

**Current Title:** Theorizing the interests of the EU Member States in the Eastern Partnership

**Panel:** Theorising EU external action – Assessing the impact of the EU Abroad

**ISA BISA Conference**  
**Edinburgh, June 2012**  
**Presenter: Bogdana DEPO**  
**EXACT ITN Marie Curie Fellow**  
**Supervisor: Prof. Wolfgang Wessels**  
**Cologne University**

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	3
Introduction.....	3
I. Theorizing the interests of the EU and its Member States within the Eastern Partnership .....	5
Some Space for normative interests of the EU Member States within the Normative Power Europe concept? .....	5
Realism – explaining security interests .....	7
Liberal Intergovernmentalism – opening up the ‘black box’ .....	8
II. Linking theory and practice .....	9
Normative interest at the level of the EU Member States.....	9
Democracy promotion within the state policy of the EU Member States .....	9
Tymoshenko case: EU and the Member States as Normative Power? .....	10
Realist interests .....	12
Liberal Intergovernmentalism .....	14
Conclusion .....	15
Bibliography.....	17

## Abstract

The aim of this article is to analyse the interests of the EU Member States in integrating the Eastern Partnership countries. The article is built on three theoretical frameworks that would unveil normative, realist and economic interests of the Member State in bringing closer Ukraine to the EU within the mentioned strategy. The article aims to answer the question on what the potential *finalité* of the EU's policy towards its Eastern European neighbours is or might be while building a bridge between theoretical underpinning and empirical findings.

## Introduction

The Eastern Partnership, as a part of the European Neighbourhood Policy, is a new policy of the European Union, which has left a number of questions with its introduction. The main question is where the Eastern Partnership might bring to. 'To explain an event or state of affairs is to find another which caused it'<sup>1</sup>, therefore, this article discusses the interests of the key EU Member States in support the emergence and development of the Eastern Partnership by framing within the theoretical concepts of Normative Power Europe, realism and liberal intergovernmentalism.

The Normative Power Europe concept might not be sufficient in explaining the strategy of the EU Member States towards the Eastern Partnership countries. If the EU Member States would be guided only by the 'normative interest', the Eastern Partnership (EaP) could be defined as a strategy preparing Ukraine and other Eastern Partnership countries to the pre-accession process. Whereas the EU, following the success story of transformation of the post-communist Central and Eastern European countries with weak economy into the democratic states under the value-driven idea of 'return to Europe', it could have also facilitated the rough way towards the membership prospective through the EaP countries. But are the EU Member States interested in bringing the Eastern Partnership partner countries to the membership? Or are there other interests of the EU Member States that are stimulating enough to bring the EaP partner countries to a close political and economic integration, but not close enough in order not to bring them to the membership? The other major interests of the EU Member States could be of security or economic interest. The importance of the those interests of the EU Member States are to be added into the 'melting pot' of the final dish of what the Eastern Partnership is.

The *acquis academique* has different approaches in studying the European Neighbourhood Policy and new Eastern Dimension. Some scholars study the EU for what it is from the prospective of the third countries and not what it does. Therefore, they explore different faces of the EU as of a Civilian Power (Duchêne 1972), Superpower (Galtung 1973), Normative Power Europe (Manners 2002), Realist Power (Zimmermann 2007), Ethical Power Europe (Hyde-Price 2008), Quiet Superpower (Moravcsik 2009).

While others academics analyse the adaptation of the EU rules by the ENP countries through the concepts of Europeanization developed by Schimmelfenning and others or external

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 3.

governance discussed by Lavenex. The aim of these researches is to analyse the impact of the EU on the third countries that do not have EU membership prospective in the upcoming future.<sup>2</sup> The scholars, such as Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier have researched the extent and conditions under which the EU can be successful in Europeanization beyond the group of actual and would-be members. While a number of scholars research on the success-formula of democratization and socialization of the European Neighbourhood Policy countries, the theoretical approach towards and understanding on the prospective of the partner countries on the offered policy, such as the ENP or the EaP, is lacking. (Börzel 1998, 1999, 2000, - 2010, 2011, Risse 2000, 2001, 2010; Schimmelfennig 2003, 2005, 2008; Sedelmeier 2006, 2007).

One more popular aspect of analysing the ENP is the EU's involvement into the conflicts or crisis areas due to the perpetual interest of establishing secured and stable neighbourhood. Therefore, a number of scholars look at the intergovernmental instruments, such as CFSP and ESDP (Regelsberger et Wessels, 2004; Wessels, 1999, 1997, 2002; Ginsberg 1999, 2001). The researched conflict areas in the Eastern Dimension are '(un)-frozen conflicts' in Moldova and in Caucasus (Wolff 2011, Christopher 2010, and others). The Arab Spring in the Southern Neighbourhood has provoked even higher academic interest towards the available instruments within the EU, that could address the security and defence aspect within its Neighbourhood. Therefore, the current academic attention has shifted to the EU's Southern neighbourhood.

The gap within the current research agenda is lack of focus on the interests of the EU Member States in formulating the EU's foreign Policy. The interests of the states should not be underestimated as they define the current and further development of the EU's policy. The EU's policy, such as Eastern Partnership, aims to address different aspects, such as norm promotion, security interests, as well as the economic interests of the Member States, therefore, the multi-theoretical approach should to be applied in order to, on one hand, have a broader overview of the interests, and on the other hand, to counterbalance the shortcomings of each theory.

Within this article, the three theoretical approaches are to unveil interests of the EU Member States in introducing the Eastern Partnership (EaP), namely normative, realist and the economic interests. In order to counterbalance the shortcomings of the Normative Power Europe, but also in order to build a complex understanding of the interests in introduction of the Eastern Partnership the analytical concept must take into account the security and economic interests. Therefore, at the theoretical level it is necessary, firstly, to define the normative interests of the EU Member States by applying the Normative Power Europe; secondly, to apply the realist theory while discussing the security interests of the EU Member States; and thirdly, to explore economic interests of the EU Member States by opening the EU 'black box' through a liberal intergovernmentalism conceptual framework.

