

New Frontiers in European Studies

Guildford, 30 June - 1 July 2011

Conference papers are works-in-progress - they should not be cited without the author's permission. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s).

www.uaces.org

Discourse and CFSP/CSDP Policy-Making: Conceptual and Methodological Concerns

Nikola Tomic (PhD student), N.Tomic@lboro.ac.uk
Department of Politics, History and International Relations
Loughborough University, UK.

*Draft paper for the New Frontiers in European Studies: UACES Student Forum 12th Annual Conference
University of Surrey, Guildford, 30 June - 1 July 2011*

Panel: Europe, Discourse, and Institutions: Challenging the mainstream in European Studies I

Abstract

Discourse analysis in the field of European Studies, and especially in the foreign policy domain, has not been very prominent. Most of the explanatory approaches of European integration in the recent years were focusing on the decision making processes in different policy areas and belong to the different types of new institutionalisms (rational choice, historical and sociological institutionalism. The more recent development of a fourth institutionalism – pioneered by Vivian Schmidt and labeled ‘discursive institutionalism’ – attempts to introduce a discursive side to institutionalist analysis. While the approach is systematically developed and useful for analysis of different types of policy, there are difficulties in applying the approach to thoroughly analyzing EU’s foreign policy making for several reasons. This paper positions a discursive institutionalist analysis of EU foreign policy in the broader literature on the EU and its foreign policy. The paper then presents some of the main difficulties of translating the theory to practical analysis and attempts to provide some solutions to these problems. The conceptual and methodological concern include the undeveloped definition of a coordinative discourse vis-à-vis a communicative discourse, the problematic identification of actors involved in CFSP/CSDP policy-making as well as methodological issues with operationalizing the analysis of EU’s CFSP/CSDP.

Keywords: European Union, CFSP/ESDP, discourse, discursive institutionalism

NOTE: This paper is work in progress. Do not cite without permission from the author. Comments and recommendations are more than welcome.

1. Introduction

Although attempts have been made to make use of discursive institutionalism in analyzing EU's foreign policy, none of these attempts do justice to the importance of a discursive approach to institutional analysis. At this point it is important to emphasize the abovementioned formulation of 'EU's foreign policy'. It has become a habit both in the public and media as well as in academia to use 'European' and 'EU' interchangeably, like for example 'European diplomacy' vis-à-vis 'EU diplomacy' or 'European foreign policy' vis-à-vis 'EU foreign policy' as a general term which encompasses the more specific policies of the EU in the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and its security component, the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP).¹ While the difference may seem minuscule at first, a second closer look reveals a considerable impact on the object of research, set of research questions and theoretical approaches. When one talks of European foreign policy, one can be talking of both the foreign policy actions of the EU, as well as foreign policies of individual member states or group of member states. However, if one discusses EU foreign policy, it is clear that one is referring to the EU as the actor involved, and to all the institutional, legal, political and normative characteristics of the EU and its foreign policy. Simply put, the term 'European foreign policy' is more general and imprecise, which is why I prefer to operate with the term 'EU foreign policy'.

The term is not just used for purposes of precision but for easier operationalization of the research. Namely, analyzing EU foreign policy requires a much more in-depth understanding of concepts, definitions, actors, institutional design and institutional mechanisms of the policy-making process itself. For the purpose of this paper (and my research in general) I focus on and analyze the early, more informal stage of the policy process. The goal is to examine the role of actors in the committees, working groups and agencies responsible for policy preparation and implementation, and in particular their role in setting the overall foreign policy discourse of the European Union.

¹ CSDP was formerly known as ESDP (European Security and Defense Policy) but was renamed with the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. The CFSP/ESDP policy framework is generally considered as EU's foreign policy in the classical sense, and is distinguished from the broader term of EU external relations, which includes other policy domains of the EU which deal with third countries, like the enlargement policy, external trade, development and aid policy and others.

In the following sections I will outline the general and more recent trends of European Union studies and how the aforementioned research question fits into the broader literature on the EU and its foreign policy. More recent trends in EU studies and research on the CFSP/CSDP includes constructivist, discursive and institutionalist approaches that focus on ideas. The theoretical framework systematically developed by Vivien Schmidt, discursive institutionalism, combines the discursive and the institutionalist approach to studying policy. The last section is dedicated to describing how discursive institutionalism can be used to analyze the discursive aspects of the CFSP/CSDP and which points of the theory need to be further developed and adapted to the uniqueness of the CFSP/CSDP.

2. European Union studies and discursive approaches

2.1 General trends in European Union studies

The domain of European Union studies has since the early years of the European Union until today examined the reasons for and nature of the European Union. As a consequence of this endeavor the field of EU studies has developed multiple theoretical approaches of European integration. These approaches and the vast literature on the EU can be divided into two general approaches. The first approach sees the European Union as a dependent variable, while the second sees it as an independent one. (Jachtenfuchs, 2001, p. 245) The first approach tries to examine, understand and explain the very process of European integration and to identify the reasons and mechanisms behind it. The major theoretical debates in this approach exist between the two dominant classical theories of European integration, namely intergovernmentalism and neo-functionalism. The second approach uses the European Union and its complex institutional, legal, political and bureaucratic structures to explain certain phenomena in domestic or international politics and society. This general approach to studying the EU does not negate or disregard the existing theories of European integration but simply does not focus on ‘the bigger picture’, but takes the EU as given and tries to understand its parts. Within this approach the more policy-oriented research takes a dominant role. To understand policies, researchers need to borrow concepts from other disciplines, like for example international relations theory, organizational theory, comparative politics, public policy analysis and others. This paper falls under this approach and studies in particular the foreign policy of the EU.

