

Edited by

Caterina Carta and Jean-Frédéric Morin



ASHGATE

EU Foreign Policy through the Lens of Discourse Analysis

Making Sense of Diversity



**The
Globalisation,
Europe, Multilateralism
Series**



The
**Globalisation,
Europe, Multilateralism**
Series

Leading scholars in discourse analysis and European foreign policy join forces in this book, marking a real breakthrough in the literature. Not only do they offer original perspectives on European foreign policy, but they bring together various theories on foreign policy discourses that remain too often isolated from each other.

This theoretical diversity is clearly reflected in the book's four-pronged structure: Part I – *Post-structuralist Approaches* (with contributions from Thomas Diez, Henrik Larsen and Beste Isleyne); Part II – *Constructivist Approaches* (with contributions from Knud Erik Jørgensen, Jan Orbie, Ferdi de Ville, Esther Barbé, Anna Herranz-Surrallés and Michal Natorski); Part III – *Critical Discourse Analytical Approaches* (with contributions from Senem Aydin-Düzgit, Amelie Kutter, Ruth Wodak, Salomi Boukala, and Caterina Carta); Part IV– *Discursive Institutional Approach* (with contributions from Ben Rosamond, Antoine Rayroux, and Vivien A. Schmidt).

The volume is the first full-length study on how to apply different discourse analytical approaches and methodologies to European foreign policy. The paperback edition makes for a unique selling point as a course text.

Honouring both the plurality and fecundity that characterises discursive approaches, this book demonstrates the pertinence of focussing on discourses, in their many different hues, for understanding one of the most salient developments of the contemporary international system: the production, reproduction and transformation of Europe. It will be of great interest all at once to students and scholars interested in the role of language in international politics, the workings of international governance, or indeed in the great European project.

Charlotte Epstein, University of Sydney, Australia

With its unique collection of essays, this book celebrates two kinds of diversity: the highly diverse discursive environment that constitutes the EU's multifaceted identities, and the many academic approaches to analysing these multiple intersecting narratives. A fascinating read celebrating what we need to accept as the EU's irredeemable polyphony.

Kalypso Nicolaidis, University of Oxford, UK

This book represents an excellent contribution to the literature. First, it unpacks discourse analysis and demonstrates the diversity of the various discursive approaches. Second, it uses these discourse analytical lenses to shed new light on EU foreign policy. Essential reading for anybody interested in the application of discourse analysis to 'real world' issues!

Thomas Risse, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Caterina Carta is Assistant Professor at Vesalius College (VUB) and **Jean-Frédéric Morin** is Professor of International Relations at the Université libre de Bruxelles.

ASHGATE

Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East, Union Road,
Farnham, Surrey,
GU9 7PT, England

www.ashgate.com

ISBN 978-1-4094-6375-7



9 781409 463757

Contents

List of Figures and Table

List of Abbreviations

Notes of Contributors

Acknowledgment

Introduction: EU's Foreign Policy through the Lenses of Discourse Analysis

Caterina Carta and Jean-Frederic Morin

PART I: POST-STRUCTURALIST APPROACHES

1. Speaking Europe, Drawing Boundaries: Reflections on the Role of Discourse in EU Foreign Policy and Identity

Thomas Diez

2. Continuity or Change in National Foreign Policy Discourses Post-Lisbon? The Case of Denmark

Henrik Larsen

3. EU External Action on Counter-Terrorism: A Discourse Theory Approach

Beste Isleyne

PART II: CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACHES

4. Constructing European Diplomacy in a Changing World

Knud Erik Jørgensen

5. ‘A Boost to our Economies that Doesn’t Cost a Cent’: EU Trade Policy Discourse since the Crisis

Jan Orbie and Ferdi de Ville

6. Model, Player or Instrument for Global Governance: Metaphors in the Discourse and Practice of EU Foreign Policy

Esther Barbé, Anna Herranz-Surrallés and Michal Natorksi

PART III: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYTICAL APPROACHES

7. Unravelling European Union Foreign Policy through Critical Discourse Analysis: Guidelines for Research

Senem Aydin-Düzgit

8. (De-)Constructing the EU as a Civilising Power: CFSP/CSDP and the Constitutional Debate in Poland and France

Amelie Kutter

9. Talking about Solidarity and Security in the Age of Crisis: The Revival of Nationalism and Protectionism in the European Union – a Discourse-Historical Approach

Ruth Wodak and Salomi Boukala

10. From the ‘Magnificent Castle’ to the Brutish State of Nature: Use of Metaphors

and the Analysis of the EU's International Discourse

Caterina Carta

PART IV: DISCURSIVE INSTITUTIONALIST APPROACHES

11. The EU's Normative Power and Three Modes of Liberal Communicative Discourse

Ben Rosamond

12. Understanding 'Constructive Ambiguity' of European Defence Policy: A Discursive Institutional Perspective

Antoine Rayroux

13. EU Leaders' Ideas and Discourse in the Eurozone Crisis: A Discursive Institutional Analysis

Vivien A. Schmidt

Index

List of Figures and Tables

Figure

Figure 5.1 Constructivism and (meta)theoretical perspective

Tables

Table I.1 Actors, competences and ability to speak at the international level

Table 2.1 Articulations of actorness before and after the Lisbon Treaty

Table 3.1 Three central constructions around EU counter-terrorism governance

Table 6.1 Frequency of discursive elements conceptualised as ‘model’, ‘player’ or ‘instrument’

Table 6.2 Examples of metaphorical expressions of the EU as “model”

Table 6.3 Summary of the analysis of the metaphors of the EU’s global role

Table 8.1 Strategies of legitimation

Table 8.2 Salient topics of EU reform in opinion articles 2002–2004 (in % of N)

Table 10.1 Metaphors and related EU tropes

Table 11.1 The EU’s modes of liberalism

Table 11.2 Tentative classification of EU external intervention by mode

Table 12.2 Constructive ambiguity and the national discourse

Table 13.1 Ideas in the Eurozone discourse

Table 12.2 Constructive ambiguity and the national discourse

Table 13.2 Different levels of generality of ideas in discourse and rates / mechanisms of change

Table 13.3 Discursive interactions in coordinative sphere

Table 13.4 Discursive interactions in the communicative sphere

List of Abbreviations

AP	Attentive public
CDA	Critical discourse analysis
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
CTC	Counter-Terrorism Coordinator
DA	Discourse analysis
DG	Directorates-General
DHA	Discourse-historical approach
DI	Discursive institutionalism
ECB	European Central Bank
EEAS	European External Action Service
EFSF	European Financial Stability Facility
EMU	European Monetary Union
EP	European Parliament
EPC	European Political Cooperation
EU	European Union
FPA	Foreign Policy Analysis
HR	High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
IHEDN	Institut des hautes études de défense nationale
IR	international relations

JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
MS	Member states
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPE	Normative Power Europe
POE	Policy and opinion elite
R2P	Responsibility to protect
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
US	United States of America
WTO	World Trade Organization

Notes on Contributors

Senem Aydin-Düzgit is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Relations at Istanbul Bilgi University. She received her PhD in Political Science at the Free University of Brussels (VUB), obtained an MSc in European Politics and Policy from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and a BA in Political Science and International Relations from Bogazici University. Her principle research interests include EU enlargement, EU-Turkey relations, discourse studies, politics of identity and democratisation. Her articles have been published in *West European Politics, Cooperation and Conflict*, *South European Society and Politics*, *Alternatives*, *Journal of International Relations* and *Politique Européenne*. She is the author of *Constructions of European Identity: Debates and Discourses on Turkey and the EU* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Esther Barbé is Professor of International Relations at the Autonomous University of Barcelona and Coordinator of the IBEI research programme "Security, Power and Multilateralism in a Globalised World". She has been a visiting fellow at the London School of Economics, Sciences-Po and the University of Cambridge. Her research areas focus on Spanish foreign policy, EU foreign policy, Euro-Mediterranean relations, international security, power transition in the international system and multilateralism. She has published several books and articles in Spanish and international journals, such as *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Foreign Affairs-Mexico*, *European Foreign Affairs Review*, *International Affairs*, *Mediterranean Politics* and *Cooperation and Conflict*.

Salomi Boukala has worked as an international news specialist for various media in Greece and still contributes to Greek newspapers. She is currently a PhD candidate at Lancaster

University; and her research centers on issues of European identity and Greek media discourses, with particular reference to the discursive construction of supranational and national identities and the representation of the ‘Other’. She holds an MA in Media and Mass Communication from the University of Leicester, UK and a BA in Social Anthropology and Social Policy from Panteion University, Athens. She has also worked as a research associate at the Academy of Athens on the ‘Greek media representation of migrants’ project. Her research interests include Critical Discourse Analysis and Discourse Historical Approach; argumentation strategies; identity politics and media studies.

Caterina Carta is assistant professor at Vesalius College (VUB). She holds a Ph.D. in Comparative and European Politics from the University of Siena. She is associated researcher at the Institute d'études européennes (IEE) at ULB, Brussels. Her articles have been published in *Cooperation and Conflict*, *the British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *European Foreign Affairs Review*. She is author of *The European Union's diplomatic Service: Ideas, Preferences and Identities* (Routledge, 2012).