The structure of the article is as following. It starts with the theoretical overview of the Normative Power Europe, Realism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism which are to be presented in the view of their potential explanation of the idea behind the Eastern Partnership.

---

<sup>2</sup>Frank Schimmelfennig, "Europeanization beyond Europe Imprint / Terms of Use," *Integration The Vlsi Journal* 4, no. 3 (2009): 5.

The article continues with the empirical part which is to prove or disprove the discussed theories by using the four EU Member States and one EaP partner country as the study cases. Within this part, the interests of the EU Member States towards Ukraine mainly are to be analysed. The author will conclude with the shortcomings and usefulness of the applied theories and main findings.

It is merely impossible to make a strict classification of the EU Member States and to cluster them within a specific ideal type of a normative, realist actor or the one which is driven by the economic interests. The 'ideal type' of Max Weber does not exist in real life. However, an attempt to identify interests of the EU Member States is important, as a composition of these interest results in the formulation of the EU's foreign policy, such as Eastern Partnership is.

## **I. Theorizing the interests of the EU and its Member States within the Eastern Partnership**

As the Eastern Partnership was introduced in May 2009, this new policy towards the Eastern European Neighbours is often analysed in the broader context of the European Neighbourhood Policy. On one hand, the Eastern Partnership is a part of the ENP, which aims 'to strengthen the specific Eastern dimension'<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, contrary to the Southern Dimension who are neighbours of Europe, the Eastern Partnership is designed for the Eastern European neighbours, where three out of six countries have declared their European membership aspirations.

Nevertheless, 'to be or not to be' enlargement depends on the interests of the EU Member States. Therefore, those interests are to undergo the theoretical analysis within the first part of the article. The article is drive by the argument that 'theory is a guide to empirical exploration',<sup>4</sup> therefore, within this part it is expect to find the theoretical arguments that would pave their way for the empirical justification or disapproval of the theoretical underpinning.

### **Some Space for normative interests of the EU Member States within the Normative Power Europe concept?**

The normative return in the political science is an attempt to fill in the gap in failure of the social science to bring in the moral choice of the actors within the international system.<sup>5</sup> The relatively new theoretical concept of the Normative Power Europe (NPE) is aiming to contributing to the academic trend by studying the ideational aspect of the EU<sup>6</sup>, which was developed due to the historical context of its emergence, its unique hybrid polity (referred to as 'sui generis') and its constitutional norms that are of ethical value. From the 50s till today the European Union has grown into an international actor whose interests go beyond material

---

<sup>3</sup> Council of the European Union, "Prague Eastern Partnership Declaration", n.d.P. 4

<sup>4</sup> Colin Hay, *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002). P. 47

<sup>5</sup> Andrew Hurrell, "Norms and Ethics in International Relations," in *Handbook in International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlsnaes, Beth A. Simmons, and Thomas Risse (London: Sage Publications, 2002), p. 138.

<sup>6</sup> Ian Manners, "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms," *Journal of common market studies* 40, no. 2 (2002): 238-239.

and physical power. Moreover, its interests are shaped around community values, which are defined by Manners as the five core values: peace, liberty, democracy, the rule of law, and respect of human rights, as well as four minor ones: social solidarity, anti-discrimination, sustainable development, and good governance.<sup>7</sup> The ideational or normative aspect of the EU's nature has contributed to establishing the EU's identity as of an actor promoting a set of norms and values within and beyond its borders.

EU, as a 'force of goodness in international society'<sup>8</sup>, promotes its value through the ENP and the EaP. The EaP countries got the normative lecturing within the broader framework of the Eastern Partnership Summit Declaration, where they have committed to what Manners called core and minor values, namely to: 'the principles of international law and to fundamental values, including democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as to, market economy, sustainable development and good governance'.<sup>9</sup> The importance to follow those values is enhanced by means of political conditionality, where ideally the EaP partner countries would obtain access to new programmes or money under the condition that they stay committed to the European values.

Whereas, the NPE discusses only the ideational aspect at the EU level, the space for the Member States within this concept remains undefined. The approach of studying the EU level only is not sufficient when discussing the normative aspect of the EU foreign policy, as the EU foreign policy is a result of the Member States interests.

The NPE focus suggested by Manners is built around the EU as an actor, rather discussing the normative approach of its states and their foreign policy. Gerrits argue that as long as there is no space for the Member States within this concept, the debate over the NPE remains virtual,<sup>10</sup> therefore, a narrow academic circle has started working on opening-up the 'black box' of the NPE aiming to discover differences of the EU Member States when it comes to the normative approach. Wagnsson goes into debate on high-lighting tensions within the Member States, the leadership of which tries to balance between the normative justification and rationalization in terms of interests.<sup>11</sup> Richard Youngs goes further, stating that behind the EU's human rights promotion, the self-interested calculations and rational considerations are hidden.<sup>12</sup>

The clash between the normative approach and power politics was discussed by some other prominent academics, such as Halliday, Doyle and Brown.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, in order to open-up

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. P. 242

<sup>8</sup> Helene Sjurgen, "The EU as a 'normative' power: how can this be?," *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, no. 2 (March 2006): 235-251, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501760500451667>. P. 235

<sup>9</sup> Council of the European Union, "Prague Eastern Partnership Declaration." P. 4

<sup>10</sup> Andre (ed.) Gerrits et al., "Normative Power Europe in a Changing World: A Discussion," ed. Andre Gerrits, *Clingendael European Papers* No 5 (n.d.). P. 6

<sup>11</sup> Charlotte Wagnsson, "Divided power Europe: normative divergences among the EU 'big three'," *Journal of European Public Policy* 17, no. 8 (December 2010): 1089-1105, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501763.2010.513551>. P. 1090.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Youngs, "Normative dynamics and strategic interests in the EU's external identity," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42, no. 2 (2004): 415-435. P. 429.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. P. 420

the mentioned rational of the states as main actors of the international system, the realist theoretical framework should be applied aiming to discuss the rational part of the normative interest behind the EU's strong imagine as of the Normative Power.

