remains to be resolved.

Preliminary conclusions on Turkey

At present there are only a few of the 35 chapters covering the totality of EU law and policies where Turkey already complies with the EU *acquis*. Turkey still has a long way to go before it is ready to be a member. But even if it were to comply with the acquis, full EU membership for Turkey remains unlikely in the foreseeable future. In fact, the current member states would have to agree, unanimously, on granting Turkey membership. The Cyprus problem, combined with the fact that its membership bid has become a major controversy of the ongoing enlargement of the EU, means that it is uncertain whether Turkey ever will become a member (Müftüler-Bac 2008).

In spite of the Customs Union of 2005, Turkey is only partly integrated with the EU in economic matters. Cooperation concerning internal security is close to non-existent, but there is a certain level of cooperation regarding external security. This participation, however, has been somewhat complicated by tensions between Greece/the EU and Turkey over the unresolved Cyprus issue, among other things. Whether or not this unresolved conflict has reduced the stabilizing effects of the EU in the region is difficult to say. This complex situation, with Turkey being a non-EU NATO member and Cyprus being a non-NATO EU member, may also serve to prevent the conflict from escalating. In any case, Turkey still remains quite loosely coupled to the EU security community, despite its candidate status. One result has been that the EU has been less effective in trying to externalize norms rules and values than it has been towards other candidate countries with better prospects of membership. Independently, however, Turkey still takes a certain responsibility for its own neighbourhood. A few years ago it even launched a 'zero problems with neighbours policy' and made efforts to normalize relations with neighbouring countries. However, more recently – and especially with the varying reactions to the Arab Spring – Turkey has also come to realize that it cannot be friends with everybody (Kinzer 2011). While the 'zero problems policy' is upheld, Turkey has in a rather complicated relationship to many of its neighbours. For instance, the Turkish political leadership has hinted at military intervention against Syria if Bashar al-Assad doesn't stop murdering his own people. However, there is not only the relationship with Syria that is problematic. The relationship with Israel is also tense as long as Israel continues to drill for gas with the Greek-Cypriots in the

east Mediterranean; friendship with Iran has soured after Turkey agreed to let NATO deploy parts of its missile shield on Turkish soil; diplomatic relations with Armenia continue to be problematic; and finally, membership talks with the European Union are, as we have seen, still frozen.

Integration, Security and the ENP countries

The ENP was developed in 2004, aimed at creating a 'ring of friends' around the eastern and southern periphery of the enlarged European Union by incorporating non-members into an EU-led economic region. The ENP proposes a framework for developing new types of integration arrangements with the whole range of neighbourhood countries, arrangements that stop short of enlargement but go beyond the association or cooperation templates currently in place. Central to the ENP are the Action Plans between the EU and each ENP partner, which set out an agenda of political and economic reforms with short- and medium-term priorities of 3 to 5 years at a time. They build on existing agreements between the EU and the partner in question, such as Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCA) or Association Agreements (AA), but are more ambitious in terms of offering political association and deeper economic integration, increased mobility and more people-to-people contacts. Within the ENP, the EU offers its neighbours a privileged relationship, based on mutual commitment to common values (democracy and human rights, rule of law, good governance, market economy principles, sustainable development, and so on). The level of ambition in each relationship, however, depends on the extent to which these values are shared.[5]

Let us now take a closer look at two countries, Ukraine and Morocco, representing the Eastern and the Southern neighbourhood, respectively.

Example 1: UKRAINE
Scope of the agreement, level of participation and adaptation
Relations between Ukraine and the EU are currently shaped via the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), where Ukraine is said to be a priority partner. The EU has been seeking an increasingly close relationship with Ukraine, going beyond cooperation, to gradual economic integration and deepening of political cooperation. However, this position has recently been challenged by the decision by the Ukrainian President, Viktor Yanukovich, to put former Prime Minister Yulia Timoshenko in jail.

---

[5]   Not surprisingly, the ENP is not yet fully activated for countries like Algeria, Libya and Syria in the South (or Belarus in the East).