Thomas Diez is Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Tübingen. He received his PhD from the University of Mannheim in 1999. From 1997 to 2000, he was Research Fellow at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute and subsequently, from 2000 to 2009, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and then Professor of International Relations and Head of Department at the University of Birmingham. He joined Tübingen in April 2009. Diez has also taught in Copenhagen, Aarhus, Munich and Victoria (BC). Among his most recent publications are *Key Concepts in International Relations* (co-author, Sage 2011), *An Introduction to International Relations Theory: Perspectives and Themes* (co-author, third edition Pearson 2010), *European Integration Theory* (co-editor, second edition Oxford UP 2009) and *Cyprus: A*

Conflict at the Crossroads (co-editor, Manchester UP 2009). In September 2009, he received the Anna Lindh Award for his contribution to the field of European Foreign and Security Policy Studies.

Anna Herranz-Surrallés is Lecturer in International Relations at Maastricht University. Her research addresses the external relations and foreign policy of the EU, focusing on aspects such as the international promotion and diffusion of norms and policies, the practices of legitimation and democratic control of foreign and security policy, and the concepts of governance and diplomacy, especially as applied to the domain of energy policy. Her work has appeared in journals such as the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Mediterranean Politics*, *Cooperation & Conflict* and *Journal of European Public Policy*.

Beste Isleyen is a PhD candidate and lecturer in the Department of Political Science at the University of Tuebingen / Germany. Her research interests include critical approaches to international relations, especially foreign relations of the European Union (EU), post-structuralist discourse theory and conflict research. Isleyen writes her PhD dissertation on EU policy towards the peace process between Israelis and Palestinians by drawing upon Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality.

Knud Erik Jørgensen (PhD) is a professor in the Department of Political Science at Aarhus University. He teaches International Relations theory, European foreign policy and European Studies. He chairs the European International Studies Association (EISA) and is co-editor of the Palgrave Studies in International Relations and associate editor of *Journal of European Integration*. Publications include authored and edited books, including (co-edited with Mark Pollack and Ben Rosamond) *Handbook of European Union Politics* (Sage 2007); *International Relations Theory: A New Introduction* (Palgrave 2010); co-edited with Katie Laatikainen, *Handbook*

on the European Union and international Institutions: Performance, Policy, Power (Routledge 2013).

Articles have been published in leading journals such as the *European Journal of International Relations*.

Amelie Kutter (Ph.D) is researcher at the Cultural Political Economy Research Centre, Department of Sociology, Lancaster University. She is working on management and discourses of the current financial and economic crisis in the Eurozone, UK, US, and Germany. She holds a PhD (European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Odra) and a MA (Diplom, Free University Berlin) in political science. She has lectured, researched and published on the financial crisis, European integration, postsocialist transformation, and transnational political communication at Lancaster University, FU Berlin, EUV, TU Dresden, CERI/Sciences Po. She specialises in discourse studies and methods of textual analysis.

Henrik Larsen is Associate Professor of International Relations and holds the Jean Chair in European Foreign and Security Policy Integration at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. He has previously published *Discourse Analysis and Foreign Policy: France, Britain and Europe* (1997), *The ESDP and the Nordic Countries: Four Variations on a Theme* (With Nina Græger and Hanna Ojanen, 2002) and *Analysing Small State Foreign Policy in the EU: The Case of Denmark* (2005).

Jean-Frédéric Morin is professor of international relations at the Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB) where he teaches international political economy, foreign policy analysis, and global environmental politics. His current research projects explore the global politics of intellectual property rights as well as the international biodiversity regime. His work has been published in leading journals such as *International Studies Review*, *Global Governance*, *European Journal of International Politics*, *Review of International Political Economy*, and *Review of International Studies*.

Michal Natorki is Senior Research Fellow at the European Neighbourhood Policy Chair, College of Europe, Natolin Campus. He was an Associate Lecturer in International Relations at the Autonomous University of Barcelona as well as Visiting Scholar at the London School of Economics, the Aberystwyth University, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, and Free University of Berlin. His articles have appeared in *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Cooperation and Conflict*, *East European Politics*, *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, *European Political Economy Review*, and *Journal of Constitutional Law in Eastern and Central Europe*.

Jan Orbie (Ph.D) is professor in the rank of senior lecturer at the Centre for EU Studies, Department of Political Science at Ghent University in Belgium. He lectures several courses in the Master for EU Studies at Ghent University, including Theories of European Integration, European External Policies, and EU Trade Politics. His research focuses on the international policies of the EU, in particular EU trade and development policies. He is the author of numerous chapters, articles and edited books on EU trade politics and development, the EU's global social policy, and EU democracy promotion. He is also supervising several research projects in the field of EU external relations. Jan Orbie is co-director of the Centre for EU Studies, Erasmus coordinator of the Department of Political Science, and a member of the Research Council of Ghent University.

Antoine Rayroux is a Fulbright-Schuman postdoctoral researcher at Georgetown University for the academic year 2013-2014. He holds a Ph.D in political science from the Université de Montréal (CEPSI) and the Université libre de Bruxelles (REPI). His research mostly deals with the Europeanisation of defence policies in France and Ireland, within the framework of European Union military interventions. He is interested in security studies, international peace operations in Africa, and sociological approaches to European integration and international

relations.

Ben Rosamond is Professor of Political Science and Deputy Director of the Centre for European Politics at the University of Copenhagen. He is also editor of the journal *Comparative European Politics* and principal investigator on a major new interdisciplinary research programme entitled *Europe's New Global Challenges: Market, Law and Society* ('EuroChallenge'). He is author or editor of some six books, among them *Theories of European Integration* (Palgrave Macmillan 2000), *Handbook of European Union Politics* (Sage 2007, ed. with Knud Erik Jørgensen and Mark A. Pollack) and *New Regionalism and the European Union: Dialogue, Comparison and New Research Directions* (Routledge 2011, ed. with Alex Warleigh-Lack and Nick Robinson). His work on theorizing European and regional integration, the role of ideas in European economic integration and sub-disciplinary pathologies in political science has been published in journals such as *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *Cooperation and Conflict*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *International Affairs*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *New Political Economy*, *Political Studies* and *Review of International Political Economy*.

Vivien A. Schmidt is Jean Monnet Professor of European Integration, Professor of International Relations and Political Science at Boston University, and Founding Director of BU's Center for the Study of Europe. She received her MA and PhD from the University of Chicago, her BA from Bryn Mawr College, and also attended Sciences Po, Paris. Schmidt has published widely on European political economy, institutions, and democracy, most recently on the Eurozone crisis. Recent books include the forthcoming *Resilient Liberalism: European Political Economy through Boom and Bust* (co-edited, Cambridge 2013), *Debating Political Identity and Legitimacy in the European Union* (co-edited, Routledge 2011), *Democracy in Europe* (Oxford 2006),

and *The Futures of European Capitalism* (Oxford 2002). Recent honors, awards, and fellowships include an honorary doctorate from the Free University of Brussels (ULB), the Belgian Franqui Interuniversity Chair, and a Visiting Professorship at the Free University of Berlin.

Ferdi De Ville holds a Ph.d (2011) in political science at Ghent University. In his dissertation he analysed the relationship between the international trade regime and European social, environmental and consumer protection. A paper summarising his Ph.D research has been published in a *Journal of European Public Policy* Special Issue (19:5) highlighting the best papers of the 2011 EUSA conference. He has published in several edited volumes on EU external relations and in journals including *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *Journal of European Integration*, *European Integration online Papers* and *International Journal of Communication*. Ferdi has also done policy advisory research on European trade policy for the Flemish government. His current research focuses on new bilateral trade agreements of the EU and the relationship between EU trade politics and the euro crisis.

Ruth Wodak is Distinguished Professor and Chair of Discourse Studies, at Lancaster University. She is member of the British Academy of Social Sciences and the *Academia Europaea*, past President of the *Societas Linnquistica Europaea* 2010, and holds an honorary doctorate of University Örebro, Sweden. Her research interests focus Critical Discourse Studies, European and national identity and language politics, language and politics, and issues of racism, anti-Semitism, and discrimination. She is co-editor of *The Journal of Language and Politics*, *Discourse and Society*, and *Critical Discourse Studies*, and of the book series *Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture*. Recent book publications include *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual* (2011); *Analyzing Fascist Discourse: European Fascism in Talk and Text* (2013; with J. Richardson); *The Sage Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (2010; with P. Kerswill and B.

Johnstone), *The discursive Construction of National Identity* (2009; with R. de Cillia, M. Reisigl, and K. Liebhart), and *Rightwing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse* (2013; with M. Khosravi-Nik and B. Mral).

Acknowledgements

This edited volume is a direct product of the WIRE-GR:EEN workshop ‘The EU as a Global Discursive Actor’, held at the Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, on 14-15 February 2012. GR:EEN (Global Re-ordering : Evolution through European Networks) is a European Commission FP7 project (project number 266809) and the GR:EEN head coordinator for ULB is professor Mario Telò. For more information about GR:EEN, please visit www.greenfp7.eu. WIRE is a series of innovative Workshop on International Relations held regularly on various topics and jointly organized by ULB and Ghent University. For more information about the WIRE series, please visit www.wire-series.org. In addition to contributors of this volume, participants to the WIRE-GR:EEN workshop included Amandine Crespy, Barbara Delcourt, Valentina Morselli, Claudia Morsut, Christian Olsson, Amandine Orsini, Vicky Reynart, Mario Telò and Eleni Xiachogiannopolous. We warmly thank sponsors of this workshop for their financial assistance as well as participants for their constructive comments on earlier versions of the following chapters.