### Realism – explaining security interests

It would be academically useful to discuss the EaP through the other than ideational interest of the EU by applying the realist lenses. The realism as a cornerstone of most of the international relations theories unveils the security interests of the EU Member States. The classical realists would say that 'realism defines the actors and states and sees the main processes in international relations as constituting *a search of security*, where states are monoliths with interests, and the main interest of each is the *maximization of power*.'<sup>14</sup> Hans Morgenthau stated that the international behaviour is defined by the national interests, while excluding moral sentiments and hopes.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, contrary to the previously discussed Normative Power Europe, realists disregard moral approach.

At this point, contrary to the NPE concept, we look at the level of states. The EU is not sovereign actor within the international arena, but is a vehicle for the collective interests of its member states.<sup>16</sup> The European Union is a union of the sovereign states which are expected to act as a united actor with one voice. As in many other areas, foreign policy is one of the areas where it is the most difficult to reconcile the interests of all the Member States. The states, as realist actors, are watching over their own security and survival in a competitive world of power.

In order to insure secure and stable neighbourhood the Member States cooperate. As the adversaries could best achieve their security goals through cooperation,<sup>17</sup> the Eastern Partnership and the ENP can be example for it. Aiming to establish stability and security<sup>18</sup> within their external milieu, the greater states, since they have greater stake in stability, propose regional co-operation.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, in the neo-realist language the ENP and the Eastern Partnership could be defined as the projects of cooperation.

The other explanation of the Eastern Partnership can be seen through the realist interpretation of the balance of power. Morgenthau stipulated that whenever the equilibrium is disturbed by one of the parties within the system or due to the external factor, the system shows the tendency to re-establish the equilibrium. The realists would argue that the EaP has appeared as a strategy of balance of power between the EU Member States and the Russian Federation,

---

<sup>14</sup> Hollis and Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. P. 38.

<sup>15</sup> Hans. J. Morgenthau, *Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace*, 2nd rev an. (New York: Knopf, 1954).

<sup>16</sup> Adrian Hyde-Price, "'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique," *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, no. 2 (March 2006): 217-234, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501760500451634>. P. 220.

<sup>17</sup> Glaser L. Charles, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 50-90.

<sup>18</sup> European Commission, "Strategy Paper on the European Neighbourhood Policy", 2004. P. 3

<sup>19</sup> Kenneth N Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Waltz, Kenneth N (Boston: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co, 1979).

which for a long time was and still is considered as the regional hegemon over the post-Soviet space<sup>20</sup>.

States look for opportunities to alter the balance-of-power by acquiring additional increments of power. States employ a variety of means aiming to acquire more power in the EaP countries; economic, diplomatic, or military.<sup>21</sup> Economic is about offering each EaP partner country Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area which would counterebalance the Customs Union proposed by the Russian Federation. Diplomatic balances are the annual summits with Ukraine, Civil Society Forum within the Eastern Partnership and meetings on all levels on bilateral and multilateral track of the Eastern Partnership. While military approach aims to shift the balance by stimulating cooperation with NATO, even if doing so makes Russia suspicious or hostile. The winner of this balance game gets to dominate other states in the region, therefore, for the EU Member States it is important to reinforce cooperation within the indicated fields.

### **Liberal Intergovernmentalism – opening up the ‘black box’**

The Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI) is useful in analysing the economic interests of the EU Member States in the specific policy, such as the Eastern Partnership is. The most notable is that building up on the realist assumptions, the LI also argues that the states are the rational actors, but contrary to (neo)-realism, it allows to open up the realist perception of the states as the ‘black boxes’ and look inside them. The LI allows us to discuss the national interests and preferences formation within the state. Secondly, the LI concept of power is different from the realist one, as the LI does not view state security as a dominant motivation. The main interest of state lies with the economic one; therefore, in comparison to the realist perspective, the power aspect is shifted from the security to the economic one.<sup>22</sup> The LI-ists argue that the military mobilization and spending is not essential, what is essential within this concept is the trade networks, investment, and migration. Following the thought on economic interest, Moravcsik argues that government policy on European integration is linked with the opinion of the employers in export- and import-competing sectors,<sup>23</sup> who shape the national preferences. At the later stage the States come together at the EU level to bargain for their national interest while formulating common EU trade policy towards third parties.

Acknowledging that the trade relations and economic integration is an essential part of the EU relations with the EaP country, the LI is a theoretical framework that allows us to look at the position of the EU Member States and their influence on formulation of the EU trade policy

---

<sup>20</sup> RUTH DEYERMOND, “Matrioshka hegemony? Multi-levelled hegemonic competition and security in post-Soviet Central Asia,” *Review of International Studies* 35, no. 01 (January 8, 2009): 151, [http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0260210509008365](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0260210509008365). P. 156

<sup>21</sup> John Mearsheimer, “Struggle for Power,” in *Essential Readings in World Politics*, ed. Karen A. Mingst and Jack L. Snyder, 4th ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008), 60-79.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel Wincott, “Institutional Interaction and European Integration: Towards an Everyday Critique of Liberal Intergovernmentalism,” *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 33, no. 4 (December 1995): 597-609, <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-5965.1995.tb00553.x>. P. 600.

<sup>23</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, *The choice for Europe: Social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastricht*. (New York: Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1998).

towards the EaP countries. The economic model of preference formation might also explain how the export- and import-competing sectors within one country have influenced the state policy preferences, which later has influence on the policy formation at the EU level.