The political dialogue between the EU and Ukraine started in 1994 when the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) was signed. That document focused on economic and social issues as well as on the necessity of improving public government and guaranteeing free press and civil rights. The framework set for political discussions was modest: yearly meetings between EU Troika and Ukrainian leadership and some inter-ministerial consultations. The Partnership and Cooperation agreement of 1994 entered into force in 1998 and expired in 2008. None of the top level meetings brought any major changes to a reserved EU approach. Leaders focused chiefly on economic transition and human rights records as well as on issues in connection with the Chernobyl nuclear power plant and its containment.

A Joint EU–Ukraine Action Plan was endorsed by the European Council on 21 February 2005. It was based on the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement of 1994 and provided, according to the European Commission, a comprehensive and ambitious framework for joint work with Ukraine in all key areas of reform. Negotiations on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union started on 18 February 2008 between the Ukrainian government and the EU Trade Commissioner. As of May 2011, three outstanding issues remained to be solved: quotas on Ukrainian grain exports, access to the EU's services market, and geographical names of Ukrainian commodities. Apart from these issues, the deal was ready and was expected to be signed in December 2011(EuropeanCommission 2011). Then, with the unresolved issue concerning the imprisonment of the former Prime Minister, the EU postponed the signing of the Agreement. While this is a setback, it may also be interpreted as an indication that EU conditionality works: if an associated country does not fulfil the requirements or comply with the EU acquis, integration into the EU security community is not possible.

If this issue is solved and the agreement is signed, Ukraine will be the ENP country that is the most integrated in economic terms. In other policy areas, such as justice and home affairs and CFSP, cooperation is more limited, although Ukraine has also participated.

In relation to justice and home affairs, the EU and Ukraine have deepened their dialogue on the establishment of a visa-free regime for short-term travel. Several expert visits took place in 2009 to identify where improvements are needed in Ukraine's management of migration flows and border-related issues. Currently, 40% of Schengen visas are delivered free of charge under the Visa Facilitation and Readmission Agreements (active from January 2008). There is also continued cooperation with Moldova on border management, particularly

through the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM), including in the fight against smuggling and illegal trafficking. A Strategic Cooperation Agreement was signed between the EU and Europol at the EU–Ukraine Summit in December 2009 (EuropeanCommission 2011).

In relations to CFSP, Ukraine has aligned itself to nearly all EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) positions and has taken part in several of the EU's ESDP/CSDP operations in 2010 (EuropeanCommission 2011). Currently, Ukraine is one of 14 'third states' (alongside Albania, Angola, Canada, Chile, Croatia, FYROM, Iceland, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and the USA) contributing to the EU's ongoing missions and operations, and the only Eastern partner. Ukraine is engaged in the European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the ATALANTA mission combating piracy off the coast of Somalia. On 1 July 2011 the Ukrainian Naval Forces joined the Greek-led European Union Battle Group HELBROC on six-month stand-by duty (Zarembo 2011).

In terms of adaptation to the EU acquis, there has been important progress in the economic area, but fewer positive signs in the political domain. In fact, Ukraine has experienced a deterioration of respect for fundamental freedom, notably as regards the freedom of the media, freedom of assembly and democratic standards. Other key challenges are comprehensive reform of the judiciary and the fight against corruption. According to a recent article, there has been limited real progress in Ukraine's internal preparations for closer integration with the EU (Stegniy 2011: : 51).

Preliminary conclusions on Ukraine

The agreements between Ukraine and the EU have a fairly broad scope. Ukraine also participates and contributes to some extent in the various policy areas. While there still are many challenges to overcome related to the adaptation of the EU *acquis* in the political domain, Ukraine is the ENP country that is most integrated in economic terms. In addition it participates and contributes in the area of internal and external security. While there is still some way to go in relation to adaptation to the EU *acquis* – especially in the political domain – the overall conclusion is that Ukraine is rather tightly coupled to the EU security community. Indeed, at present it is more tightly coupled than Turkey, even though Turkey is officially a candidate country. On the other hand, Ukraine is more loosely coupled than Croatia, which is soon to become a member of the European Union.