Moreover, earlier versions of chapters 1 (by Diez), 2 (by Larsen), 4 (by Jørgensen), 7 (by Aydin-Düzgit), 10 (by Carta) and 12 (by Rayroux) first appeared in the journal *Cooperation and Conflict* in a special issue edited by the co-editors of this volume. Likewise, earlier versions of chapters 5 (by Orbie and de Ville), 11 (by Rosamond), and 13 (by Schmidt) were first published by the *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* in a special section edited by the co-editors of this volume. We warmly thank the anonymous reviewers of *Cooperation and Conflict* and the *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* for their comments, journal editors Lee Miles and Andrew Baker for the constant support, and the publishers to have

authorized the reproduction of parts of these original articles.

Finally, a special thank goes to Mario Telò and Frederik Poujaert, co-directors of the GR:EEEN-GEM book series for their steady encouragements and assistance from the very beginning of this project, three years ago.

Caterina Carta & Jean-Frédéric Morin

Brussels, 2013

Introduction

EU's Foreign Policy through the Lenses of Discourse Analysis

Caterina Carta and Jean-Frédéric Morin

What Do Discourses Tell Us About the International Role of the EU?

For over fifty years, the process of European integration has profoundly shaped an imagined sense of belonging to a European community. Despite difficulties in establishing what exactly a European Union (EU) identity is supposed to be, the process of European integration assumed the Aesopian motto 'United we stand, divided we fall'. Recent events conveyed the impression that European integration is not to be taken for granted. Waves of enlargement, institutional reforms, social and political unrest, economic and financial instability, both in Europe and in its immediate neighbourhood, have profoundly challenged the meaning and course of the European integration process.

In a speech delivered more than twenty years ago, Margaret Thatcher laconically posited: 'such a body [a European Community of 30 nations, ...] is an even more utopian enterprise than the Tower of Babel. For at least the builders of Babel all spoke the same language when they began' (Thatcher 1992). This comment still evokes some topical concerns

about the process of European integration. Beyond linguistic diversity, do European member states and EU institutions share the same references when contributing to the articulations of the EU international discourse? Whose discourse is the one finally agreed upon? To what extent are different discourses compatible with each other? And, how can this diversity be translated into foreign policy practices?

This book looks at these questions through the lens of discourse analysis as applied to the field of International Relations (IR). Depending on one's theoretical lenses, discourses can be conceived as exercising framing, generative, performative and coordinative functions. First, discourses frame and structure what can be conceived and uttered (Hajer 1993). The process whereby we attribute a signified to a signifier entails the articulation of this signifier into a broader semantic system of meanings (Derrida 1976). Second, discourses generate and construct the meaning of what exists in such a way that nothing exists if it cannot be thought through and transposed into language (Wittgenstein 1971). Third, discourses have a performative power (Austin 1962). Rhetorical strategies inherent in discourses contribute to the way we perceive social facts (Foucault 1969), by establishing semantic connections among phenomena. Therefore, discourses shape our own perception of reality (Wæver 1995). Fourth, the process of creating discourse is inherently interactive and intersubjective (Habermas 1984). In this regard, discourses are semantic fields in which social interactions are produced.

This book bears testimony to the plurality of theoretical approaches and methods within the remit of discourse analysis. Different theoretical perspectives understand differently both the formative range of discourse and the functions that discourse analysis, as a set of cognate methods, can perform. The very object of analysis of this book is itself contested. EU foreign policy is characteristically fragmented, and its meaning disputed. Different national and

institutional actors converge in the making of international discourses. If we define EU foreign policy as the ‘sum of official external relations conducted by [an] independent actor[s]’ (Hill 2003: 3), we will soon realise that the number of independent national and institutional actors that form the EU voice account for an inherently pluralistic choir. Discourse analysis can be of great use in illuminating the way in which social discursive practices convey meaning to foreign policy discourses, through both contestation and communicative action.

The underlying objective of this book is two-fold: to shed light on the versatility of discourse analysis toolkits and to link this with an empirical investigation of the EU's international discourse. In *substantive* terms, this book celebrates academic diversity as it gathers contributions from different theoretical and analytical schools. In *analytical* terms, it aims to contribute to advancements in the study of EU foreign policy discourse. The EU has been conceptualised as a ‘difference engine’ in which internal processes of construction and representation converge in its international identity (Manners and Whitman, 2003: 380-381): the ways in which EU actors articulate discourses in order to frame an international position is the main topic of our collective enquiry. Is there anything specific about the EU's international discourse-making?

The first section of this introduction arranges the four theoretical approaches and methods presented in the book – namely interpretative constructivism, post-structuralism, discursive institutionalism (DI) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) – along two dimensions: a) the role of discourse in the constitution of the world, depending on whether approaches perceive social structure as being constitutive of or constituted by discourse; and b) interpretation of the weight of material and ideational elements in discourses. This model helps us make sense of the profound theoretical diversity that characterises analytical

approaches to IR discourse. The second section tackles the question of ‘who does the speaking’. It identifies the different voices that converge in the EU's international choir, and problematizes the discursive environment that forges international discourses through the theoretical lenses of selected approaches. In the last section, the contributions to this book are presented.

Discourse Analysis and Theoretical Diversity

Although discourse analysis has been defined as ‘an emerging research program, engaging a community of scholars’ (Milliken 1999: 226), the term discourse is widely contested. Different conceptions range from narrow interpretations which clarify that ‘in linguistics, [a discourse is] a stretch of language, larger than the sentence’ (Bullock and Stallybrass 1977:175 in Gasper and Apthorpe 1996: 3), to broad ones that assume that ‘there is nothing outside discourse’ (Campbell 2005: 4). Linguistic traditions of discourse analysis draw on the distinction between text and discourse (Wodak 2008: 6), or ‘small d’ and ‘big D’ discourses’ (Gee 2007: 26). Broad interpretations extend the focus to ‘the role of more macro linguistic and social structures in framing our social and psychological life’ (Burr 2003: 20). Discourse analysis as applied to IR generally focuses on ‘big D discourses’, with a varying emphasis on the study of texts.

As mentioned, diversity not only concerns the object of our study (e.g. the community of actors who concur to define the EU's international discourse and the nature and functions of discursive patterns connected with foreign policy), but also the interpretative lenses adopted. On the one hand, IR can be conceived as a dividing discipline (Holsti 1985), cut across by endless and unsolved debates over the *incommensurable* (Kristensen 2012: 32). On the other, discourse analysis is characterised by a plurality of disciplinary, theoretical and

methodological approaches marked by internal heterogeneity, in such a way that ‘it is perfectly possible to have two books in discourse analysis with no overlap in content at all’ (cf. MacDonnel 1986, Stubb 1983 in Potter and Wetherell 1996 [1987]: 6). This internal heterogeneity makes it extremely difficult to synthesise the different approaches presented here. As a cautionary note, we should therefore clarify that when referring to determined approaches or authors, we exclusively have in mind the references quoted in this chapter.

Despite these observations, it is possible to identify some common ground between the discursive approaches presented in this volume. In general, analytical discourse approaches to IR tend to have positivist approaches as a polemical target. The latter generally claim that it is possible to individuate ‘law or law-like regularities’ that consent to infer and order patterns of human behaviour and social life (Sil and Katzenstein 2010: 416). Social constructivism, post-structuralism, DI and CDA approaches, in their differing variants and to different extents, tend to criticise the positivist ‘separation of subject and object and the search for clear cause-effect relationship[s]’ (Bieler and Morton 2008: 104). Hence, these theoretical approaches view ‘as isomorphic the seer and the seen, the knower and the known’ (Ryan 1970, in Manning 1979: 660). In this sense – with the limits that inform all generalisations – they tend to walk along an interpretative turn in social science, in that they posit that ‘both the object of investigation – the web of language, symbols, institutions that constitute signification – and the tools by which investigation is carried out share inescapably the same pervasive context that is the human world’ (Rabinow and Sullivan 1988: 5-6). Therefore, what we can access are the different *representations* of the world, constructed by perceptions, thoughts, and language.

To grasp the diversity of IR theoretical approaches and their methodologies, Sil suggests that one should focus on two *fundamental problems* that have plagued social science

disciplines since their inception' (2000: 354). These are the relationships between ideas and material components of social action, and between structure and agency. The former recalls the long-lasting theoretical diatribe between rational-choice and sociologically inspired theorists. These two camps contend on the question of what factors guide and inform both human motivations and social interactions, whether material and interest-based, or ideational and normative. The relationship between agency and structure raises a significant question: 'does the *ontological* primacy of the individual actors also accord them *epistemological* primacy vis-a-vis the structures that constrain, or give meaning to their action?' (Sil 2000: 354).