## II. Linking theory and practice

Within the empirical part, three theoretical frameworks are to be applied with an aim to investigate which interests the EU Member States are dominant in supporting or not of Ukraine's integration with the EU. The following countries were chosen as a study cases: France, Germany, Sweden and Poland, as they insure geographical representation, represent new and old EU Member States with high or low interest in the EaP countries, with cooperative/antagonistic relations with the Russian Federation. Ukraine is chosen as a focus country within the Eastern Partnership, due to its importance for the EU Member States interests and progress in the contractual relations with the EU.

### Normative interest at the level of the EU Member States

As it was discussed in the previous theoretical part, the NPE concept concentrates at the EU level; however, it does not mean that in real world the Member States do not have normative interests or that they do not use NPE in order to supports other interests, such as security or economic. Within the Member States, there are states that are more normative than other, where Sweden might be an example of normative actor in the region. But also there are states that use normative cloth to promote their realist or economic interests.

### Democracy promotion within the state policy of the EU Member States

Sweden might be an example of the democracy promoter in the Eastern Partnership countries, which follows its own normative agenda. Brommesson in his work discusses the *normative* Europeanization of Sweden's foreign policy which for few decades had a reputation of the 'moral super power'.<sup>24</sup> Sweden which has built its image as a bridge-builder between capitalism and communism since 1970<sup>th</sup> has managed to keep its neutral position even after becoming EU member. It is also known for being a strong democracy-promoter, activities of which became a part of its development cooperation programme.<sup>25</sup> Sweden has what it calls 'democracy and environment<...>development assistance' with three EaP countries, namely Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova. For example, for Ukraine, Sweden has 5-year-state programme where it targets at 'more efficient and transparent public administration that is closer to European standards and European norms'.<sup>26</sup> Swedish leadership, contrary to other EU Member States, is less reluctant to openly criticize and the democratic deficit in the EaP countries. Recently Karl Bildt referring to Tymoshenko trial stated: 'Clearly this particular

---

<sup>24</sup> D. Brommesson, "Normative Europeanization: The case of Swedish foreign policy reorientation," *Cooperation and Conflict* 45, no. 2 (June 16, 2010): 224-244, <http://cac.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0010836710370246>.

<sup>25</sup> Rickard Mikaelsson, "Promoting democracy: Sweden and the democratisation process in Macedonia," *Linköping Studies in Arts and Science*, no. 446 (2008).

<sup>26</sup> Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, "Democracy and the environment at the centre of Sweden's development assistance", n.d., <http://www.sida.se/English/Countries-and-regions/Europe/Ukraine-/Our-work-in-Ukraine/>.

trial is conducted under laws that would have no place in any other European country and should have no place in a country aspiring to European membership'.<sup>27</sup>

France, Germany and Poland have less strong or no policy developed for democracy towards the Eastern European neighbours. For example, France has development programmes aimed at poverty reduction beyond continental Europe. French Human Rights programme is also aimed at other recipients than EaP countries. Germany has human right policy which it promotes within the framework of the Council of Europe.<sup>28</sup> While general German foreign policy areas cover different regions of the world, within which the Eastern Partnership countries are not covered. Poland, within its Development Assistance, 'includes activities promoting democracy in Eastern European countries'. The developed activities are included in a new Annual Strategy for Polish Foreign Assistance for 1012.<sup>29</sup> Since this is a first attempt of Poland to become a democracy promoter to the East, it's too early to say if Poland is successful in this role. So, out of this overview, one can see that only Sweden and since this year Poland have long-term state programme oriented towards the democracy promotion Eastern Partnership countries, while Sweden is and will remain for a while the biggest state contributing to democratic developments in there region, including financial contribution.

### **Tymoshenko case: EU and the Member States as Normative Power?**

Looking at the Eastern Partnership, and taking the Tymoshenko trail in Ukraine as an indicator of the EU's and its Member States reaction on the deterioration of the rule of law in one of the EaP countries, one can see that even though the EU as an entity is a main normative actor the Member States find their own role within the process. For this, one should look at the development of the Tymoshenko trail and reaction of the EU and its Member States. It is to be analysed within three stages. The first stage dates prior the announcement of the verdict on imprisonment of Tymoshenko for 7 years, which was on the October 11. 2011. The second stage is between the October 2011 and March 2012, the last date is when the scandal has focus around the mistreatment of Tymoshenko in the prison. The third period is March 2012 - till present, which has led to the discussions at the EU and Member State level on boycotting football championship co-hosted with Poland.

The first period, on one hand, this period is marked by the common EU's concern about the selective justice in Ukraine. *Externally* the EU comes as a single normative actor. The unified EU position was declared within the statement of the EU High Representative on the 26th of May 2011 who expressed 'our [EU's] concern at suggestions of political motivation behind these cases'.<sup>30</sup> The official statement was also delivered by the Enlargement Commissioner

---

<sup>27</sup> Miriam Elder, "Tymoshenko trial jeopardises Ukraine trade deal, warns EU", n.d., <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/sep/25/tymoshenko-trial-ukraine-european-union>.

<sup>28</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, "The Council of Europe", n.d., [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Aussenpolitik/Friedenspolitik/Europarat/Uebersicht\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Aussenpolitik/Friedenspolitik/Europarat/Uebersicht_node.html).

<sup>29</sup> Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Plan Współpracy Roswojowej w 2012 r.", 2012, [http://www.polskapomoc.gov.pl/files/Dokumenty\\_i\\_Publikacje/Plan\\_wspolpracy\\_2012/plan\\_2012\\_final.pdf](http://www.polskapomoc.gov.pl/files/Dokumenty_i_Publikacje/Plan_wspolpracy_2012/plan_2012_final.pdf). P. 6

<sup>30</sup> Catherine Ashton EU High Representative, *Statement by the spokesperson of EU High Representative Catherine Ashton on the case of Yulia Tymoshenko* (Brussels, n.d.), [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/122218.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/122218.pdf).