Example 2: MOROCCO
Scope of the agreement, level of participation and adaptation
Relations between the EC/EU and Morocco date back to 1963. They have received a significant boost in the past decade with the entry into force of the Association Agreement of March 2000 and the adoption of the Action Plan in July 2005 as part of the European Neighbourhood Policy. With 'Advanced Status' granted to Morocco on 13 October 2008, the partnership entered a new and more ambitious phase.

While diplomatic relations date back to 1963, the first cooperation agreement was signed in 1976. Morocco also applied for membership in the EC in 1987, but the application was rejected by Community foreign ministers as they did not consider Morocco to be a European country.[6]

With no prospects for membership, Morocco has been a part of the Barcelona Process and later the Neighbourhood Policy. At the 1995 Barcelona Conference the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership was inaugurated, establishing a policy with ambitious and long-term objectives in the fields of the political and security partnership, the economic and financial partnership and cooperation in social, cultural and human affairs. To develop these conditions bilaterally, the EU and Morocco set up the EU–Morocco Association Agreement in 2000. This document forms the legal basis for relations between Morocco and the EU.

Beyond this agreement, the EU also granted Morocco what is termed *advanced status* in 2008 on deepening ties and cooperation – the first country in the region to be granted such status. The agreement constitutes a 'roadmap' which widens the sphere of EU–Morocco bilateral relations by setting out new objectives in three main areas: closer political relations, with the holding of an EU–Morocco summit (the first, held in 2010, represents the first summit between the EU and an African/Arab country) and the establishment of consultation mechanisms at ministerial level; integration of the single market on the basis of gradual adoption of the Community *acquis* and sectorial cooperation; and a focus on the human dimension.

Morocco tops the list of partners that benefited from the EU's financial support as part of neighbourhood assistance, receiving about 205 million euro in 2009. According to the ENP country report from 2010, the status of Morocco after its second year with advanced status is generally positive. Morocco has become an important economic partner for the EU in the region. It is also a strategic ally in facing many

---

6   However, the rejection may well have also been connected to the country's very poor democratic and human rights standards, which have since greatly improved, resulting in an unofficial attempt to renew the application.

common challenges, including the fight against terrorism and illegal migration. However, there is still room for improvement in many areas, especially concerning the development of an independent juridical system (EuropeanCommission 2010: : 4).

On the political front, Morocco's advanced status offers the opportunity to deepen dialogue and cooperation on key strategic issues that challenge both parties. While Morocco has agreed to give support to CFSP declarations on a case-to-case basis, the two parties have not yet agreed on implementation procedures, and the cooperation remains on the declaratory level (Lecha 2011: : 238). On the other hand, besides setting up an EU–Morocco summit and holding regular meetings to enhance political dialogue, the new political agenda includes Morocco's participation in crisis management operations (military and civilian) with the EU and supporting statements of the Common European Security Policy (Idrissi 2011). Since 2004, Morocco has actively participated in EUFOR Althea mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Its positive and cooperative approach to CSDP issues reflects Morocco's commitment to the EU.

Regarding the security dimension, cooperation has aimed at developing border control mechanisms, Morocco's participation in training and seminars of the European Police College, the establishment of cooperation between Morocco and the European Police Office and deeper cooperation with the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (Idrissi 2011).

In terms of judicial cooperation, emphasis is placed on the EU support to the proposed upgrading of the Moroccan legislative and institutional framework for asylum in accordance with international standards. To this can be added the possibility for Morocco to access the conventions of the Council of Europe related to judicial matters, open to non-member participation, and the establishment of a cooperative agreement between Morocco and Eurojust (the European agency for the fight against crime), and cooperation on pursuing reforms in order to implement all recommendations of the Equity and Reconciliation National Instance, a Moroccan body in charge of assessing past cases of human rights abuses (Idrissi 2011).