The most dominant theoretical approaches to mid-level and micro-level analysis of the European Union stem from the field of international relations. Hill and Smith (2011) have identified three key perspectives of the EU in international relations research: the EU as a subsystem of international relations, the EU as part of the wider processes of international relations and the EU as a major power in international relations. (p.8) The first perspective focuses on the EU and how the different foreign policies of member states impact the EU foreign policy as a whole. The second perspective sees the EU as a player in international affairs and focuses on the impact of the international arena on the developments of EU's foreign policy. The third perspective also sees the EU as a player in the international arena, but focuses on the nature of its 'power' and the role of the EU in the international arena. Although this categorization is useful for understanding the different research agendas in European Union studies and the studies of EU foreign policy, most often research questions cut across the three different perspectives. This paper is no different. Although it primarily focuses on the different mechanisms within the EU foreign policy, it needs to take into account (both in the conceptual framework and empirical research) the external factors of international affairs as well as the role of the EU in the international arena.

By positioning the paper in a policy-oriented approach and cutting across different perspectives of the EU in the IR field, it is now adequate to be more specific and position the research question within more particular approaches of international relations and EU studies. The research question asks about the role of actors from lower level CFSP/CSDP institutions in constructing the foreign policy discourse of the EU. Naturally, the theoretical framework of the paper needs to borrow from institutionalist approaches, since it focuses on institutions, from social constructivism, since it focuses on constructs and from discursive approaches, since it focuses on discourse. All of these theoretical approaches have been introduced in European Union studies in the 1990s. Although the respective research agendas in EU studies have expended in quality and quantity of work, they are far from exhausted.

2.2 Newer trends in European Union studies

Social constructivism has been introduced into European Union studies as a spill-over from international relations theory, as a result of the "rather narrow focus and sterility of the debates between neofunctionalism and (liberal) intergovernmentalism." (Risse, 2009, p.144)

Constructivism is not a theory like liberalism or realism in the discipline of IR, or neofunctionalism or intergovernmentalism in EU studies. It is rather a philosophical approach which sheds light on certain features of international politics (Adler, 1997, p.323) or European integration. (Risse, 2009, pp.144-5) It posits the social and political reality, in general, and certain aspects of international politics and European integration, in particular, as constructs of groups or individual actors.

The way through which actors in international relations and the EU foreign policy create reality is through communication and practice. Discourse theory as a relative of constructivism is thus relevant for analyzing the discursive creation of meaning of the material world. Discourse as an important factor in analyzing European integration and EU foreign policy has been pushed forward authors such as Risse (1996, 2000), Diez (1999, 2001), Rosamond (2001, with Hay, 2002) Larsen (1997) and Waever (1998b, 2002, 2005). Considering that, like social constructivism, discourse theory is not a general theory of European integration, but an approach useful in explaining or illuminating certain aspects of it, the topics analyzed through such an approach are too numerous to be reviewed in this paper. However, three different research agendas and approaches to discourse theory in European Union studies can be identified: analyzing discourses of national foreign policies and its relations with the European level, the discourse analysis of European identity and culture and finally analyzing discourse to explain governance and political struggle. (Waever, 2009)

The first approach is most common, as it is closer to more traditional views on European foreign policy, remnants of the dominant IR approach to European Union studies. It posits the national member states as unified actors in international relations (and European integration, as a subsystem of international relations, as discussed above). The research questions revolve around the mutual impact of discourses from the national levels and the European level. The literature on Europeanization is closest to this approach. (Boerzel & Risse, 2000, 2007; Goetz and Hix, 2001; Olsen, 2002; Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Radaelli 2004) One of the main problems with this approach is that it sees discourses as a relatively stable variable in explaining developments in European foreign policy. Besides using the term discourse rather loosely and sometimes even misplacing the term (replacing terms like rhetoric, identity or argumentation), it does not properly (if at all) pose the question how discourses are created and where they originate from, but take them for granted as *the* discourse of a member state in a given situation. Such a broad definition of discourse, where “it is ‘all discourse’” (Waever,

2009, p.172), may make discourse analysis more approachable and available to scholars of European Union studies, but it takes away the potential depth of analysis. Another issue with this approach is that it focuses primarily on states as carriers of discourse, which similarly may be analytically more appealing, but this approach fails to take into account the more subtle mechanisms of discourse creation at the European level of foreign policy making.

The second treatment of discourse in European Union studies poses questions of identities, of 'we' feelings and of the 'other' (Checkel and Katzenstein, 2009; Diez, 1995, 1999, 2005; Manners, 2002) This approach is relevant for providing the background information and ideational positions of actors in different policies of the EU. Actors create contexts and position themselves within them through discourse. The actors of the European foreign policy create their own role in the international arena and define their own nature in this arena. One can even go one step further. For EU foreign policy analysis, it may also be helpful to move beyond the EU perspective and take into account the way the rest of the world constructs the EU and defines its role in the international arena. The way others view the EU may have an impact on the way the EU reacts to these views and reshapes its identity as an international actor.

The third approach to discourse and European integration can be seen as a compromise between the first and the second approach, because it focuses on both discourses across national boundaries as well as individual national discourses, which can be seen as "the discursive manifestation of multi-level governance" (Waever, 2009, p.177) and political struggle ranging across both the national and transnational (or supranational) levels of discursive action. Through this approach, discourses cross not just borders of states, but also different policy sectors. It postulates the existence of conflicting and discursively constructed 'polity ideas' which is set of "normative ideas about a legitimate political order." (Jachtenfuchs et al., 1998, p.409) This treatment of discourse enables researchers to analyze European discourses both in depth and breadth. Relating this approach to the analysis of EU foreign policy and the research focus of this paper, this approach helps explain both the interaction of the EU level and national levels of policy making as well as the construction of legitimizing ideas at all levels of discursive action. Although both the national and EU levels will be taken into account, the emphasis will be on the discursive formations at the EU level.

To avoid vagueness and repetition, it is at this point necessary to describe the nature and mechanisms of the EU level. The paper concretely focuses on the institutional setting of Brussels-based institutions of the EU CFSP/CSDP. As mentioned above, the focus of the paper on institutions also requires theoretical insights from institutional approaches.