If we are about to apply this framework to the field of discourse analysis, we should slightly modify this model. In discourse analysis terms, a preliminary step is to understand what social structures consist of and how they can be accessed. In other words, does the social structure constitute discourses, or do agents' discourses constitute the social structure? While not denying that there is a world out there, different theoretical approaches can be located along a continuum, depending on whether they conceive a) discourse as heavily reproducing (and hereby constituted by) real and structural dynamics; or b) discourse as the only point of access to the real world and, accordingly, as *constitutive* of reality as we know it (in Diez's terms, as replicated in agency)¹. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002: 20, ff.) attempted to delineate such a continuum by including as crucial point of reference Althusser, Gramsci and Foucault. With the addition of Habermas², the centrality of these authors descends from two important common features of discourse-analysis approaches: their critical stance and their continuous oscillation between Kant's idealism and Marx's historical materialism (for a review, Held 1980:

¹ The authors would like to thank Thomas Diez and Jan Orbie for their comments on this point.

² The authors would like to thank Ruth Wodak for raising this point.

16).

Althusser applied and expanded Marx's approach on ideology. Ideology is conceived here as a '*bricolage imaginaire*', drawing on the abstract projection and reproduction of concrete and material historical dynamics (1976: 176). He conceptualised the State as being composed of repressive and ideological apparatuses which aim to *subsume* and *reproduce* the dominant ideology as shaped by relations of production. Through ideology, material and structural forces establish 'imagined relations' which turn concrete individuals into abstract categories due to a '*représentation du monde déterminée*' (1976: 180). In this framework, individuals are visible only insofar as they are *interpellated*. Interpellation reduces agents to mere puppets of superimposed structural logics. Paraphrasing Berger and Luckmann, the structure is, therefore, able not only to dominate the *appearance*, but also the *content* of actors' ideation (1991 [1966]: 21). Ideational components are hereby mere reproductions of material relationships; or in Althusser's theorisation, 'material displacements' of an external or internal (i.e. consciousness) verbal discourse.

Althusser's approach has been criticised on the grounds of its structural determinism and portrayal of agents' inability to determine their beliefs and actions. Moving away from Althusser's concept of interpellation, a less deterministic relationship can be established between both ideas and interests and between agency and structure. This move allows a) to bring agents back into the analysis and b) to more decisively integrate the ideational dimension of material factors by analysing the reification and objectification of social processes.

Starting from Marx's assumption that capitalist society constitutes the core structure that shapes all social phenomena, Gramsci contests Marx's implicit assumption that capitalism

is just a system of production. Accordingly, Gramsci refers to the term 'language', rather than discourse, to depict 'a multiplicity of facts more or less organically coherent and co-ordinated' (1929[1999]: 347). Hegemony is contested and finally conquered through the interaction of diversified and internally heterogeneous societal forces. Hegemony, in this light, represents a balance between political and civil society (Gramsci 1931 [1953]); it is a multidimensional phenomenon, which benefits from several strategies aimed at the imposition of what has to be considered 'common sense'. As such, it cannot be understood exclusively along the continuum of relations of production, and it cannot be deduced by class belonging. Gramsci exerts a shift from economic determinism to the organisation of social orders *via* the material structure of ideology. The focus is therefore on the ways in which, by means of objectification and reification, things acquire a meaning. This move allows researchers to focus on 'the very objectifications of subjective processes in human activity, or the ways in which the socially constructed world is intersubjectively realised' (Bieler and Morton 2008:117).

Elaborating on these premises, Foucault, in *The Subject and Power*, decisively empowers the constitutive and foundational nature of discourse. Foucault (1969 [2011]) posits that both unities of discourses and objects are formed 'by means of group controlled decisions' (2011: 32), under historically located conditions. Key concepts in its theorisation are those of knowledge and power. As in Gramsci, power is not portrayed exclusively as coercively imposed. It is seen as an ongoing productive creation of shared knowledge and discourse. Through its performative function, power creates both the social world and the discursive categories to access it (Foucault, 1982: 780). In so doing, power locates subjects both in society and in the discursive field; it generates markers for the identity of individuals, objectifying them. In contrast to Althusser's model, an additional component of power is resistance, where

individuals struggle against objectification. Foucault contextualises power in the framework of a diversified definition of social structure, determined by ‘complex and circular relations’ (1982:781). In this context, individuals engage in what Foucault calls ‘anarchical’ struggles (1982:781), somehow shooting against a moving target: ‘the *form* of power’ (ib., emphasis added). In this context, struggles occur over a semantic field against a contingent sense of oppression. This locates Foucault on the more subject-oriented side of the continuum, and in a more ideational and less material realm.

Deeply engaged with the Frankfurt school, Habermas acknowledges the crucial function of language as a ‘medium of domination and social force’ (1974:17, in Forchtner, 2011:9) and argues against the Marxian tradition that ‘politics is [no longer] only a phenomenon of the superstructure’ (1971:101, quoted in Held, 1980: 251). Beyond the analysis of the pathologies of advanced capitalist societies, Habermas assumes that society finds the seeds for social change in communicative action. In the *Theory of Communicative Action* (1984), he posits that social actions can be strategic or communicative, depending on ‘how they specify the goal-directed actions of different participants: as interlacing of egocentric calculations of utility ... or as reflecting an understanding in the sense of a cooperative process of interpretation’ (1984: 101). Communicative actions are oriented towards reciprocal understanding and intersubjectively validated through ‘validity claims’, ‘*internally* connected with reasons and grounds’ (1984: 209, emphasis in the text). Validity claims therefore set the grounds for the intersubjective establishment of a shared ‘moral practical sense’ (ib.). Through cultural reproduction, social interaction and socialisation, individuals ‘coordinate their actions through the intersubjective recognition of criticisable validity claims’ (1984:208). In this context, through the establishment of discursive communities, individuals can achieve

collective goals, and empower their shared life-world.

Theoretical Diversity in this Book

In the wake of these pioneering works, selected theories do not presuppose that agents form their identities and interests in isolation from the social context: interaction within the social structure moulds the discursive activities of all subjects. What changes are both the definition of actors' degree of freedom in perceiving the *social structure* and their own and other actors' positions within this structure. This difference determines what constitutes the main structural components around which power is distributed. The blend of ideas and interests in individual motivation and social interactions is generally presented in non-dichotomised terms. What changes is the ways these components relate to each other.

Among selected approaches, constructivists tend to embrace ontological idealism. Arguably, constructivism is all but a homogenous approach (Price and Reus-Smit 1998, Fierke and Jørgensen 2001). To make sense of this diversity, Checkel distinguishes three main variants marked by strong epistemological differences: conventional, interpretative and radical/critical (2007:58). In this introduction we mainly refer to the interpretative school and 'its emphasis on the role of language in mediating and constructing social reality' (Checkel 2007:58). Constructivist authors have applied this framework to foreign policy and the notion of national interest (Kubáľková 2001, Weldes 1996).

Interpretative constructivists emphasise the centrality of intersubjective cognitions and norms in the definition of the social structure (Schimmelfennig 2001:58). By discursively interacting within a given structure, agents endogenously construct social reality, and, in turn, interactions within the structural context contribute to reconstructing their preferences and

interests. The dynamics of communication are largely inspired by Habermas and his distinction between communicative and strategic action (Deitelhoff and Mueller 2005). While the latter type is oriented to gain hegemony in discursive practices, the former strives to gain recognition and build consensus. The concept of power is therefore deeply related to responsibility (Connolly 1974:97 in Guzzini 2005:510). Constructivists distance themselves from the rational tenet that ideas and interests are exogenous to any social structure. To explain this ontological turn, Hopf places the question “who am I?” ... both logically and ontologically prior to the question of ‘what do I want’ (1998: 175).

In empirical accounts, constructivists generally argue that a logic of appropriateness, rather than a logic of consequentiality (March and Olsen, 1989), informs both the nature of the agents and their reciprocal interactions. Therefore, emphasis is on the process of intersubjective creation of meaning, as led by interpretation (Kratochwil, 1988) and reasoned consensus (Risse 2000). While not denying the existence of *brute* facts, constructivists claim that in assessing reality, agents enter the semantic field of collective intentionality (Searle 1995: 23). Through interactions and social filters, individuals encounter a space composed of intersubjective projections of what reality is supposed to be, which mixes ‘closeness and remoteness both spatially and temporally’ (Berger and Luckmann 1991[1966]: 36). Among selected approaches, constructivism is the most ideational. Put simply, its focus on cooperation, rather than power, stemming from a central tenet: normative concepts are ‘the names of the solutions of problems’ (Korsgaard 2003: 116). As normative concepts are ‘the names of the solutions of problems’, discourses transcend both the material structure of society and individual interests.

In a similar vein, Schmidt's DI (2008) focuses on ideas through the lens of discourse.

By placing emphasis on discourse rather than on ideas, Schmidt claims that it is possible to address ‘the representation of ideas (how agents say what they are thinking of doing) and the discursive interactions through which actors generate and communicate ideas (to whom they say it) within given institutional contexts (where and when they say it)’ (2008: 306). Hence, the term discourse enmeshes textual and contextual elements, components of agency and structure. Accordingly, DI establishes a dialectical relation between agents and structure. Institutions are seen as both influencing agents and being influenced by them (Schmidt 2008: 314).

Contrary to constructivist approaches, DI posits that arguing (e.g. oriented towards ideational persuasion) and bargaining (e.g. strategically-oriented) discursive practices are inherently intermingled (Schmidt 2008: 312). In this sense, relying on Boudon (2003), the rationality of agents is conceived as cognitive in nature, e.g. it informs the sense-making process of actors more than the setting-up of their preferences. To come back to our distinction of discourse as being constitutive of or constituted by the social world, Schmidt’s DI opposes ‘the conflation of material reality and interests into ‘material interests’’ (2008: 312). In a similar way as constructivists, DI refers to Searle's distinction (1995) between brute and social facts to depict the wide array of ‘real but not material’ factors that coincide to frame actors’ behaviours. This locates DI closer to constructivism in our continuum.