Preliminary conclusions on Morocco
Other Mediterranean non-EU partners are far from Morocco's level of participation in various EU policies, including CSDP. The only exception is Turkey, which in addition to being a Mediterranean partner country also has official status as an EU candidate country. Thus, it seems as if Morocco has welcomed the ENP philosophy, as the it has offered integration à la carte and allowed those partner that were ready

to undertake the necessary reforms to go faster and deeper. The fact that Morocco has obtained 'advanced status' is an example of this. Thus, Morocco in the South, like Ukraine in the East, is now rather closely coupled to the EU security community, but less so than official candidate countries like Croatia. The scope of the agreement is quite broad and the level of participation in the economic area as well as internal and external security are relatively high compared to other ENP countries, especially those of the South. In terms of adaptation to the EU *acquis,* there is still room for improvement. Here we may note that Morocco has been more open to democratization than its neighbours (Hirst 2011). Already in 1962 Morocco drafted its first post-colonial constitution that, although basing its governance model on an all-powerful monarch, nevertheless pushed the boundaries of traditional Arab governance by advancing institutions with powers and authority of their own. Four additional modifications in 1970, 1972, 1992 and 1996 further advanced the principles of rights which people all over the world were demanding. Most recently, faced with the unrelenting force of political change with the Arab Spring in 2011, Morocco's King Mohammad VI proposed the writing of a new constitution. Drafting the new text were members of Moroccan society: from the private sector, universities, religious organizations and civil society. The proposed constitution radically alters Morocco's system of governance, providing increasing power to elected government (including the Prime Minister), establishing the equality of the sexes and improving civil liberties. All the same, there is still a long way to go before the country lives up to democratic standards – for instance, it has been argued that the security apparatus, cabinet positions and religious appointments still remain under royal control. Despite these criticisms, the Moroccan constitutional reforms appear to be genuine.

Concluding remarks

This article has analysed the relationship between security, integration and associated non-EU members, seeking to increase our understanding of how the EU functions as a regional security actor through the mechanism of integration. We have examined the extent to which five associated states have been integrated into the EU by looking at the scope of their association agreements, their level of participation in EU policies and the level of adaptation to EU rules and norms in the three main policy areas – economic integration, internal security and external security. The main findings of the empirical analysis are summarized and presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The integration of associated non-members into the EU

		EEA	CANDIDATES		ENP East	ENP South
		Norway	Croatia	Turkey	Ukraine*	Morocco
	Dimensions					
Economic integration	*Scope*	Wide	Wide	Medium	Wide	Wide
	Participation	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Adaptation	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
Internal security (JHA)	*Scope*	Wide	Wide	Low	Wide	Low
	Participation	High	Low	Low	Medium	Low
	Adaptation	High	High	Low	Low	Low
External security (CFSP/ CSDP)	*Scope*	Wide	Wide	Medium	Wide	Medium
	Participation	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Adaptation	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium

*Assuming that the Deep Free Trade Agreement with the EU is signed

My initial assumption was that the EEA country, Norway, would score high on most of the dimensions studied, and that scores would gradually become lower as we moved from EEA countries to candidate countries, to ENP countries in the East, and finally to ENP countries in the South. The reason was that I expected these countries to be gradually more loosely coupled to the EU security community. To some extent, we find that this is in fact the case.

However, there are some interesting deviations. Even though Croatia and Turkey are both candidate countries, they do not score higher than the ENP countries, on all dimensions. Whereas Croatia's agreements