3. Institutionalism and ideas

Institutional approaches have become more prominent in the fields of IR and European Union studies in the last two decades of the twentieth century, and are becoming increasingly important in explaining policy decisions due to the rise of formal and informal institutions in international relations, including the European arena. It is at this point neither necessary nor possible to describe the different types of institutionalism, especially because of the considerable “proliferation in the adjectives used to characterize its variants.” (Hay, 2006, p.56) However, from the number of new institutionalisms, three generally acknowledged types include rational choice institutionalism, historical institutionalism and sociological institutionalism. Only in the last decade has institutionalism benefited and evolved from works focusing on both institutions and ideas, which fall under such terms as discursive institutionalism (Campbell and Pederson, 2001; Schmidt, 2008, 2010) or constructivist institutionalism (Hay, 2006) This paper will use the term ‘discursive institutionalism’ when referring to these developments of institutional approaches. This term is used because of the focus of this paper on discourses as the means of construction of ideas (beliefs, norms, and meaning of things) in a given institutional context. For the discursive analysis of EU foreign policy, as discussed above, both ideas and discourse are relevant factors. Therefore the choice of discursive institutionalism as the analytical framework of analysis should not come as a surprise.

While the ‘new’ institutionalisms were useful to explain their respective foci of interest, they were soon faced with questions such as policy change and the role of ideas, which they consequentially tried to address. In international relations and European Union studies, the rational choice theories have long been dominant. Accordingly, rational choice institutionalism would be the obvious choice to analyze EU foreign policy institutions, but this approach has certain drawbacks for which it is not suitable to adequately explain the role of actors in the committees, working groups and agencies responsible for policy preparation and

implementation. While rational choice institutionalists see actors as rational agents strategically pursuing their interest, explaining how ideas matter presented itself as a challenge. One of the ways rational institutionalists tried to include ideas in explaining policy decision was to define ideas as an intervening variable which affects (mostly limits) actors' options and goals. Ideas are thus seen as 'road maps' for action. (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993) Goldstein and Keohane identify three types of ideas that influence actors: worldviews, principled beliefs and causal beliefs. Principled beliefs are normative ideas which serve as justifications for policy decisions. Causal beliefs are ideas of how certain aims of those decisions can be attained, while worldviews can be seen as the larger framework within which both normative and cognitive types of beliefs are created and decisions are made, although Goldstein and Keohane don't really define the concept of world views, but instead give the examples of religions and ideologies.

One of the major critiques of this approach by discursive institutionalists is the separation of ideas and interest as two distinct variables. (Hay, 2006; Schmidt, 2008, 2010; Blyth, 2002) As Blyth (2002) explains, interests and ideas should not be separated in analysis because the "concept of interest presupposes unacknowledged but very important *cognates* of interest, such as wants, beliefs and desires" (emphasis in original) and "specifying interests becomes less about structural determination and more about the construction of "wants" as mediated by beliefs and desires – that is, ideas." (p. 29) The construction of interests through ideas keeps these two concepts inseparable as variables that influence policy decisions.

Sociological institutionalists share the criticism of rational choice institutionalists and their focus on interests. On the other end of the rational-ideational debate, sociological institutionalists put greater emphasis on norms, values and beliefs – that is, ideas, to use Blyth's conclusion. However, sociological institutionalists have a more static view of ideas (norms, values, beliefs) and take them for granted as causal variables for policy decisions. Discursive institutionalists have a more dynamic view of ideas, as something that is not given or created out of nowhere. They take a step back and analyze how ideas are discursively constructed.

As they analyze the actual process of the construction of ideas, norms, values beliefs and meanings, discursive institutionalists inevitably take into account the time factor, because construction implies a change from one state to another, from something (or nothing) to

something else, and this change requires time. This development of change over time is also linked to the critique of historical institutionalism, which argues that “long episodes of institutional inertia follow rare ‘critical junctures’ during which exogenous shocks provoke massive, path departing institutional transformations.” (Beland, 2009, p.703) As an alternative explanation, Kathleen Thelen (2004) argues that institutional change is more an ongoing evolution, even between critical junctures, rather than an abrupt reaction to an exogenous force. Such a historical perspective is far more useful in explaining EU foreign policy than an approach which sees the history of EU foreign policy only as a series of events and the EU’s reaction to them.

The turn to ideas, interests and change originate from the necessity of bridging the existing divide between positivism and constructivism, and between rationalist and ideational explanations of events, especially in institutionalist approaches. A comprehensive approach is not only useful, but necessary for the analysis of foreign policy making and EU’s CFSP/CSDP. While material factors inevitably play a great role in explaining policy outcomes, ideas and discourse have considerable explanatory value. For these reasons, a discursive institutionalist perspective has a great potential in explaining the complex mechanism of CFSP/CSDP policy making, and the process of discursive construction within the Brussels-based institutional context. The most elaborate and structured theoretical framework is provided by Vivien Schmidt, who is also pushing for the recognition of discursive institutionalism as the fourth ‘new institutionalism.’ (Schmidt, 2010)

4. Discursive institutionalism and EU foreign policy

4.1 Discourse, structure and agency

One distinction of discursive institutionalism, as pointed out by Schmidt (2008) is the use of the term discourse. She uses the term to encompass the numerous terms that circulate in the literature, like ideas, values, norms, beliefs, rhetoric, arguing, deliberation, and others. She also points out the pragmatic use of the term in contrast to the more theoretical post-modernist use of discourse. Discourse is not just a structured set of constructed meanings, but also as a process of constructing meanings. In other words a discourse is not just a product of communicative action, but the process of communicative action as well. Such a definition

allows Schmidt to attribute actors a greater level of autonomy in reevaluating the discourse and its embedded meanings and ideas. Focusing away from discourse as a structure which constrains actors, Schmidt argues that the carriers of discourse are “sentient agents who construct their ideas conveyed through discourse following a meaning-based logic of communication.” (2008, p. 3) As a result, discourses become more dynamic, which makes it easier to account for change in policies.