Štefan Füle. In its resolution on the Tymoshenko case, the European Parliament has also stressed on the fact that the ‘EU continues to emphasise the need for respect to be shown for the rule of law, <...> whereas the EU considers these principles especially important in a country which aspires to enter into a deeper contractual relationship based on a political association.’<sup>31</sup>

*Internally*, the EU Member States are divided. On the other hand, as there were on-going at that time negotiations on the Association Agreement and the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with Ukraine, the question was if the EU should initialize the agreements or not. *Internally* there was a division between the positions of the EU Member States within the Council on two camps. Germany and France were the main advocates of the idea that the establishment of the rule of law which would be viewed in freeing the political prisoners in Ukraine. It was a necessary precondition for signing agreements for those countries, as rule of law and impartial judiciary system would reassure their businesses and secure national investment in Ukraine.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, they were suggesting waiting for the verdict of the court first on the Tymoshenko case.

Poland was strongly promoting signature and ratification of the Association Agreement and the DCFTA. The main argument of Poland was based on its experience of integrating with the EU in the 1990<sup>th</sup>, where by means of the offered EU instruments and support it has managed to develop into the democratic state. The democratisation of the Ukraine would be significantly fostered via deep integration with the EU. This argument, which was suggesting that the cooperation with almost an authoritarian regime would be more ‘normative’ than punishing it<sup>33</sup> by non-signing, was gaining support within the Council members from the Eastern European Member States and the United Kingdom. Poland, as well, as other CEE countries which view Russia as security threat, aimed at binding Ukraine with the contractual relations and taking it out of the Russia’s sphere of influence. So, what one can see, is even if there is an external unity of the EU Member States on the issue of rule of law in Ukraine, internally, due to classing economic interest (of Germany and France) and security ones (Poland and CEE) – the vision on whether to sign or not was argued differently. The common feature was that both camps used the normative statement to hide their economic or security interests.

The second stage has started after the October 11 verdict, when Tymoshenko was found guilty in the abuse of office charges and was condemned to imprisonment for seven years. This period is marked by the reinforced normative stand of the EU, but still with minor manifestation of the normative positions of the states. The disappointment on the verdict was expressed both on the EU leadership and to limited extent by the Member States. On the day of the announcement of the verdict Barroso stated that ‘We are deeply disappointed with the

---

<sup>31</sup> Resolution of the European Parliament, *Ukraine: the cases of Yulia Tymoshenko and other members of the former government* (Strasbourg, n.d.),

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2011-0272&language=EN>.

<sup>32</sup> From an interview with a French and German diplomat, Brussels, February - March 2012.

<sup>33</sup>S. Daniel Hamilton et al., *Who is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor?*, ed. Natalie Tocci (Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 2008). P. 9.

verdict in Tymoshenko's case, <...> stressing that the level of economic integration with the European Union and <...> the political association is a response to the level of human rights and rule of law in Ukraine'. Some Member States have made short political communiques on the website of the Foreign Affairs condemning the imprisonment at the most. So, at this level strong statements of the Member States were absent.

The last stage, which has started in March 2012, was provoked by the mistreatment of the former Prime Minister in prison. The event has triggered not only rapid condemnation by the EU leadership, but due to the gravity of the situation the leaderships of the Member States have expressed their strong concern. At the EU level, the EU political leaders, namely President Herman Van Rompuy, European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso, have all said that they will not attend any match in Ukraine as a sign of protest. Special actions were taken by the Member States. As a political instrument of pressure nine leaders from Central Europe did not attend the May summit hosted by the Ukraine in Yalta. Boycotting is supported by the Member States ministers, for example French Minister of Sports supported by other ministers will not attend championship in Ukraine. Germany's development minister has announced his non-attendance. Swedish Ministers have not decided yet. What we can see is that the democratic norms that were restated on the EU level have shaped what was after repeated as the domestic vision EU Member States.<sup>34</sup> The only state that is opposing boycotting is Polish President and Prime Minister as according to them the boycotting would be a failure of the diplomacy. Again, the realist interpretation of the behaviour is that boycotting Euro 2012 would lead to isolation of Ukraine and its potential fall under the influence of the Russian Federation.

Even though, the NPE is theoretical concept in development, the empirical evidence shows that the EU Member States, such as Sweden and since recently Poland follow their normative agenda in the EaP. Therefore, the NPE concept should fill in the gap try to find the place for the States. The second brief conclusion of this empirical part is that the EU Member States use the normative connotation in order to cover their security or economic interest. Therefore, those aspects are to be discussed in the upcoming parts.

### **Realist interests**

The EU Member States have common interest in secured and stable neighbourhood – and this agenda they are united. In present days, the EaP countries are characterised by recurring political instability and the weak governance which provokes the transnational criminal activity.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, these region hosts three '(un)-frozen conflicts' in the region. Insuring the 'stability and security in the neighbourhood'<sup>36</sup> is becoming even more challenging with the presence of the military troops of the Russian Federation in all the EaP countries, excluding Belarus.

---

<sup>34</sup>Rosemary Foot, *Rights beyond Borders: the Global Community and the Struggle over Human Rights*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). P. 9.

<sup>35</sup> George Christou, "European Union security logics to the east: the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership," *European Security* 19, no. 3 (September 2010): 413-430, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09662839.2010.526110>. P. 413

<sup>36</sup> European Commission, "Strategy Paper on the European Neighbourhood Policy." P. 3

The EU Member States become disunited on the role of the Russian Federation in the region. For some Member States, Russia is a security ally and a partner insuring energy security, therefore, the cooperation with the EaP partner countries and Ukraine specifically should be limited to the 'non-teasing' policy of Russia. To other EU Member States – Russia is a direct security threat, therefore, giving membership prospective to the EaP partner countries and especially to Ukraine is a good example of maximization of power according to the realists. Nevertheless, each EU Member State has its own realist interest in supporting or not deep integration with the region.