with the EU are broad and the level of adaptation are high in all policy areas, the level of participation is low – and often lower than for the ENP countries examined here. This is probably because a candidate country is included in the various EU policy areas before it actually becomes a member. Still, with a high level of adaptation, Croatia is ready to participate in all policy areas and must be seen as an integrated part of the EU security community. As for Turkey, it too is a candidate country, but scores lower than the ENP countries on most dimensions. This may be explained by the fact that Turkey's prospects for full EU membership have dwindled, and that very few chapters have yet been opened for negotiation. The ENP countries chosen for study here, Ukraine and Morocco, are both the most advanced in their categories. And here we can note that the level of Europeanization is, to some extent, more important for these countries than for certain of the candidate countries. This is an interesting finding, especially now when the enlargement of the EU is reaching saturation point. The case of Morocco is perhaps the most intriguing, since this country is culturally more distant from the current member states. However, the fact that Morocco still desires a close relationship to the EU and that it also is the country that has had the most peaceful transition towards increased democracy in recent years may indicate that the ENP has become a more successful instrument for expanding the European security community than the enlargement process currently is.

What then does this tell us about the EU as a security actor? We can draw three lessons from this analysis. First, it is still the traditional security aspects of the integration process that are the most important: the relationship between economic integration and security. Second, while there are several models of association, all of them seem to produce similar effects: they may differ in form and speed, but the direction is the same. Finally, all these adaptations and associations are characterized by soft power. The various processes have involved negotiations, dialogues and voluntary adaptation – with no use of threats, power or force. Surely, then, this is the key aspect of the EU as a regional security actor.

References

Adler, Emanuel, and Michael Barnett, eds. 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, States and Fear: A Security Agenda for the Post-Cold War Era*. 2nd edition. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Buzan, Barry , and Ole Wæver. 2004. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of National Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner.

Deutsch, Karl W. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

The Economist. 2007. 'The ins and outs. The EU's most effective foreign-policy instrument has been enlargement. But how far can it go?' 15. March.

Epstein, Rachel A., and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2008. 'Beyond conditionality:international institutions in postcommunist Europe after enlargement'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 15 (6): 795–805.

European Commission. 2010. *Croatia 2010 Progress Report*. COM(2010)660 Brussels.

———. 2010. 'Mise an oevre de la politique européenne de voisinage en 2010. Rapport pays: Maroc'. *Document de traivail conjoint des services* COM (2011)303 Brussels

———. 2010. *Turkey 2010 Progress Report*. Commission Staff Working Document COM (2010) 660 Brussels.

———. 2011. *Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2010. Country report on: Ukraine*. COM (2011)303 Brussels.

Featherstone, Kevin. 2002. 'Europeanization in theory and practice.' In *Europeanization of Security and Defence Policy*, eds. Elisabeth Davidson, Arita Eriksson and Jan Hallenberg. Stockholm: Swedish National Defence College. 13–20.

Freyburg, Tina , and Solveig Richter. 2010. 'National identity matters: the limited impact of EU political conditionality in the Western Balkans'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 17 (2): 263–281.

Hill, Christopher. 2007. 'The future of the European Union as a global actor.' In *Managing a Multilevel Foreign Policy: The EU in International Affairs*, eds. Paolo Foradori, Paolo Rosa and Riccardo Scartezzini. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Hillion, Christophe. 2011. *Integrating an Outsider. An EU perspective on Relations with Norway*. Oslo: Europautredningen.

Hirst, Joel D. 2011. 'Morocco – an Arab Spring success'. In *Huffington Post,* 27. June.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 2000. 'Towards a Common Foreign and Security Policy?'. *Journal of International Affairs* 38 (2): 189–199.

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

———. 2008. 'A "Tragic Actor"?: A realist perspective on "Ethical Power Europe"'. *International Affairs* 84 (1): 49–64.

Idrissi, Boutaina Ismaili. 2011. *Analysis of Morocco–European Union artnership within the Framework of the Advanced Status: Main Features and Challenges*. Oslo: Europautredningen.

Ikenberry, John G., and Charles A. Kupchan. 1990. 'Socialization and hegemonic power'. *International Organization* 44 (3): 283–315.

Kagan, Robert. 2003. *Of Paradise and Power*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kelly, Judith. 2006. 'New wine in old wineskins: promoting political reforms through the New European Neighbourhood Policy'. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44 (1): 29–55.