Such a view is similar to the view on structure and agency of Anthony Giddens (1984), who noted that “structure is not to be equated to constraint but is always both constraining and enabling.” (p.25) Accordingly, discourse as a product of communicative action should not be seen as a constraining structure, but also a structure enabling actors to change the existing state of affairs in a strategic, intentional manner. Intentionality and reflexivity is of great relevance in a dynamic approach (such as DI) to a dynamic policy (such as the CFSP). As Hay and Rosamond (2002) point out:

It is important, at the outset, that we differentiate between the internalization of a discourse [...] and the more intentional, reflexive and strategic choice of such a discourse as a convenient justification for policies pursued for altogether different reasons. In the first scenario ideas about globalization might be held to be constitutive (in part) of the perceived interests of political actors; in the latter, they are more of an instrumental device deployed in the promotion of a set of extant preferences and (perceived) interests. (p.150)

Schimmelfennig’s notion of ‘rhetorical action’ (2001) is an example of looking at discourse as a strategically used practice and an opportunity for actors to legitimize policy proposals and decisions. However, Schimmelfennig also warns of the backfire effect of discourse and rhetorical action in the form of ‘rhetorical entrapment,’ which constrains agents to act and deviate from the existing, established discourse.

When analyzing the use of discourse in Brussels-based institutions and in the context of the CFSP/ESDP, the more dynamic approach of discursive institutionalism certainly seems adequate. However, “one must be wary of simply ‘copying and pasting’ concepts and analytical frames; analytical tools need adaptation to the peculiarities of ESDP.” (Vanhoonacker et. al., 2010, p.3)

4.2 Adapting the theory to EU foreign policy analysis: coordination

One of the differences between CFSP/ESDP and other EU policies is the considerably greater absence of public input in the policy making process. A significant part of this process takes place outside the reach of the public's eyes and ears. Most often the first contact of the public with a policy is the publically available document on EU's website or public statements of EU officials. The public often gets involved in the policymaking process at the very last stages of the process, which would not be so much of an issue, if the CFSP would not have such a great impact on people's lives. In fact, it often determines the course of everyday lives of a whole people, for example, in cases of joint actions in forms of humanitarian or military missions.

Considering that the general public is presented with already drafted and finalized texts and public statements, the issue of democratic deficit inevitably emerges. The weight of this issue can arguably be mitigated by two lines of thought – one being that even in national policymaking, matters of foreign policy and security are left with little or no democratic input. Such reasoning certainly raises normative concerns.

Another argument that intends to mitigate the gravity of CFSP's democratic deficit is the point that democratically elected ministers and representatives of member states actually decide in the Council of ministers, which can arguably satisfy proper democratic representation at the level of the EU. This argument can easily be refuted, because the decisions made by democratically elected representatives of member states are made on policy provisions, decisions, scenarios, assumptions and ideas determined by non-elected actors in the institutional framework of the CFSP/CSDP. These actors, who are members of committees, working groups and agencies, are the ones that have *de facto* power of controlling the discourse of the whole EU. They do this by materializing policies in the form of text. This discourse in the form of text is transferred up the policymaking process up to the negotiating table, and if approved, these policies are also implemented. While in the process the text and wording may change, the discourse (both normative and cognitive ideas) is mostly preserved. Moreover, as the argument goes, “the political control of foreign and security policy, which is considered sacrosanct by member state governments, is only rarely exercised by politicians at the level of the European Council or Council of Ministers.” (Howorth, 2011, p.3)

In the context of CFSP/CSDP one differentiation made by Schmidt is therefore crucial, namely the distinction between communicative discourse and coordinative discourse. (Schmidt, 2000, 2006, 2008, 2010) The latter represents discursive interactions of actors within institutions during policy construction, while the former represents the discursive interaction between these actors and the public. The interaction of communicative discourse takes into account both top-down and bottom-up directions and includes processes such as public deliberation and policy legitimization. Since the public has little (if any) input in the CFSP and especially in the CSDP policy making process, one cannot really talk of deliberation with the public. Legitimization on the other hand falls outside the research focus on policy making, since it comes after the policy decision have already been made. The interest lies on the process of policy creation, including the creation of discourses within the policy making process. The key characteristic of CFSP/CSDP policy making is consensus-building and coordination. Therefore, making use of discursive institutionalism will require a focus on the coordinative discourse within Brussels-based institutions. Besides placing coordinative discourse in the policy sphere (in contrast to the communicative discourse which is placed in the public sphere) and enumerating the types of actors that can be involved in coordinative discourse, Schmidt does not elaborate on the distinctiveness of coordinative discourse vis-à-vis communicative discourse. What is the nature of coordinative discourse and what are its characteristics are only few of the questions that require answering if one wants to develop on the very important distinction between coordinative and communicative discourse.

Following the argument that policy creation goes parallel to discourse creation, the same parallel can be drawn between the nature of policy making and the nature of the coordinative discourse. The principles in policy-making, hence, in the discursive activity in the institutional context of CFSP/CSDP in Brussels are consensus, information sharing and coordination. As a result, the literature on socialization (Nuttall, 1992, 2000; Lewis, 2005; Manners and Whitman, 2000; Smith, M.E., 2004; Tonra 2003; Juncos and Pomorska, 2006) will argue that through recurring interaction based on these principles over a longer period of time, the actors in such institutional contexts will develop shared values, beliefs, ideas, and consequentially interests (although not all actors wish to confess to these developments). The peculiarity of the CFSP/CSDP is the interplay between national, member states' interests and the common interest constructed through coordination of national representatives. As described above, increasingly "national interests are being transformed within a European context" (Tonra, 2000, p.159)

4.3 Adapting the theory to EU foreign policy analysis: actors

To examine how these processes occur one primarily needs to identify the actual actors involved in the policy making and discourse creation. The main institutions responsible for identifying issues, setting the agenda and framing policy ideas are the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS). Established at the Helsinki European Council in 1999, these permanent bodies consist of national diplomats, chiefs of defense of the member states and their deputies and military experts.

The PSC is “*de facto* the highest administrative body in the ESDP” (Vanhoonacker et al., 2010, p.9) and prepares the dossiers related to foreign and security policy for the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER), which then prepares the agenda and dossiers for Council meetings. The PSC is helped by the Politico-Military Group (consisting of defense counselors and diplomats), the Nicolaidis group, which sets the agenda for the PSC and the EUMC, which provides recommendation and advice on military matters. The EUMC is the highest military body in the ESDP. It consists of Chiefs of Defense of member states who are often represented by their Military Representatives. The EUMC is assisted by the EUMC working group and the EUMS. The EUMS consists of military and civilian experts seconded by the member states and are integrated in the General Secretariat of the Council.