*France*, being highly dependent on nuclear power, views the Russian as a potential provider for its domestic market of energy consumption.<sup>37</sup> But there is other realist consideration. France was hostile to idea of the Eastern Dimension from the beginning, as French security interest lies mainly with the Southern Neighbourhood. The argument of France was that the Eastern Dimension would take political attention and money from the Southern Neighbourhood. Therefore, in 2003 it has insisted on the inclusion of the new Eastern European neighbours into the European Neighbourhood Policy. On one hand, France has insured equal distribution of financial resources between the South and East. On the other, it aimed to stop the enlargement to the East. In 2009, the French support for the EaP was negotiated as a trade-off for CEECs' support of the Union for Mediterranean.

*Germany* views Ukraine and the Eastern Partnership policy as a bridge between EU and Russia.<sup>38</sup> Germany, whose gets 42% of gas from Russia, has strong interest in securing the energy supply and maintaining friendly relationships with the Russian Federation. Therefore, together with France, German has blocked NATO membership of Ukraine and Georgia in 2008. Germany has also blocked NATO membership of the Baltic States fearing the alienating Russia, but after it was backing the process. Germany was behind a number of the integration projects, such as 2004 enlargement and the Eastern Partnership. Even though, only Poland and Sweden are two countries that are known as the founding countries of this project, Germany was supporting and putting its political weight behind in negotiations to launch the Eastern Partnership.<sup>39</sup>

*Poland* views Russia as a potential aggressor and threat for the security. 32% Poles believe that Russia is responsible for Smolensk tragedy<sup>40</sup> which means that 1/3 of the respondents view Russia not only as a not-friendly neighbour, but also as a country responsible for a death of its political elite. And only 12% consider that the Polish-Russian relations are good.<sup>41</sup> In 2010, according to Wikileaks cables published in Guardians, Poland was scared more of the Russia than of Syria, therefore, it has supported an idea of the establishment of the PRO

---

<sup>37</sup> Diana Bozhilova and Tom Hashimoto, "EU–Russia energy negotiations: a choice between rational self-interest and collective action," *European Security* 19, no. 4 (December 2010): 627-642, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09662839.2010.528406>. P. 628.

<sup>38</sup> From the interview with the German diplomat, April, 2012.

<sup>39</sup> From the interview with the Polish diplomat, March 2011.

<sup>40</sup> "Polacy coraz gorzej o Rosjanach", n.d., <http://wiadomosci.wp.pl/kat,1342,title,Polacy-coraz-gorzej-o-Rosjanach,wid,13244204,wiadomosc.html>.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

missiles on its territory.<sup>42</sup> Poland supports the membership of Ukraine and other EaP partner countries, as it would counter-balance Russia in the security aspect by admitting Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia into the EU club.

*Sweden's* security policy has changed since the Cold War according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but in reality it has changed after the 2004 enlargement. Within this enlargement, the security circle of Nordic countries was completed with the EU and/or NATO membership of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Sweden which has officially declared a non-alignment in peacetime aiming at neutrality in case of a war, in reality it aligns with the Western politics which also include the constant contact with NATO. When it comes to the Eastern Partnership, the aim of Sweden is rather neutral – stabilization of the neighbourhood through the democracy promotion, up to the officially declared support of the membership prospective for Ukraine. Therefore, even not having strong security interest in the integration of the Eastern Partnership countries with the EU, Sweden, having positively experienced the stabilization of the region with the 2004 enlargement, is a strong proponent of bringing security in the Eastern neighbourhood through the enlargement.

### Liberal Intergovernmentalism

The LI approach to the state interest preference formation is based on the economic size, population, abundance of mineral resources, where Ukraine has obvious advantage. The Eastern Partnership countries are interested in the trade agreement with the EU due to the massive economic pool.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) might be economically beneficial for most of the states, excluding Sweden.

Firstly, the current trade flow for the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of 2011 of France, Germany and Poland with Ukraine suggests that Ukraine is an important trade and economic partner for the EU Member States. These countries are in a list of top ten exporters for Ukraine; and each of these countries has leadership in specific field. France is a top exporter for pharmaceutical and cosmetic products, Germany for industrial products, while Poland for electric machinery. Therefore, taking into consideration that these countries supply products for a 50 million population, one can argue that Ukraine is an important trading partner for the mentioned countries in those areas. At the same time, Swedish export to Ukraine takes only a share of 0.3% of its total state export, meaning the economic interest of Sweden in Ukraine is marginal.

	<b>Export</b>	<b>Import</b>
France <sup>44</sup>	400,3 M€	291,4 M€
Germany	5338 M€ <sup>45</sup>	3,432,6 M€

<sup>42</sup> Ian Traynor, "WikiLeaks cables: Poland wants missile shield to protect against Russia," *Guardian*, n.d., <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/06/wikileaks-cables-poland-russia-shield>.

<sup>43</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe, the Second Superpower," *A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs* (n.d.). P. 95

<sup>44</sup> Trésor Direction Général de la République France, "Les échanges commerciaux entre la France et l'Ukraine au premier semestre 2011", n.d., <http://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/File/330267>.

<sup>45</sup> Statistisches Bundesamt, "Ukraine", 2012, <https://www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/CountriesRegions/InternationalStatistics/Country/Europe/Ukraine.html>.

Poland <sup>46</sup>	2094,2 M USD	1362 M USD
Sweden <sup>47*</sup>	425 M€	67 M€

The second differences between the three mentioned countries and Sweden, is that they are good and product oriented, while Sweden has its share in services. Germany's main export products to Ukraine are machinery, motor vehicles, chemical and pharmaceutical products, electrical goods, foodstuffs and animal feed. France exports to Ukraine chemicals, perfumery, as well as mechanic equipment, electric materials, as well as agricultural products and materials. While Poland gains from trade with Ukraine by exporting electric machinery, chemical products, and some products of metallurgical production, Sweden's business in Ukraine is represented by 3 banks and some types of mainly of financial and service oriented businesses.