Keohane, Robert O, and Joseph S. Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Kinzer, Stephen 2011. 'Triumphant Turkey?' *The New York Review of Books* 18. August.

Krasner, Stephen. 1976. 'State power and the structure of international trade'. *World Politics* 28 (3): 317–347.

Lavanex, Sandra. 2004. 'EU external governance in "wider Europe"'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (4): 680–700.

Lavanex, Sandra, and Frank Schimmelfenning. 2009 'EU rules beyond EU borders: theorizing external governance in European politics'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 16 (6): 791–812.

Lecha, Eduard Soler I. 2011. 'Converging, diverging and instrumentalizing European Security and Defence Policy in the Mediterranean'. *Mediterranean Politics* 15 (2): 231–248.

Manners, Ian. 2002. 'Normative Power Europe: a contradiction in terms?' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2): 235–258.

———. 2006. 'Normative Power Europe reconsidered: beyond the crossroads'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 13 (2): 182–199.

McCormick, John. 2007. *The European Superpower*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mérand, Frédéric (2010). 2010. 'Pierre Bourdieu and the birth of ESDP'. *Security Studies* 19 (2): 342–374.

Moracscik, Andrew. 2010. 'Europe: rising superpower in a bipolar world.' In *Rising States, Rising Institutions*, eds. Alan S. Alexandroff and Andrew F. Cooper. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Müftüler-Bac, Meltem. 2008. 'Turkey's acession to the European Union: the impact of the EU's internal dynamics'. *International Studies Perspectives* 9: 201–219.

Olsen, Johan P. 2002. 'The many faces of Europeanization'. *Arena Working Papers (on-line version: http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp02_2.htm)* Oslo: Arena.

Pedersen, Thomas. 2002.'Cooperative hegemony: power, ideas and institutions in regional integration'. *Review of International Studies* 28 (4): 677–696.

Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. 'The logic of practicality: a theory of practice of security communities'. *International Organization* 62 (2): 359–384.

———. 2010. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO–Russia Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2000. 'Whither Europeanizaton? Concept stretching and substantive change'. *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 4 (8): http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm.

Rieker, Pernille. 2006. *Europeanization of National Security Identity. The EU and the changing Security Identities of the Nordic States*. London: Routledge.

———. 2006. 'Norway and the ESDP: Explaining Norwegian participation in the EU's security policy'. *European Security* (3): 281–298.

———. 2012. 'Integration, security and the European Neighborhood. The importance of the ENP as a security policy instrument'. *Studia Diplomatica* (1).

———. Forthcoming. 'Active participation despite limited influence. Explaining Norway's participation in the EU's security policy.' In *Common or Divided Security: German and Norwegian Approaches to 21st Century Security Challenges*, eds. Robin Allers and Carlo Masala. Rowman & Littlefield

Sjursen, Helene. 2006. 'What kind of power?' *Journal of European Public Policy* 13 (2): 169–181.

Stegniy, Oleksandr. 2011. 'Ukraine and the Eastern Partnership: '"Lost in Translation"'. *Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 27 (1): 50–72.

Subotic, Jelena. 2011. 'Europe is a state of mind: identity and Europeanization in the Balkans'. *International Studies Quarterly* 55: 309–330.

Sverdrup, Ulf I. 2000. 'Ambiguity and adaptation: Europeanization of administrative institutions as loosely coupled processes'. *Arena Report* 12, Oslo: Arena.

Sæter, Martin. 1998. *Comprehensive Neofunctionalism: Bridging Realism and Liberalism in the Study of European Integration*. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI).

———. 2003. 'EU-prosessen omformer europeisk sikkerhet.' In *En annerledes supermakt? Sikkerhets- og forsvarspolitikken i EU*, eds. Pernille Rieker and Ståle Ulriksen. Oslo: NUPI.

Toje, Asle. 2011. 'The European Union as a small power'. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (1): 43–60.

Zarembo, Kateryna. 2011. 'Ukraine in EU security: an undervalued partner'. *Policy Brief* 88 Madrid: The Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior (FRIDE).