The ESDP structures responsible for civilian aspects of the policy include the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM) and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC). CIVCOM consists of ambassadors from the member states and is in some regards the equivalent of the EUMC, because it gives recommendations and advice to the PSC regarding civilian operations. CIVCOM is assisted by the CPCC, which is integrated in the Council Secretariat.

Besides these institutions, there are other preparatory bodies and actors involved in the early stages of the policy making process. Working groups consist of members from the Permanent Representations of member states in Brussels and are in charge of drafting and formulating policy. The European External Action Service (EEAS) and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (currently Catherine Ashton) are important actors in coordinating EU’s foreign policy both vertically (between member states and the EU

level) and horizontally (among institutions). While the EEAS is still under development, considering it includes both members from the European Commission and the Council Secretariat, it can be assumed that the input in the CFSP/CSDP will be considerable. The role of the High Representative and the Council Secretariat has in the past also proven to be important in the CFSP/CSDP policy process. (Dijkstra, 2008, 2010) The European Union has also set up three CFSP/CSDP agencies to provide expertise, analyses and information: The European Defense Agency (EDA), the European Union Institute for Security Studies (ISS) and the European Union Satellite Centre (EUSC).

The complexity of CFSP/CSDP's policy making structure and the frequently informal nature of coordination make it difficult for academics to follow the exact channels of discursive action within the Brussels institutional context. However, the current research on the day-to-day work of these institutions and the socialization processes as described above proves useful in understanding the context of Brussels-based institutions and the 'Brussels culture', which can be defined as the "formal internalization of shared norms and precedents." (Tonra, 2000, p.159) Within this context, a discursive institutionalist approach can be adapted to serve as the conceptual framework for EU foreign policy analysis.

5. Methodological concerns

With the theoretical and conceptual framework set up, the next question is a 'how' question, namely the question of method. Linking discourse analysis with foreign policy analysis is a methodologically challenging task. One attempt by Ole Wæver posits discourse analysis not just as a methodological and analytical framework for foreign policy analysis, but as a theoretical framework as well. The definition of discourse falls towards the structuralist camp. Namely discourse is defined as a structure of meaning, and as Wæver argues "Structures of meaning can explain and elucidate foreign policy." (Wæver, 2001, p.26) As the argument follows, "discourses organise knowledge systematically, and thus delimit what can be said and what not." (Ibid., p.29) According to this approach discourse is understood as a precondition to actors' statements. This approach decouples the use of language from the users of language. Instead, language is used when and where appropriate within a given structure of meanings.

Such a structuralist approach to discourse demonstrates weaknesses, because it focuses on the rules of the diffusion of meaning, but not necessarily on the creation of meaning. In other words, it falls back on the typical structure-agency conundrum, favoring the structure side of the debate. The question of where, when, and most importantly, how these structures came into being in the first place, inevitably poses itself. Therefore a more agent-oriented theoretical approach to discourse, like discursive institutionalism as described above can prove more useful in linking discourse analysis with foreign policy analysis. Foreign policy analysis, among other aspects, also focuses on the agent, whether it is a unified actor or a group of actors. In such an approach, discourse is seen as both product and precondition of statements. Discourse, in this view, is the carrier of an ever-changing set of meanings as well as the process in which meanings are reconstructed or preserved.

5.1 The socio-cognitive approach

In foreign policy such an approach is particularly valuable because it allows for analyzing both the content of discourse (the *what*) as well as the discursive process (the *how* and the *why/when/where/who/to whom*). A valuable contribution to the actual method of analysis of discourse in an agent-oriented approach comes from Teun van Dijk and his socio-cognitive approach to discourse analysis. (1990, 2008) In this approach reality represents subjective experiences of the ‘objective’, material reality ‘out there.’ Such an approach posits that the structures of meaning (realities) are created by actors’ cognitive processes and reproduced or changed by discursive processes.

It can be equivocal to just say that discourses construct reality. The numerous approaches to discourse however do grant researchers freedom to define in greater length what the phrase ‘discourses create reality’ means. My take on the question is that discourses construct knowledge, norms and values. Knowledge is simplistically seen as the conception of an individual or society of *what is*, and includes views and perceptions of reality and feelings and attitudes towards this reality. Norms and values are seen as the conception of individuals or a society of *what should be*. The existing knowledge and norms represent the background ideational abilities mentioned in the previous section. These abilities can be identified by content analysis and discourse analysis of official texts, as well as from questionnaires and interviews.

The actual impact of these background ideational abilities on agenda setting and policy design and the use of actors' foreground discursive abilities are more difficult to establish empirically. In terms of content and discourse analysis, intertextuality and a comparison of older and newer drafts can shed light on the impact of existing knowledge and norms on a given topic. Questionnaires and interviews with the actors involved in the policy process can confirm or negate the impact of norms on agenda setting and policy design when compared to the finding of the content analysis and discourse analysis.

What distinguishes discourse analysis of texts from content analysis of texts is the taking into account of the context. In explaining EU foreign policy, the institutional context is necessary but not sufficient, as one also needs to take into account other variables. To understand the notion of context, it is again useful to turn to van Dijk: "Contexts are not some kind of objective social situation, but rather a socially based but subjective construct of participants about the for-them-relevant properties of such a situation." (2008, p.56) Teun van Dijk's theory of context also has some connections with discursive institutionalism, because of its focus on the agent. Van Dijk's theory of context elaborates on how contexts influence and are influenced by discourse. The element of context is particularly useful to explore and analyze how discourses are constructed within Brussels institutions. Institutions are not the only part of the context, but also the existing knowledge and norms of individuals involved in discourse production, in other words, the subjective interpretation of reality, as well as the spatial-temporal situations (the actual material phenomena, like an event, for example the 9/11 attacks or piracy attacks off the coast of Somalia).