An interesting fact is that Poland has almost identical market that the one of Ukraine, as both of the markets are dominant by agricultural products. While labour cost in Poland is lower than in the EU Member State, comparing to Ukraine, the labour cost is higher in Poland. Therefore, the products for agricultural products are of higher price in Poland than they are in Ukraine. As a result, Poland sees strong competitions from Ukraine, when the DCFTA will enter into force. Never the less, Poland stays a strong proponent of Ukraine's signature of the DCFTA due to its geopolitical consideration.

The common for all the states judgement is that DCFTA with Ukraine will boost trade in already exist existing areas of cooperation, but it will also open new possibilities for cooperation. From economical point of view, Poland would be the country that would suffer the most due to the identical markets. Sweden would suffer the least, as its economic interest is marginal. For France and Germany it is an opportunity to intensify trade within the cooperation areas, but also to explore new ones.

## Conclusion

Analysing the Eastern Partnership by means of three theoretical concepts was analytically useful due to two reasons. Firstly, each theoretical framework has manifested shortcomings which were compensated by the application of further theoretical framework. Secondly, while building a bridge between theoretical and empirical parts, the complex overview of the diverse Member State interests towards Ukraine was possible only due to the simultaneous application of the theoretical concepts, since each theoretical approach concentrated on normative, security or economic interest of the Member States.

To start with concluding on the shortcomings, the article has proven that the theoretical concept of Normative Power Europe is not enough to explain the Eastern Partnership. The first major shortcoming is that the NPE is its focus on the EU level and does not allow us to

<sup>46</sup> Ambasada Rzeczypospolitej Polski w Ukrainie, "Wymiana handlowa pomiędzy Polską a Ukrainą", 2011, [http://kiev.trade.gov.pl/pl/ukraine/article/detail,419,Wymiana\\_handlowa\\_pomiedzy\\_Polska\\_a\\_Ukraina.html](http://kiev.trade.gov.pl/pl/ukraine/article/detail,419,Wymiana_handlowa_pomiedzy_Polska_a_Ukraina.html).

<sup>47</sup> Swedish Statistics, "Foreign trade - exports and imports of goods", 2012, [http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart\\_\\_\\_\\_142266.aspx](http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart____142266.aspx).

focus on the normative aspect of the Member States. The empirical analysis of normative interests of the Member States has showed that some of them have normative agenda and that they could be considered as the democracy promoters based on their state activities. The second shortcoming of the NPE in the context of this article is that the concept of power is ideational which is opposing the security or economic interests. While the realists argue that the Member States will only allow the EU to act as the source for shared ethical concerns as long as this does not conflict with their core national interests, such as security ones.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, the realists compensate shortcoming of the NPE bringing our attention to the states, as the main actors in international system, actions of which are based on their security interest.

The main limitation of the realist theory is that it views states as the black boxes, within which the states are rational and follow the only the aim of the power-maximization. The realists do not look inside the states, seeking for other interests and preferences, as the ‘pressures from the international competition weigh more heavily than ideological preferences or internal political pressures’<sup>49</sup>. Therefore, even though, the realists take into consideration that there are other interests, those interests are not as important taking into consideration the geopolitical pressure. Therefore, the liberal intergovernmentalism steps in facilitating opening the ‘black box’ of the Member States and allowing the analysis of the economic interests of the EU Member States on bringing Ukraine closer to the EU. The major shortcoming of the liberal intergovernmentalism is that it undermines security concerns of the Member States, as according to Moravcsik, the Member States are driven mainly by the economic interest and domestic concerns.

The main findings of the article are as following. Firstly, the Member States to a big extend hide behind normative interest, attempting to insure their security (in case of Poland) or economic interest (in case of France and Germany). Whereas, when the economic interests are higher than the security one, the Member States stand firmly behind the EU as a Normative Power. In this case, the norm promotion in Ukraine and the eventual establishment of the rule of law is viewed as a guarantee for their investment and protection of their national business in Ukraine. Whereas, when security interest is high, the Member State cedes its economic interest for the sake of security and disregard normative interest. This case is proven by Poland, which is willing to open its less competitive market to the similar Ukrainian one, aiming at embracing Ukraine into the deep political and economic cooperation with the EU and taking it away from Russia. If the state has neither strong security nor economic interest, it can become a democracy promoter, such as Sweden is in the region.

Therefore, the application of the three theoretical concepts for the case of Ukraine was useful, as it helped to unveil different aspects of interests of the EU Member States in deep integration of Ukraine and the EaP in general. The article failed to explain what the potential *finalité* of Ukraine within the Eastern Partnership might be, as the findings on the current

---

<sup>48</sup> Hyde-Price, “‘Normative’ power Europe: a realist critique.” P. 223.

<sup>49</sup> Kenneth N Waltz, “Reflections on Theory of International Politics. A Response to My Critics,” in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert Owen Keohane (Columbia University Press, 1986). P. 329.

Member States' interests cannot explain if the Member States would opt for offering the membership prospective or not.