While recognising the performative and enacting quality of discourses, post-structuralist scholars place emphasis on the concept of power. Derrida’s often-cited passage, that ‘there is nothing outside the text’ (Derrida 1976: 158–159) sums up the tendency of seeing discourse as the key to access the social world. One of the foundations of post-structuralism is the co-constitution of the world and the subject. A key element of post-structuralist ontology

stems from the idea that the perceived world acquires meaning through discourse. Discourses provide ‘criteria of intelligibility’, that ‘establish the conditions of possibility for social being and, as such, cannot be considered as separate from, or secondary to the material realm’ (de Goede 2001: 152, quoted in Bieler and Morton 2008: 110). Semantic signs mediate the relation between the objective reality and the subjective representation of that reality, ‘signs [that] derive their meanings not through their relations to reality but through internal relations within the network of signs’ (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 11). Interactions among discourses constantly modify the structure of meanings and the perception of social reality. Meanings are therefore highly volatile, contingent, provisional and, as such, elusive. Discourses are modulated by means of interactive articulation through a network of meanings among different signifiers. Both as a concept and as analytical tools, articulation works on three levels:

Epistemologically, articulation is a way of thinking the structures of what we know as a play of correspondences, non-correspondences and contradictions, as fragments in the constitution of what we take to be unities. Politically, articulation is a way of foregrounding the structure and play of power that entail in relations of dominance and subordination. Strategically, articulation provides a mechanism for shaping intervention within a particular social formation, conjuncture or context (Daryl Slack 1996: 113).

In this conceptual framework, the concept of discursive struggles depicts the modality of interaction in the discursive field. Recalling Gramsci and Foucault, hegemony is hence not necessarily imposed through coercion, but through the ‘*organisation of consent*’ (Barrett, 1991:54, emphasis in the text). In as much as post-structuralism (at least in Laclau’s and Mouffe’s theorisation) detaches discursive dynamics from the structure, ‘struggle is reduced to struggle in discourse, where ‘there is no reason why anything is or isn’t potentially articulatable with

anything' and society becomes 'a totally open discursive field' (Hall 1980: 56).

A heterogeneous movement rather than a homogenous school gathers under the heading of CDA. CDA scholars are inspired by different epistemological traditions, generally located in the 'Western Marxist' tradition (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak, 2011:360), ranging from Foucauldian post-structuralism to Habermas, from Gramsci to the Frankfurt School (Forchtner 2011). CDA is explicitly committed 'towards criticising and changing society, in contrast to traditional theories oriented solely to understanding it or explaining it' (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 6). CDA establishes a dialectic relation between the role of discourse and the real world. In other words, the world *is* out there and material relations influence the positioning of subjects in the real world as well as in the discursive field. Discourses are, therefore, seen as vehicles that reproduce the social domination of one group over another, although power does not necessarily refer to capitalism. CDA authors alternatively consider power in relation to corporations, gender, race or political relations. As in the continuum presented above, critical discourse analysts generally assume that the relations that tie up social and discursive practices are 'dialectical in the sense of being different but not 'discrete', i.e. not fully separated' (Fairclough 2010: 231). By giving social practices centrality CDA 'allows an oscillation between the perspective of social structure and the perspective of social action and agency – both necessary perspectives in social research and analysis' (Chiapello and Fairclough 2002: 193).

Among the selected approaches, CDA, in its different variants, is the one with the clearest commitment to linguistic analysis. This focus 'accounts for its emphasis upon practical ways of analysing texts, and the attention that it gives to the role of grammar in its ideological analysis' (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 361). Linguistic analysis is therefore pursued

through a variety of methodologies (for a review, Wodak and Meyer, 2009). CDA does not strive to investigate the linguistic unit per se, but analyses broader social phenomena (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 2). The heterogeneity that characterises CDA makes it difficult to generalise as far as tenets, focus, and methods of analysis are concerned. Wodak (2008) suggested seven underlying themes in CDA. These can be summarized as: 1) an interest in the language in use (as opposed to abstract language); 2) a focus on texts, discourses, conversations, acts of speech or events as units of analysis; 3) an extension of linguistics beyond isolated sentences; 4) the inclusion of non-verbal elements in the analysis; 5) a focus on dynamic interactional moves and strategies; 6) a focus on the contexts in which language is used and its functions; and 7) linguistic attention to text grammar and language use.

This section only superficially highlighted the main tenets of selected approaches, drastically simplifying their internal heterogeneity. However, as can be noted, placing selected theoretical approaches within the two dimensional continuum of material/ideational components and the constitutiveness of reality/discourses helps to spot similarities and differences between cognate discourse-analysis approaches. The next section will focus on the question of ‘who does the speaking in EU foreign policy’ and will present different theoretical insights on how to make sense of the EU discursive field in relation to EU agents.

Who Does the Speaking?

The ‘self’ needs quotation marks because an order of expectations cannot be expected to contain an identifiable self; it remains an order of distributions that operate on one another (Leydesdorff 2006: 541).

Both the EU and the process of European integration in foreign policy matters are contested

discursive fields (Hay and Rosamond 2002: 151). When travelling from the state level to the EU level, we crash into an open and heterogeneous discursive environment, where the very existence of a minimum of cultural homogeneity is a matter of discussion. Throughout its evolution, the main architects of European integration have given a plurality of definitions to what the EU (and previously the European Community) is. These definitions range from an *'objet politique non-identifié'* (Jacques Delors 1987, in Schmitter 1996: 121) to 'a technocratic edifice' (paraphrased from de Gaulle 1965, quoted in Nelson and Stubb 2003: 33)³, from 'a Family of Nations' (Thatcher 1992) to a *'concept charged with significance'* ((Delors 1989, 2003: 59), emphasis added). This *concept* has been alternatively portrayed as sustained by 'solidarity in production' (Schumany scholars highlighted that the EU is a 'flexible and disaggregated series of patterns, arrangements and institutions which expresses a collective yet pluralistic identity ...' (Allen and Smith 1990: 23). It is best conceptualized as a 'variable and multi-dimensional presence', certainly not a unified actor (Allen and Smith, 1990: 20). Scholars, therefore, focused on the 'fragmented nature of agency at the European level' (White 1999: 44), and connected this inherent fragmentation with definitions of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in terms of a *policy process*, rather than as a policy (Edwards 1997). Hence, both with reference to the term 'common' and that of 'policy', scholars of European integration have underlined the mislead of the formula 'Common Foreign and Security Policy' inaugurated with the Maastricht Treaty: for Ginsberg it can be regarded as a 'system in evolution towards 'a' European Foreign Policy', (2001: 33), for Edwards (1997) it is a misnomer, and for Schmalz (1998) it is mere rhetoric.

³ All following quote are taken from the collection of discourses compiled by Nelson and Stubb (2003).

Despite this fragmented condition, several scholars suggest that it is still possible to employ the tools of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) to analyze the EU's foreign policy system (White 1999), or to peer into the European foreign policy 'black box' through institutionalist lenses (Smith 1996, 2004). This spurred some analysts to assume an actor-centred approach (White, 1999). By focusing on actors, processes, issues, instruments context and actions related to the EU foreign policy system, it becomes possible to conceptualize European Foreign Policy 'as a part of a political system, with inputs from national actors and their preferences (in conjunction with domestic politics) and from external sources; and with the outputs of foreign policy actions and positions' (Ginsberg 2001:39).

Despite its challenging nature, therefore, not dissimilarly from states, the EU is primarily a 'collective actor,' which expresses a pluralistic identity. The question of 'who does the speaking' in IR opens up endless theoretical discussions on how and through what kind of socio-political processes collective actors produce statements. To resume briefly the entity of this debate, we can refer to the 'two-bodies' metaphor elaborated during the sixteenth century: the physical body of the juvenile King Edward IV and his body politic – the Crown. The latter 'intangible body' (conceived as the real core of political activities) availed the former to act in ways that went beyond the 'minority,' 'infirmity,' 'old age,' 'birth or death' of the physical body (Coleman 1974: 19-20).

In light of this distinction, capitalised Foreign Policy, can be conceived of as an activity of 'production and reproduction of the identity in whose name it operates ... a modern cultural artefact implicated in the intensification of power in the state' (Campbell 2005: 68). Subsequently, Foreign Policy constitutes a form of 'containment of challenges' against both 'internal' and 'external' political contestation (Campbell 2005: 71). Along the same lines, Diez

(in this volume) identifies three levels of ‘struggle’, or contestation in Campbell’s parlance. First, the level of individual participants in discourse; second, the level of discursive positions (see also Epstein 2010), which finds collective actors in the semantic field in a variety of complex ways; and third, the level of the overall discourse, e. g. ‘competing discursive positions that are not only actively pursued by collective actors, but also shape the latter’s identities’ (Diez, this volume).

In this introduction, we take a different perspective and suggest locating discursive positions within the EU foreign policy system of governance. While aware that collective subject positions in the EU system of governance are not summarised by their institutional location, national as well as bureaucratic heterogeneity call for reference to the positions of agents in the EU structure.