5.2 Methods, data selection and case studies

The subjectiveness of actors taken into account by this framework has its methodological implications and begs for interviews and questionnaires. A discourse analysis of texts, which are the material products of discourse, and its findings can then be compared with the responses from the questionnaires and interviews. Questionnaires and interviews are necessary for multiple reasons. One of the reasons is to complement the data found in text. In matters of security, not all versions of a text are publicly available, especially the early drafts and informal notes and correspondence. Therefore it is necessary to rely on interviews and questionnaires as a subjective, yet direct source of information on the context of the discursive process. Another reason is to elucidate if not reveal the position of the actors involved in a given context and a

given situation. Interviews and questionnaires can reveal the knowledge on certain topics at a given moment in time as well as the norms, values and worldviews of the actors involved. As aforementioned, the responses from the structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews can complement the findings of the discourse analysis of texts. By triangulating the findings of the three methods, a more clarified picture of the background ideational abilities and foreground discursive abilities can be presented.

Certainly, these methods have their inherent flaws. However, in combination they can complement each other for more accurate conclusions, and hopefully generalizations, which can be tested on other case studies. One of the main potential issues with this approach is that the interpretive analysis of qualitative and quantitative data dominates in this type of methodology. Interpretation of data is prone to criticism of bias, both in terms of the selection of data, as well as the bias in analysis (guesstimating, prioritizing of affirmative data over contradicting data, etc.) To avoid bias, it is important to have variety in variables based on which data will be selected, as well making sure to exhaust the analysis.

For such a detailed and persuasive analysis of a discourse, one needs to exhaust the analyzed material, i.e. to reach the point where the analysis of carefully collected data does not generate any more insights or hypotheses. However, for a persuasive generalization of discourse formation within an institutional setting, one needs to broaden the scope and data set across as many discourses as possible for a more elaborate comparison and more accurate generalization on the conditions for discourse formation within the observed institutional setting. In my research, I was faced with the tradeoff between quantity and quality, between depth and breadth of analysis. Due to the constraints and limitations accompanying this type of research, I have opted for a balanced approach to analysis, where both the number of case studies (and analyzed discourses, respectively) and the depth of analysis of individual discourses are to some degree limited.

To keep the analysis both focused and in-depth, I look at missions deployed by the EU. The thesis assumes that joint actions, in the form of missions, require considerable coordination from its early drafting stage all the way to the voting table. Consequentially, the level of coordinative discursive action is expected to be high. When choosing the case studies I had certain variables in mind: the timing of the mission development, the duration of the process, the nature of the planned mission and the geographical scope of the mission.

The timing of mission development and deployment is relevant in relation to the institutional developments of the EU and its CFSP/CSDP. The period before and after the Lisbon Treaty or the very beginnings of ESDP may prove to be relevant periods of time, in terms of setting the context for discursive processes. Based on this variable, a closer look at EU's first ever missions in Bosnia (civilian) OR Macedonia (military), as well as EU's first mission after the Lisbon Treaty, the training mission in Somalia, may reveal interesting findings.

The duration of the coordination process, from the first mentioning/idea of a mission to the implementation/deployment represents another important variable. The longer the period from the initial idea to implementation, the more information and activity there is to analyze. If however the period is smaller, there could be other potential reasons for that (urgency of the matter or existing efficient coordination). The nature of the mission varies between the military and civilian. A third option would be a hybrid mission, of which there is only one, the EU mission in Sudan.

Finally, the geographical scope of the missions range from missions within the European continent to territories outside of it. The proximity of an issue where a mission is chosen as a solution influences the way in which policy makers speak about the issue. Arguably, the closer the issue geographically, the more important it is for the EU. I would therefore look at a case study within Europe and maybe one in Africa.

Considering the criteria above, I will look at the last EU mission in Somalia and either Bosnia or Macedonia as the first missions. Discursively very intense, due to the long duration of its development, the EULEX mission as a policy-making process also offers considerable amounts of valuable data.

6. Conclusions

To analyze the foreign policy of the European Union, one needs to understand the nature of the policy making process. First of all, one needs to distinguish between European foreign policy and EU foreign policy. The term 'European foreign policy' can imply both the CFSP/CSDP and individual foreign policies of member states or groups of member states. EU foreign policy clearly implies the CFSP/CSDP, where the EU is the primary actor. The EU is not a unitary

actor, like a nation state, which IR scholars prefer to operate with. The EU is a complex actor with its unique institutional setup, ranging across national levels and a supranational level. To have a better understanding of EU's foreign policy, one needs to take into account its complexity. Although European Union studies have mostly borrowed theoretical concepts and frameworks from the discipline of international relations, needs to follow both more recent trends in IR theory and institutionalist theories. The recent constructivist turn to international relations has gone a step further in understanding the origins of policies. Instead of taking interests and preferences for granted, the ideas and meanings of the material reality have been taken into account. Discourse theory, a relative of constructivism, can explain how these ideas and meanings are constructed through the use of language. Discourses, as structured sets of meanings and carriers of ideas, are linked with actors' perceptions of reality, and their normative and cognitive ideas of action. Actions (or practice), ideas and norms become institutionalized and are reproduced in a given institutional context. Institutional approaches combined with discursive approaches can prove to provide with better explanations of the origins and developments of policies. Combining these two approaches can also enrich both the institutionalist literature and the literature on discourse.

One of the proponents of such a combination is Vivien Schmidt and her discursive institutionalism, posited as the 'fourth new institutionalism'. Discursive institutionalism is a useful theoretical framework to understand a policy making process, because it bridges the explanatory gaps of the different strands of institutionalism: rational choice, historical and sociological institutionalism. Discursive institutionalism takes into account both ideas and interests. Its definition of discourse includes both an ideational element (content of discourses) and a dynamic element (process of discursive action). Such a definition of discourse gives more freedom to actors in the structure-agency debate. Although discourses as structures of meaning can constrain actors in their choices of action, they can also enable actors to change the existing structures through the process of discourse (re)creation. The greater focus on agency, enables researches to understand the role of actors and their use of language in the policy making process.