## Bibliography

- Ambasada Rzeczypospolitej Polski w Ukrainie. "Wymiana handlowa pomiędzy Polską a Ukrainą", 2011.  
[http://kiev.trade.gov.pl/pl/ukraine/article/detail,419,Wymiana\\_handlowa\\_pomiedzy\\_Polska\\_a\\_Ukraina.html](http://kiev.trade.gov.pl/pl/ukraine/article/detail,419,Wymiana_handlowa_pomiedzy_Polska_a_Ukraina.html).
- Ashton EU High Representative, Catherine. *Statement by the spokesperson of EU High Representative Catherine Ashton on the case of Yulia Tymoshenko*. Brussels, n.d.  
[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/122218.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/122218.pdf).
- Bozhilova, Diana, and Tom Hashimoto. "EU–Russia energy negotiations: a choice between rational self-interest and collective action." *European Security* 19, no. 4 (December 2010): 627-642.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09662839.2010.528406>.
- Brommesson, D. "Normative Europeanization: The case of Swedish foreign policy reorientation." *Cooperation and Conflict* 45, no. 2 (June 16, 2010): 224-244.  
<http://cac.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0010836710370246>.
- Charles, Glaser L. "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help." *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 50-90.
- Christou, George. "European Union security logics to the east: the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership." *European Security* 19, no. 3 (September 2010): 413-430.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09662839.2010.526110>.
- Council of the European Union. "Prague Eastern Partnership Declaration", n.d.
- DEYERMOND, RUTH. "Matrioshka hegemony? Multi-levelled hegemonic competition and security in post-Soviet Central Asia." *Review of International Studies* 35, no. 01 (January 8, 2009): 151.  
[http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0260210509008365](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0260210509008365).
- Elder, Miriam. "Tymoshenko trial jeopardises Ukraine trade deal, warns EU", n.d.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/sep/25/tymoshenko-trial-ukraine-european-union>.
- European Commission. "Strategy Paper on the European Neighbourhood Policy", 2004.
- Foot, Rosemary. *Rights beyond Borders: the Global Community and the Struggle over Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gerrits, Andre (ed.), L. Aggestam, Ian Manners, and and others. "Normative Power Europe in a Changing World: A Discussion." Edited by Andre Gerrits. *Clingendael European Papers* No 5 (n.d.).
- Hamilton, S. Daniel, Radha Kumar, Andrey S. Makarychev, Nathalie Tocci, and Brantly and others Womack. *Who is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor?* Edited by Natalie Tocci. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 2008.

- Hay, Colin. *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Hollis, Martin, and Steve Smith. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Hurrell, Andrew. "Norms and Ethics in International Relations." In *Handbook in International Relations*, edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Beth A. Simmons, and Thomas Risse, 573. London: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Hyde-Price, Adrian. "'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, no. 2 (March 2006): 217-234.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501760500451634>.
- Manners, Ian. "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms." *Journal of common market studies* 40, no. 2 (2002): 238-239.
- Mearsheimer, John. "Struggle for Power." In *Essential Readings in World Politics*, edited by Karen A. Mingst and Jack L. Snyder, 60-79. 4th ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.
- Mikaelsson, Rickard. "Promoting democracy: Sweden and the democratisation process in Macedonia." *Linköping Studies in Arts and Science*, no. 446 (2008).
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany. "The Council of Europe", n.d. [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Aussenpolitik/Friedenspolitik/Europarat/Uebersicht\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Aussenpolitik/Friedenspolitik/Europarat/Uebersicht_node.html).
- Moravcsik, Andrew. "Europe, the Second Superpower." *A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs* (n.d.).
- . *The choice for Europe: Social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastricht*. New York: Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Morgenthau, Hans. J. *Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace*. 2nd rev an. New York: Knopf, 1954.
- "Polacy coraz gorzej o Rosjanach", n.d. <http://wiadomosci.wp.pl/kat,1342,title,Polacy-coraz-gorzej-o-Rosjanach,wid,13244204,wiadomosc.html>.
- Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Plan Współpracy Roswojowej w 2012 r.", 2012.  
[http://www.polskapomoc.gov.pl/files/Dokumenty\\_i\\_Publikacje/Plan\\_wspolpracy\\_2012/plan\\_2012\\_final.pdf](http://www.polskapomoc.gov.pl/files/Dokumenty_i_Publikacje/Plan_wspolpracy_2012/plan_2012_final.pdf).
- Resolution of the European Parliament. *Ukraine: the cases of Yulia Tymoshenko and other members of the former government*. Strasbourg, n.d.  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2011-0272&language=EN>.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. "Europeanization beyond Europe Imprint / Terms of Use." *Integration The Vlsi Journal* 4, no. 3 (2009): 1-28.

- Sjursen, Helene. "The EU as a 'normative' power: how can this be?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, no. 2 (March 2006): 235-251.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501760500451667>.
- Statistisches Bundesamt. "Ukraine", 2012.  
<https://www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/CountriesRegions/InternationalStatistics/Country/Europe/Ukraine.html>.
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. "Democracy and the environment at the centre of Sweden's development assistance", n.d. <http://www.sida.se/English/Countries-and-regions/Europe/Ukraine-/Our-work-in-Ukraine/>.
- Swedish Statistics. "Foreign trade - exports and imports of goods", 2012.  
[http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart\\_\\_\\_\\_142266.aspx](http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart____142266.aspx).
- Traynor, Ian. "WikiLeaks cables: Poland wants missile shield to protect against Russia." *Guardian*, n.d.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/06/wikileaks-cables-poland-russia-shield>.
- Trésor Direction Général de la République France. "Les échanges commerciaux entre la France et l'Ukraine au premier semestre 2011", n.d. <http://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/File/330267>.
- Wagnsson, Charlotte. "Divided power Europe: normative divergences among the EU 'big three'." *Journal of European Public Policy* 17, no. 8 (December 2010): 1089-1105.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501763.2010.513551>.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Reflections on Theory of International Politics. A Response to My Critics." In *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert Owen Keohane. Columbia University Press, 1986.
- . *Theory of International Politics*. Waltz, Kenneth N. Boston: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co, 1979.
- Wincott, Daniel. "Institutional Interaction and European Integration: Towards an Everyday Critique of Liberal Inter governmentalism." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 33, no. 4 (December 1995): 597-609. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-5965.1995.tb00553.x>.
- Youngs, Richard. "Normative dynamics and strategic interests in the EU's external identity." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42, no. 2 (2004): 415-435.