In order to act and speak at the international level, a complex system has been established. Rosamond (2005) offers two different reasons for explaining the inherently plural nature of this system. First, the ‘fragmented nature of agency at the European level’ (White 1999: 48) enables different national and institutional actors to act and speak on behalf of the EU. Second, the changing attribution of competences creates a plurality of processes that contributes to shaping the EU's external action. Accordingly, at the executive level the management of foreign policy issues is entrusted to four sets of actors who intervene in the creation of foreign policy measures.

The division of competences defines the roles of all actors and the scope of their interventions throughout the policy process. Two main policy methods converge in the making of foreign policies: for so-called ‘high politics’, the prevalent method is intergovernmental; for ‘low politics’ it is Community-based. The Lisbon treaty, therefore, maintained the approach ‘to

streamline foreign policy by combining external action across the pillar system of divergent competences created by the Maastricht 'Treaty' (Laatikainen 2010: 476). In turn, a dynamic and fluid network of informal exchanges cuts across and blurs the boundaries of both competences and the attribution of competences.

For each set of competences, the EU relies on different individual national or institutional executive agents to produce foreign policy statements. In turn, even when agreeing on principles for action, the EU does not necessarily speak with one voice, but through several voices that sing the same tune. Table I.1 below summarises these institutional arrangements. In addition to these, other EU actors can speak on behalf of the EU on more specific contexts. For instance, the President of the Central European Bank or the President of the Eurogroup may explain the EU position in multilateral fora such as the International Monetary Fund, the G8 or the G20. We also acknowledge the growing institutional importance of both the European Parliament and the intervention of the European Court of Justice (Hillion 2009, Jørgensen and Wessel 2011) in shaping the EU's international discourse. However, due to their relative limitation, this introduction does not locate these actors in the proposed grid.

Table I.1. Actors, competences and ability to speak at the international level

Executive actors converging in the process of foreign policy-making	Attributions of competences	Actors entitled to speak
The Councils	Ultimate decision-makers, intervening in all EU measures	The President of the European Council speaks in the name of the EU. The rotating Presidency or other member states (MS) can also speak on behalf of the EU
The Commission	Power of initiative, policy-formulation and policy-implementation of common	The President of the EU Commission and different Commissioners speak in their

	measures in first pillar and mixed competences.	areas of competence
High Representative-Vice President of the Commission (HR/VP); assisted by the European External Action Service (EEAS)	Power of initiative, policy-formulation in second pillar competences	The HR speaks in Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)
The Member States	Still competences of exclusive pertinence of the MS	MS' representative in their own capacity, regardless of the formal attribution of competences

Notes: This chapter refers to the old Maastricht terminology based on pillars to make sense of the attribution of competences at the EU level. It is, indeed, argued that – despite the rhetoric of de-pillarization, a real de-pillarization did not occur for foreign and external policies (Carta 2011).

Even in this simplified grid, ‘the projection of the EU to the outside [remains] as complex as the variegation that characterises its internal governance’ (Rosamond 2005: 465). Different procedures, individual actors, venues, informal and formal codes of conduct inform discursive interactions. Instead of simplifying the institutional structure, this overall reorganization crowded even further the ‘leadership table’ (Nugent and Rhinard 2011: 13).

In discourse-analysis terms, this network of relations represents the semantic field where a given discourse is articulated and produces effects (Keeley 1990: 96). This disaggregated collective structure defines the modalities of articulating foreign policy discourse within the EU. How do different actors interact in the foreign policy-making environment? How do they tune the EU international voice?

Simplifying the constructivist perspective, any discourse has to be considered as legitimate by the in-group, that is it has to provide the basis for a reasoned consensus (Risse, 2000) on the grounds of moral, legal or ideological grounds (Breeze 2012). Interactions between national and institutional actors within the EU thus define the borders of legitimate discourses, and in-group discursive articulations concur to fix meanings by means of

‘sociocultural conceptualisations’ (Silverstein 2004 in Reyes 2011). In this perspective, socialisation and exposure to common norms make it impossible not to engage with the rules and principles that characterise a given regime. As with the meaning of membership, however, shared norms and collective action do not rely on authoritative interpretation, and are constantly collectively established (Kratochwil 1988: 276). This consideration ferries us to the possibility that in the act of interpretation, other (competitive) principles converge and co-constitute the discursive environment, thereby contributing to the framing of common discourse.

From a Foucauldian perspective, members of a community are not driven by a single logic. Contestation and competition characterise the breeding ground upon which a common discourse is constituted. Any shared discourse embodies both instances of convergence and competition over the framing of common meanings. Hence, it is the EU discursive environment that therefore defines the social context in which a common discourse is articulated. As Diez (in this volume) posits, discursive practices within the EU serve both ‘enabling’ and ‘disabling’ discourses, by defining not only the nature of discourses but also the limits of the discursive fields. This continuous process of contestation and enabling and disabling meanings contributes to constructing the European identity and its foreign policy. In a constant struggle over meanings, several discursive strategies ‘over naming and evaluating things; applicable arguments and standards of judgements; and over objectives and mechanisms’ coexist (Keeley 1990:97).

The discourse that prevails originates from dynamic interactions, led by differing logics. As such, contingent policy outcomes will not necessarily coherently reflect the original intentions of actors. Power relations are therefore mediated by the social structure in which

discursive practices occur, and are reflected in ‘the temporary hegemony of a particular political discourse’ (Larsen 1997: 22). Thus, seen through the lens of different discourse analysis perspectives, a different blend of material and ideational discursive patterns can be identified. On the one hand, different actors obey a shared set of rules (Searle 1996 [1969]) and principles that define the borders of what is considered socially acceptable and legitimate. On the other hand, actors enact different discursive strategies in different contexts to pursue their goals and adapt to the goals of other actors. In this regard, different discourse-analyses complement each other in depicting both the main features of the EU discursive field and contiguous discursive practices.

Beyond the policy-making discursive field, a wider semantic field, where discourses over European governance are articulated, includes the member states’ polities. Accordingly, as Diez has argued, the structure of EU discourse is inherently layered, consisting of three layers: ‘the ‘state-nation core concept’, the ‘relational position vis-a-vis Europe’ and the question of ‘what kind of Europe is promoted’ (2001: 11). Following the layered structure of the EU discourse, the focus of discourse-analysis approaches with regard to European integration varies widely. Post-structuralist contributions (Larsen 1997, Hansen 2006) have tended to focus their attention on selected EU member states’ discourses on foreign policy; CDA have tended to focus on the EU institutional discourses on given policy fields (see Senem Aydın-Düzgit in this volume); and DI and constructivist approaches traditionally have had a swinging focus on both. For instance, DI has focused on the coordinative dimensions of discourses to depict the interactions between different levels of the EU multilevel foreign policy environment, whereas the member states are significantly constrained by the domestic dynamics of both interactive and communicative practices (see Rayroux and Schmidt in this volume).

As Shepherd notes, the ‘ways in which institutions are sites of discursive power and both product/productive of particular discourses’ in turn ‘constitute particular horizons of possibilities’ (2008: 385). Since the EU is widely considered a *sui generis* engine composed by multifaceted identities (Manners and Whitman 2003), is there any specific discourse that these interactions produce in terms of foreign policy discourse? From the point of view of normative theory, there are at least two important related questions. On the one hand, there is the question of how to ‘reconcile unity and diversity’; on the other, there is a problem of ‘dual ontology’, i.e. ‘the need to theorize in a way that models appropriately the moral standing of both individuals and states in relation to each other as well as in relation to the supranational level’ (Dobson 2006: 515).

Drawing from Duchêne’s notion of the EU as a ‘civilian power’ (1972) and from Manners’ seminal article on the EU as a ‘normative power’ (2002), a vast body of literature reasoned on the putative moral distinctiveness of the EU as an international actor. By relying on a conception of power based on ideational factors, Manners claims that the EU progressively developed the ability to ‘redefine what *can* be normal in international relations’ (2002: 253). Yet, other authors contended that the EU tends to act as a pragmatic power: it mixes in a ‘flexible, prudent, sometimes innovative, sometimes opportunist’ way (Wood 2011: 244), ‘instrumentalist security-oriented dynamics ... within the parameters set by norms defining the EU’s identity’ (Youngs 2004: 415). Simon (2012), for instance, argues that the EU’s emphasis on effective multilateralism and ‘soft crisis management’ may indeed have been strategically informed. In the 2000s, this emphasis was useful to highlight Europe’s contrast with a markedly unilateral and militaristic US administration that was met with a strong feeling of public rejection across Europe and throughout the world. As Carta in this volume suggests,

the analysis of discursive practices can only convey differentiated patterns of foreign policy discourses, articulated through a variety of strategies. Different discursive patterns range from normative-based statements based on the values inherent in interstate institutionally-disciplined foreign policy practices, to an inherently colonizing discourse based on the presumed superiority of the EU, up to strategically oriented foreign policy formulation.

Structure of the Book

The contributions gathered in this volume importantly refer to both the diversity in the making of the EU's international discourses and the diversity of theoretical lenses adopted to make sense of it.