However, translating the theory to the practice of EU foreign policy, namely the CFSP/CSDP, requires certain clarifications and adaptations to the unique nature of the CFSP/CSDP:

1. *Coordination vs. communication* - One of the characteristics of CFSP/CSDP is the lack of public input in the policy making process, contributing to the democratic deficit in the EU. One can mitigate the problem by arguing that every foreign policy is characterized by lack or little public input. This argument is not an answer to the problem, but instead raises even more normative questions. Another way of addressing the problem is arguing that, like in nation states, the deciders of policy making are democratically elected, which in the case of the EU would be the ministers of member states sitting at the Council of the EU. However, a more thorough look at the context of CFSP/CSDP policy making will reveal that the actual policies are drafted and decided on at an earlier stage of policy making. Although these lower levels of policy making include actors that are representatives of member states, they are neither democratically elected nor do they necessarily represent the 'interest' of the respective member states. Instead they have through repeated and ongoing interaction in Brussels with their peers from other member states created a common culture and nature of communication. To understand this interaction, one needs to turn to discourse and institutions. Discursive institutionalism accounts for two different types of discourse: communicative and coordinative discourse. However the differentiation is limited to the sphere of discursive action (public sphere vs. policy sphere, respectively). Since the public is not involved in the actual policy making process, one cannot talk of a communicative discourse in the policy making process. A more developed conceptualization of coordinative discourse is required to translate the theory of discursive institutionalism to the CFSP/CSDP. *How* does the discourse creation process look like? Proposed paths of development include the nature of coordinative discourse within the Brussels-based institutional context, which is a nature of consensus building, information sharing and coordination.

2. *Actors* – Another issue that needs to be addressed is the question of *who* is involved in the discourse creation process. Mapping the complex network of actors involved in the policy making process is not an impossible task, but is certainly a deterrent of potential research interested in the discursive processes within Brussels institutions. Mapping the actors is necessary but not sufficient, as every case study may have a different setup of actors involved in the policy (and discourse) making process. Process tracing can reveal the origins of discourse and a systematic discourse analysis can explain the process of discourse creation and consequentially the policy making process

3. *Methodology* – Another issue which is crucial for the translation of a discursive institutionalist approach to EU foreign policy is the careful selection of methods, data and case studies. The paper proposes the triangulation of discourse analysis of texts (official documents, policy drafts and/or informal notes and correspondence, based on availability), structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with the actors involved in the respective CFSP/CSDP policy-process. When choosing a case-study (different CFSP/CSDP missions), one also needs to have a greater variety of variables for the purpose of more accurate generalization after comparison. The paper proposes the following variables: the timing of the mission development, the duration of the process, the nature of the planned mission and the geographical scope of the mission. With an exhaustive analysis of the carefully selected data and the varied case-studies, the analysis of EU's foreign policy discourse has the potential to better explain EU's foreign policy process.

With these issues addressed, discursive institutionalism can provide for a fruitful theoretical framework for analysis of the EU foreign policy making process and the role of discourse in this process. This paper does not by any means claim to have presented final answers to the issues described above. Further development of the issues described above is duly required. The goal of this paper is to stimulate debate on the potential of a discursive institutionalist approach, especially in the field of EU foreign policy, which is a fruitful field of research on discourses and institutions.

Bibliography:

- Adler, E., 1997. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), pp.319-363.
- Adler, E., 2005. *Communitarian international relations*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Berg, B., 2001. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* 4th ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blyth, M., 2002. *Great transformations : economic ideas and institutional change in the twentieth century*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Boerzel, T.A. & Risse, T., 2000. When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change. *European Integration online Papers*, 4(15), <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-015a.htm>. [Accessed 20.05.2011]
- Boerzel, T.A. & Risse, T., 2007. Europeanization: The Domestic Impact of EU Politics. in Joergensen, K.E., Pollack, M.A. & Rosamond, B. (eds.), *Handbook of European Union Politics*, London: SAGE Publications. (pp.483-504)
- Checkel, J., 2005. International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework. *International Organization*, 59(04). Available at: http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0020818305050289 [Accessed May 20, 2011].
- Checkel, J. & Katzenstein, P.J. (eds.), 2009. *European identity*, Cambridge UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christiansen, T. & Kirchner, E. (eds.), 2000. *Committee governance in the European Union*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Christiansen, T., 2000. Review section. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7(1), pp.163-169.
- Christiansen, T., 2007. *The role of committees in the policy-process of the European Union*, Cheltenham: E. Elgar.
- Diez, T., 1995. *Neues Europa, altes Modell : die Konstruktion von Staatlichkeit im politischen Diskurs zur Zukunft der europäischen Gemeinschaft*, Frankfurt/Main: Haag und Herchen.
- Diez, T., 1999. Speaking "Europe": the politics of integration discourse. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(4), pp.598-613.
- Diez, T., 2001. Europe as a Discursive Battleground: Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 36(1), pp.5-38.
- Diez, T., 2005. Constructing the Self and Changing Others: Reconsidering 'Normative Power Europe'. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 33(3), pp.613-636.

- Dijkstra, H., 2008. The Council Secretariat's Role in the Common Foreign and Security Policy. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 13(2), pp.149-166.
- Dijkstra, H., 2010. Explaining variation in the role of the EU Council Secretariat in first and second pillar policy-making. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17(4), pp.527-544.
- European Union, 2010. Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:083:0013:0046:EN:PDF> [Accessed May 19, 2011].
- Featherstone, K., 2003. *The politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fierke, K., 2001. *Constructing international relations : the next generation*, Armonk N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.
- Goetz, K. & Hix, S., 2001. *Europeanised politics? : European integration and national political systems*, London, Portland OR: Frank Cass.
- Gariup, M., 2009. *European security culture : language, theory, policy*, Farnham England, Burlington VT: Ashgate Pub.
- Goldstein, J. & Keohane, R., 1993. *Ideas and foreign policy : beliefs, institutions, and political change*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hansen, L. & Waever, O. 2002. *European integration and national identity: the challenge of the Nordic states*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Hay, C. & Rosamond, B., 2001. Globalization, European integration and the discursive construction of economic imperatives. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(2), pp.147-167.
- Hill, C. & Smith, M. (eds.), 2011. *International relations and the European Union* 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howarth, D., 2009. Power, discourse, and policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(3), pp.309-335.
- Howorth, J., 2004. Discourse, Ideas, and Epistemic Communities in European Security and Defence Policy. *West European Politics*, 27(2), pp.211-234.
- Howorth, J., 2011. Decision-Making in Security and Defence Policy. Towards Supranational Intergovernmentalism? *KFG Working Paper Series*, (No. 25). Available at: http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/en/v/transformeurope/publications/working_paper/WP_25_Howorth.pdf [Accessed April 20, 2011].
- Jachtenfuchs, M., Diez, T. & Jung, S., 1998. Which Europe?: Conflicting Models of a Legitimate European Political Order. *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(4), pp.409-445.

- Jachtenfuchs, Markus, 2001. The Governance Approach to European Integration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39(2), pp.245-264.
- Juncos, A. & Pomorska, K., 2006. Playing the Brussels game: strategic socialisation in CFSP Council Working Groups. *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 10(11). Available at: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/index.php/eiop/article/view/2006_011a. [last accessed 21.05.2011.]
- Juncos, A. & Pomorska, K., 2008. Does Size Matter? CFSP Committees after Enlargement. *Journal of European Integration*, 30(4), pp.493-509.
- Larsen, Henrik, 1997. *Foreign policy and discourse analysis : France, Britain, and Europe*, London, New York: Routledge/LSE.
- Larsen, H., 2002. The EU: A Global Military Actor? *Cooperation and Conflict*, 37(3), pp.283-302.
- Lemke, J., 1995. *Textual politics : discourse and social dynamics*, London, Bristol PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Lewis, J., 2005. The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision Making in the European Union. *International Organization*, 59(04). Available at: http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0020818305050320 [Accessed May 26, 2011].
- Manners, I., 2002. Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(2), pp.235-258.
- Manners, I. & Whitman, R.G. (eds.), 2000. *The foreign policies of European Union member states*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Meyer, C.O. & Strickmann, E., 2011. Solidifying Constructivism: How Material and Ideational Factors Interact in European Defence. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(1), pp.61-81.
- Neyer, Jurgen, 2003. Discourse and Order in the EU. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41(4), pp.687-706.
- Neyer, Jürgen, 2006. The deliberative turn in integration theory. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(5), pp.779-791.
- Niedermayer, O., 1998. *Public opinion and internationalized governance*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nuttall, S., 1992. *European Political Co-operation*, Oxford [England], New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.
- Nuttall, S., 2000. *European foreign policy*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, J.P., 2002. The Many Faces of Europeanization. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(5), pp.921-952.

- Pedersen, T., 2008. *When culture becomes politics : European identity in perspective*, Aarhus Denmark, Oakville CT: Aarhus University Press ;;David Brown Book Co. [distributor].
- Peterson, J., 1998. *A common foreign policy for Europe? : competing visions of the CFSP*, London ;;New York: Routledge.
- Radaelli, C. & Schmidt, V., 2004. Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *West European Politics*, 27(2), pp.183-210.
- Radaelli, C. & Schmidt, V., 2004. Conclusions. *West European Politics*, 27(2), pp.364-379.
- Rhodes, R., 2006. *The Oxford handbook of political institutions*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Risse-kappen, T., 1996. Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(1), pp.53-80.
- Risse, T., 2000. "Let's Argue!": Communicative Action in World Politics. *International Organization*, 54(1), pp.1-39.
- Risse, T., 2009. Social constructivism and European Integration. in Wiener, A. & Diez, T.(eds.), 2009. *European integration theory* 2nd ed., Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. (pp.144-60)
- Ruggie, J.G., 1998. What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge. *International Organization*, 52(4), pp.855-885.
- Schimmelfennig, F., 2001. The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union. *International Organization*, 55(1), pp.47-80.
- Schimmelfennig, F. & Thomas, D.C., 2009. Normative institutionalism and EU foreign policy in comparative perspective. *International Politics*, 46(4), pp.491-504.
- Schmidt, V.A., 2000. Democracy and Discourse in an Integrating Europe and a Globalising World. *European Law Journal*, 6(3), pp.277-300.
- Schmidt, V., 2006. *Democracy in Europe : the EU and national polities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, V.A., 2008. Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1), pp.303-326.
- Schmidt, V.A., 2009. Explaining democracy in Europe. *Comparative European Politics*, 7(3), pp.396-407.
- Schmidt, V.A., 2010. Taking ideas and discourse seriously: explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth "new institutionalism." *European Political Science Review*, 2(01), p.1.

- Smith, M., 2004. *Europe's foreign and security policy : the institutionalization of cooperation*, Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stacey, J., 2010. *Integrating Europe: informal politics and institutional change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thelen, K., 2004. *How institutions evolve : the political economy of skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tonra, B., 2000. Committees in Common: Comitology and the Common Foreign and Security Policy. in Christiansen, T. & Kirchner, E. (eds.), 2000. *Committee governance in the European Union*, Manchester: Manchester University Press. (pp.145-60)
- Tonra, B., 2003. Constructing the CFSP: The Utility of a Cognitive Approach. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41(4), pp.731-756.
- Tonra, B., 2004. *Rethinking European Union foreign policy*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1990. Social cognition and discourse, in H. Giles and W.P. Robinson (eds), *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 163-86.
- van Dijk, T., 2008. *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanhoonacker, S., Dijkstra, H. & Maurer, H., 2010. Understanding the Role of Bureaucracy in the European Security and Defence Policy: The State of the Art. *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 14(1).
- Waever, O., 1998. Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses. in Wivel, A. (ed.) *Explaining European Integration*. Copenhagen: Political Studies Press. (pp.100-46)
- Waever, O., 2002. Identity, communities and foreign policy: discourse analysis as foreign policy theory. in Hansen, L. & Waever, O. 2002. *European integration and national identity: the challenge of the Nordic states*, London, New York: Routledge. (pp.20-49)
- Waever, O., 2009, Discursive Approaches. in Wiener, A. & Diez, T.(eds.), 2009. *European integration theory* 2nd ed., Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. (pp.163-80)
- White, B., 1999. The European Challenge to Foreign Policy Analysis. *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(1), pp.37-66.
- Wiener, A. & Diez, T.(eds.), 2009. *European integration theory* 2nd ed., Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R., 2002. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.*, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.