The contribution of Thomas Diez sets the scenes for the section on poststructuralist approaches. Drawing from previous works (1999), Diez's contribution posits that discourse analysis can enrich the analysis of European integration in three complementary ways: an 'Austinian' move, which focuses on speech acts; a 'Foucauldian' move, which focuses on the construction of meanings; and a 'Derridean' move, which highlights the centrality of differences in the process of meaning-construction. By crucially referring to the concept of discursive struggles, he highlights both the 'enabling' and the 'disabling' functions of discourse articulations. This tenet sheds light on the twin processes of marginalisation of certain discourses and the prevalence of others.

Henrik Larsen focuses on discursive articulations of the national 'we' at the EU level. He identifies concomitant ways in which member states articulate their 'national we' with the EU in their foreign policy practices. Drawing from Foucault's, Laclau's and Mouffe's theorisations, Larsen elaborates on four different articulations of member-state identities with

the EU and offers an empirical analysis that follows these articulations across policy-areas and geographical areas. Larsen finds that the way in which the Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs co-articulates its national 'we' with the EU follows a mixed pattern, which generally highlights an instrumental value of the EU for Denmark.

Beste Isleyne applies a poststructuralist discourse analytical approach to examine the broadening of co-operation between the member states EU in counter-terrorism governance. She argues that governance is discursively constructed through the production of particular understandings as regards what terrorism is and how the EU's approach to terrorism should develop. Her analysis illustrates that representing terrorism as a threat to the EU's internal security has opened up possibilities for the EU to develop a 'protective' anti-terror approach from 2003 onwards. This approach hinges upon the expansion of police and judicial policies and the prioritisation of activities focussing on the borders, transport and critical infrastructure. The evolution of the protective strategy has been in parallel with the emergence of particular subjects, objects, levels and instruments as core elements of EU governing.

The contribution of Knud Erik Jørgensen opens the section on constructivist approaches. Jørgensen focuses his attention on the EEAS and highlights the ways in which the EU level interacts with the member states' national constituencies. The distinction between the general public, the attentive public and the policy opinion elite (Almond 1960) guides Jørgensen in introducing the wider European context in which interaction between EU POE and national attentive publics occur. His analysis highlights two central points: on the one hand, POE communicates with the attentive public by means of abstract concepts, symbols and principles. On the other, public philosophies conveyed in POE communication strategies tend not to focus on foreign policy and are markedly uninterested in legitimating policy

contents vis-a-vis the EU national constituencies.

De Ville and Orbie consider that the multiplicity of market liberalism identified by Rosamond has not deeply destabilized DG Trade discourses. Contrary to Meunier (2007) who argues that the transition between Pascal Lamy and Peter Mandelson resulted in a ‘doctrinal shift’, De Ville and Orbie have found that DG Trade has remained deeply neoliberal over time. For them, changes in DG Trade discourse are limited to the policy ideas level, leaving the philosophical core of market liberalism intact. Moreover, the creative adaptation of DG Trade to the economic crisis helps to understand, according to De Ville and Orbie, ‘the surprisingly resilient free trade agenda’.

Esther Barbé, Anna Herranz-Surrallés and Michal Natorki focus on a crucial rhetorical element in the framing of the EU’s international identity: effective multilateralism. They analyse political speeches on multilateralism during the period 2004-2011. Drawing on a consistent body of IR literature, they map the elusive and frequently changing meanings associated to the label ‘multilateralism’, a term that conveys several images of world order and the EU’s role in it. Reflecting the EU’s multilateral genesis, the EU’s rhetoric taps onto conceptually and normatively conflicting standpoints and related debates. This plurality of meanings associated with multilateralism also explains difficulties in translating policies into actual practices. Conflicting discourses range from descriptions of the EU as a model, as a player or as an instrument of global governance, inflected on binary oppositions, such as those of Europeanism vs. Atlanticism or Community Method vs. Intergovernmentalism.

The chapter by Senem Aydın-Düzgit introduces Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) contributions. By reviewing post-structuralist and CDA discourse analysis applications, Aydın-Düzgit offers good insight into discourse-analysis methodologies. While acknowledging a

certain tendency to refute methodology as grounds for discourse analysis, she sheds light on several methodologically grounded techniques that can inform empirical analysis. In particular, Aydın-Düzgit's contribution offers a wide range of methodological guidelines for applying CDA to the analysis of foreign policy.

In her contribution, Amelie Kutter reveals that discursive practices associated with the edification of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) are inherently related to polity-building projects. She explores ways in which multilateral negotiations on the EU constitution were re-contextualised by national media debates in Poland and France (2002-2004). Once recontextualised at the national level, the construction of the EU as a civilising power undergoes several changes, reflecting intellectual-political camps in the domestic arena. She notes that, in the context of post-Cold War Europe, the rhetoric of an assertive, global multilateral actor – somehow endowed with a civilising mission – has often been associated with a legitimising discourse vis-à-vis the EU polity and with a project of polity-construction. Contrary to the view that EU foreign policy ambiguity has to be related merely to the lack of strategic and geopolitical vision, Kutter contends that the construction of the EU as a civilising power was primarily an inward-looking persuasive strategy related to the experience of the EU's eastern expansion in 2004.

Ruth Wodak and Salomi Boukala focus on the recent revival of nationalism, a complex and context-dependent phenomenon which meshes economic, socio-political and historical rationales. They analyse debates in the EP in 2008 and 2009 and compare them with simultaneous EU-sceptic positions in Dutch and British debates. By analysing European and national parliamentary and media debates, as well as speeches of prominent politicians, they illustrate the huge tensions and contradictions that characterise current European policies.

Wodak and Boukala retrace different conceptions of European identity, associated alternatively with exclusive, inclusive and supranationalist tropes. They notice the impact of contradictory forces in framing discourses about European identity: on the one hand, the tension between processes of economic globalisation – which change the patterns of meaning-making by shaping new space-time structures – on the other, processes of social fragmentation, which pave the ways for discourses based on the praise for localism, growing xenophobia, social exclusion and racism.

Carta examines ways in which individual civil servants of the Commission and the EEAS frame their discourses on the EU's international actions and its underlying core values. By relying on a critical discourse analysis strategy, she analyses the conceptions of foreign governance options held by foreign policy actors. The chapter identifies three main patterns of discourse-making and associates them with metaphors coming from the Western European literature tradition: two figures taken from Voltaire's *Candide* – Candide and Pangloss – and a character taken from a Mozart's opera, *Don Giovanni*.

Rosamond's contribution offers a useful conceptualisation of market liberal discourse using the debate over 'normative power Europe' as an entry point. In doing so, Rosamond introduces several notions that are used by other contributors, such as the false dichotomy between strategic and normative behavior, the interaction between background and foreground ideas, and the simultaneous complementarity and contradictions among liberal discourses.

Antoine Rayroux adopts the concept of constructive ambiguity to explain national French and Irish approaches to CSDP. He contends that rationalist explanations have so far failed to depict the cognitive and normative components of ambiguity in the construction of

the EU as a political entity. Relying on Schmidt's DI, Rayroux's analysis shows how different institutional settings contribute to shaping national discourses on Common Security and Defence Policy in both France and Ireland. He analyses a plethora of different actors' statements by showing how different voices shape and constrain the final national position. He highlights that constructive ambiguity allows government representatives to reduce conflicts in the domestic context and project CSDP as a natural continuation of national preferences.

Schmidt's contribution looks at discursive interactions precisely when political accountability is blurred by institutional complexity and overlaps between distinct forums. Schmidt studies discursive interactions about—and during—the European crisis, taking into account the agency of a wider diversity of actors than previous contributions. This agency includes national authorities, multiple European institutions, private stakeholders, policy experts, and the media. Although her representation of their discursive interactions is made clear thanks to her distinctions between types of arguments, levels of generality and discursive spheres; policymakers involved in the process seem to have lost control over their communicative discourses, to which political and economic actors react differently. Unfortunately for policymakers, they cannot distinguish their discourses to the market and to the people in the same way as they differentiate their coordinative and communicative discourse. Policymakers can communicate with the market, but can hardly coordinate it.

This brief overview aimed to provide insight into the theoretical endeavour of the following contributions, while certainly not paying adequate tribute to their analytical complexity. An attentive reader will find an insightful and eclectic review of approaches in the following pages.

References

- Allen D. and Smith M. 1990. Western Europe's presence in the contemporary international arena. *Review of International Studies* 16(1), 19-37.
- Almond, G. 1960. *The American People and Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger.
- Althusser L. 1976. *Idéologie et appareils idéologiques d'État*. In *Positions (1964-1975)*, edited by L. Althusser. Paris: Les Éditions sociales, 172-230.
- Austin J.L. 1962 *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barrett M. 1991. *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Berger P. and Luckmann T. 1996 [1991]. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bieler A. and Morton A.D. 2008. The deficits of discourse in IPE: Turning base metal into gold? *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(1), 103–128.
- Boudon R. 2003. Beyond rational choice theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 2–21.
- Breeze R. 2012. Legitimation in corporate discourse: Oil corporations after Deepwater Horizon. *Discourse and Society*, 23(1), 3-18.
- Burr V. 2003 *Social Constructionism*, Second ed. London: Routledge.
- Campbell D. 2005. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Carta C. 2011. *The European Union Diplomatic Service: Ideas, Preferences and Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Checkel J. 2007. Constructivism and EU politics, in *Handbook of European Union Politics*, edited

- by K.E. Jørgensen, M.A. Pollack and B. Rosamond. London: Sage, 57-74.
- Chiapello E. and Fairclough N. 2002 Understanding the new management ideology: A transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse and Society*, 13(2), 185-208.
- Coleman J.S. 1974. *Power and the Structure of Society*. London: WW Norton and Company.
- Cox R.W. 1981. Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 126-155.
- Daryl Slack J. 1996. The theory and method of articulation in cultural studies, in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by D. Morley and K.H. Chen. London and New York: Routledge, 112-127.
- Deitelhoff N. and Mueller H. 2005. Theoretical paradise – empirically lost: Arguing with Habermas. *Review of International Studies*, 31(1), 167-179.
- Derrida J. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Diez T. 2001. Europe as a discursive battleground: Discourse analysis and European integration studies. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 36(1), 15-38.
- Diez, T. 1999. Speaking ‘Europe’: the politics of integration discourse. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(4), 598-613.
- Dobson L. 2006 Normative theory and Europe. *International Affairs*, 82(3), 511-523.
- Duchêne F. 1972. Europe’s role in world peace, in *Europe Tomorrow: Sixteen Europeans Look Ahead*, edited by R. Mayne. London: Fontana, 32-47.
- Edwards G. 1997. The Potential and limits of the CFSP: The Yugoslav example, in *Foreign Policy of the European Union. From EPC to CFSP and Beyond.*, edited by E. Regelsberger, P de Schoutheete and W. Wessel. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner, 173-197.

- Elster J. 1991. *Arguing and Bargaining in Two Constituents Assemblies*. New Haven: Yale Law School.
- Epstein C. 2010. Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(2), 327-350.
- Fairclough N., Mulderrig J. and Wodak R. 2012. Critical discourse analysis, in *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 2nd edition, edited by T. van Dijk. London: Sage, 357-378.
- Fairclough N. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Second edition. Harlow: Longman.
- Fierke M. and Jørgensen K.E. (eds.) 2001. Introduction, in *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*, edited by K.M. Door, M. Fierke and K.E. Jørgensen. New York: ME Sharpe, 3-12.
- Forchtner B. 2011. Critique, the discourse–historical approach, and the Frankfurt School. *Critical Discourse Studies* 8(1), 1-14.
- Foucault M. 2011 [1969]. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault M. 1982. The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Gasper D. and Apthorpe R. 1996. Introduction: discourse analysis and policy discourse. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 8, 1–15.
- Gee, J. 2007. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Ginsberg R.H. 2001. *The European Union in International Politics. Baptism by Fire*. Lanham/Boulder/New York/Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gramsci A. 1999 [1929]. Letter 49, in *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*,

- edited by D. Forgacs. London: Lawrence and Wishart. Available at: http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/gramsci_antonio/lettres_de_prison/lettres_de_prison.html [accessed: 9 July 2013]
- Gramsci A. 1953 [1931] Letter 89. In *Lettres de Prison*. Translated by Jean Noaro. Paris: Editions Sociales. Available at: http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/gramsci_antonio/lettres_de_prison/lettres_de_prison.html [accessed: 9 July 2013]
- Guzzini S. 2005. The concept of power, a constructivist analysis. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 33, 495- 521.
- Habermas J. 1984 *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume One: Reason and Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hajer, M. 1993. Discourse coalitions and the institutionalization of practice, in *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, edited by F. Fischer and J. Forester. Durham: Duke University Press, 43-76.
- Hall S. 1980. Cultural studies: two paradigms. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 57-72.
- Hansen L. 2006. *Security as a Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- Hay C. and Rosamond B. 2002 Globalisation, European integration and the discursive construction of economic imperatives. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(2), 147-67.
- Held D. 1980 *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Hall S. 1986. On postmodernism and articulation: an interview with Stuart Hall, *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 45–60.
- Hill C. 2003. *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Hillion C. 2009 *Mixity and Coherence in EU External Relations: The Significance of the Duty of Cooperation*, CLEER Working Papers 2. The Hague: T.M.C. Asser Institute.
- Holsti KJ. 1985. *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*. Winchester: Allen and Unwin.
- Hopf T. 1998 The promise of constructivism in international relations theory. *International Security*, 23(1), 171–200.
- Jørgensen K.E. (eds.) (1997) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Jørgensen M. and Phillips L. 2002 *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Jørgensen, K.E. and Wessel R.A. 2012 The position of the European Union in (other) international organizations: confronting legal and political approaches European foreign policy, in *European Foreign Policy: Legal and Political Perspectives*, edited by P. Koutrakos. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 261-286.
- Keeley J.F. 1990. Towards a Foucauldian theory of international regimes. *International Organizatio*, 44(1), 83-105.
- Korsgaard C.M. 2003 Realism and constructivism in twentieth century moral philosophy. *APA Centennial Supplement to The Journal of Philosophical Research*, 99-122.
- Kratochwil F. 1988 Regimes, interpretation and the ‘science’ of politics: A reappraisal. *Millennium: Journal of International Studie*, 17(2), 263–284.
- Kristensen P.M. 2012 Dividing discipline: Structures of communication in international relations. *International Studies Review*, 14, 32–50.
- Kubálková V. (ed.) 2001. *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Laatikainen K.V. 2010. Multilateral leadership at the UN after the Lisbon Treaty. *European*

- Foreign Affairs Review*, 15(4), 475-493.
- Laclau E. and C. Mouffe 1985. *Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Larsen H. 1997. *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis. France, Britain and Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Leydesdorff L. 2006. The biological metaphor of a (second-order) observer and the sociological discourse. *Kybernetes*, 35(3/4), 531–546.
- MacDonnel D. 1986. *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Manners I. and Whitman R.G. 2003. The ‘difference engine’: constructing and representing the international identity of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(3): 380–404.
- Manners, I. 2002. Normative power Europe: a contradiction in terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(2), 235-258.
- Manning P.K. 1979. Metaphors of the field: varieties of organizational discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 660-671.
- March J.G. and Olsen J.P. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Milliken J. 1999. The study of discourse in international relations: A critique of research methods. *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(2), 225-254.
- Nelsen B.F. and A. Stubb A. (eds) 2003. *The European Union: Reading on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Neyer J. 2003. Discourse and order in the EU: A deliberative approach to multi-level governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41(4), 687–706.

- Nugent N. and Rhinard M. 2011. *The European Commission and the European Union's external relations after the Lisbon Treaty*. Twelfth Biennial Conference of the European Union Studies Association, Boston, March 3-5.
- Potter J. and Wetherell M. 1996 [1987]. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Price R. and Reus-Smit C. 1998. Dangerous liaisons? Critical international relations theory and constructivism. *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(3), 259-294.
- Rabinow P. and Sullivan W.M. (eds.) 1988. *Interpretive Social Science: A Second Look*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Reyes A. 2011. Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse Society*, 22(6), 781-807.
- Risse T. 2000. Let's argue! Communicative action in world policy. *International Organization*. 54(1), 1-39.
- Rosamond B. 2005. Conceptualizing the EU model of governance in world politics. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 10(4), 463-478.
- Schimmelfennig F. 2001. The community trap: Liberal norms, rhetorical action, and the Eastern enlargement of the European Union. *International Organization*, 55(1), 47-80.
- Schmalz U. 1998. The Amsterdam provisions on external coherence: Bridging the Union's foreign policy dualism? *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 3, 421-442.
- Schmidt V.A. 2008. Discursive institutionalism: The explanatory power of ideas and discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 303-326.
- Schmitter P.C. 1996. Examining the present Euro-polity with the help of past theories, in *Governance in the European Union*, edited by G. Marks, F. Scharpf, P. Schmitter and W.

- Streeck. London: Sage, 1-14.
- Searle J.R. 1995. *The Social Construction of Social Reality*. London: Penguin Books.
- Searle J. R. 1996 [1969]. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shepherd Laura J. 2008. Power and authority in the production of United Nations Security Council resolution 1325. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52, 383–404.
- Sil R. 2000. The Foundations of eclecticism: The epistemological status of agency, culture, and structure in social theory. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 12(3), 353-387.
- Sil R. and Katzenstein P.J. 2010. Analytic eclecticism in the study of world politics: Reconfiguring problems and mechanisms across research traditions. *Perspective on Politics*, 8, 411-431.
- Simón L. 2012. CSDP, strategy and crisis management: Out of area or out of business? *The International Spectator*, 47(3), 100-15.
- Smith M. 1996. The European Union and a changing Europe: Establishing the boundaries of order. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(1), 5-28.
- Smith M. 2004. *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: the Institutionalization of Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thatcher M. 1992. *Europe's Political Architecture*, speech in the Hague delivered on the 15th May 1992. [Online: Margaret Thatcher Foundation] Available at: www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=108296 [accessed: 8 June 2012]
- Van Dijk TA (ed.). 2012. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

- Wæver, O. 1995. Securitization and desecuritization, in *On Security*, edited by L.R. Lipschutz. New York: Columbia University Press, 46-86.
- Weldes J. 1996. Constructing national interests. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2(3), 275-318.
- White B. 1999. The European challenge to foreign policy analysis. *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(1), 37-66.
- Wittgenstein L. 1971. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wodak R. 2008. Introduction: discourse studies - important concepts and terms, in *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by R. Wodak. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1-29.
- Wodak R. and M. Meyer. 2009. (eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wood S. 2011. Pragmatic power EUrope? *Cooperation and Conflict*, 46(2), 242-261.