UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The 2011 Revised European Neighbourhood Policy

Continuity and Change in EU Foreign Policy

Schumacher, T.; Bouris, D.

DOI
10.1057/978-1-137-47182-6_1

Publication date
2017

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
The Revised European Neighbourhood Policy

License
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (https://www.openaccess.nl/en/policies/open-access-in-dutch-copyright-law-taverne-amendment)

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Schumacher, T., & Bouris, D. (2017). The 2011 Revised European Neighbourhood Policy: Continuity and Change in EU Foreign Policy. In D. Bouris, & T. Schumacher (Eds.), *The Revised European Neighbourhood Policy: Continuity and Change in EU Foreign Policy* (pp. 1-33). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-47182-6_1

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:16 Sept 2026

'At a moment when the EU is once again reviewing its signature European Neighbourhood Policy, this book is instructive in assessing the last revision to this strategy in 2011. Bouris and Schumacher have assembled an interestingly eclectic mix of contributions, many of which offer useful perspectives somewhat different from standard accounts of EU foreign policy. The volume sheds light on why the promised ENP upgrade went awry and failed to divert the crises with which the EU now grapples to its east and south.' – Richard Youngs, Professor of International Relations, University of Warwick, UK

'This expansive set of chapters clarifies the urgency and complexity involved in the EU's revised policy for engagement with the Union's southern and eastern neighborhoods. Conceptually sophisticated and empirically rich, the book tackles the ontological ambivalence, normative tensions, and operational challenges in the EU's Revised ENP, leaving no doubt about the inextricable, reflexive linkages between the future of the EU and developments in countries to the south and east.' – Elizabeth H. Prodromou, Visiting Associate Professor of Conflict Resolution, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, USA

'Dimitris Bouris' and Tobias Schumacher's book will become an indispensable read in the study of the ENP. It provides a major new critical synthesis of the Union's relations with its immediate neighbours in the framework of the revised ENP of 2011. This is a must-read for anyone who wants to understand the ENP's subsequent reviews and thus the EU's evolving foreign policy towards its 'near abroad'.' – Sharon Pardo, Jean Monnet Chair ad personam— Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel

Dimitris Bouris • Tobias Schumacher
Editors

The Revised European Neighbourhood Policy

Continuity and Change in EU Foreign Policy

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Dimitris Bouris
Department of Political Science
University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Tobias Schumacher
European Neighbourhood Policy Chair
College of Europe (Natolin)
Warsaw, Poland

ISBN 978-1-137-47181-9 ISBN 978-1-137-47182-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-47182-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016957732

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017
The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, , trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover image © Mikael Damkier / Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd. London

Acknowledgements

We are grateful and indebted to several people for their invaluable contribution to this volume. First of all, we would like to thank the authors, not only for their contributions but also for having been patient and for having replied to our numerous messages and for addressing all of our comments throughout the process of turning individual drafts into one manuscript. Editing can be quite a laborious task and sometimes, so they say, even challenge long-established relations with colleagues and friends as a result of the many critical and seemingly endless demands of the editors. Fortunately, our experience was different as our contributors did not mind our repeated queries and requests for revisions and updates, thus turning this process into a truly memorable experience. Also, we would like to thank Palgrave Macmillan for believing in this project and for their valuable input.

This volume grows out of several PhD Summer Schools that have been organised annually by the ENP Chair of the College of Europe, Natolin campus (Warsaw) throughout the last years and that have been devoted to the study of the multi-faceted dimensions of the ENP—original and revised. We thank sincerely all colleagues—some represented in this volume—who have volunteered to come to the Natolin campus of the College of Europe and offered inspiring talks and lectures to the many PhD students who participated in the various editions of the school. Equally, several institutions and consortia have collaborated and contributed to its success. We are grateful for the institutional and financial support, generously provided by the College of Europe, Natolin campus (Warsaw), the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Israel Office), and the Centre for the Study of European Politics

CHAPTER 1

The 2011 Revised European Neighbourhood Policy: Continuity and Change in EU Foreign Policy

Tobias Schumacher and Dimitris Bouris

Introduction

The EU's relations with its eastern and southern neighbours have never attracted as much attention as in recent years. The outbreak of what was prematurely called the 'Arab Spring' in early 2011, the fall of supposedly consolidated autocratic regimes in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, the eruption and continuation of the civil war in Syria, the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL/Daesh), the military coup of 3 July 2013 in Egypt leading to the ousting of the first ever democratically elected civilian Egyptian president, the Euromaidan revolution of 2013/2014 and the subsequent Russian annexation of the Crimea, followed by the emergence of territorial conflict between pro-Russian separatists and Ukrainian military and paramilitary forces in eastern parts of

T. Schumacher (✉)
College of Europe, Natolin campus (Warsaw, Poland)
e-mail: tobias.schumacher@coleurope.eu

D. Bouris
Department of Political Science, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: d.bouris@uva.nl

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017
D. Bouris, T. Schumacher (eds.), *The Revised European Neighbourhood Policy*, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-47182-6_1

Ukraine, growing tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan, the deterioration of democratic standards and practices in Georgia, Moldova's backsliding to corrupt and unresponsive (oligarchic) rule, unprecedented waves of human displacement—these are just some of the many dramatic developments in the EU's neighbourhood that have recently emerged on the agenda of EU foreign-policy makers. In conjunction with the remnants of the financial and economic crisis, affecting both EU member states and European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) partner countries in the EU's neighbourhood, and the persistence and re-emergence of 'stubborn authoritarianism', these developments have exposed the EU's ENP to challenges unthinkable when it was originally launched in 2003. In parallel, EU membership of central and eastern European countries in 2004 and 2007, Croatia's accession to the EU in 2013, the entering into force of the Lisbon Treaty and thus the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS), have altered the EU and EU foreign policy making towards the neighbourhood from within.

Considering the ENP's limited results as regards the 'strengthening of stability, security, and well-being' (Commission of the European Communities 2004: 3) in its eastern and southern neighbourhood, and taking into account the Arab uprisings in early 2011 (Zartman 2015), the EU responded to some of these developments by adopting on 25 May 2011 the 'New Response to a Changing Neighbourhood' which forms the core of what came to be known as the revised ENP (Tömmel 2013). It goes beyond the comparatively narrow focus of its predecessor on direct democracy promotion and is designed as a true 'umbrella' policy framework. Thus, what Lavenex remarked already some years ago, applies all the more to the revised ENP, as it truly represents 'a roof over an expanding system of functional regional integration that moves at different speeds and with different dynamics in different policy fields' (Lavenex 2008: 939). The revised ENP addresses—directly or indirectly—literally any policy and cooperation sector and reflects the EU's more general ambition to play a role as a conflict resolution actor and transformation entrepreneur in its 'near abroad'. This, however, is contradicted by (re-) nationalisation tendencies among EU member states—a trend that is reflected in the success of populist right-wing parties in national parliamentary elections in recent years and in the European Parliament elections of 25 May 2014—and a certain fatigue to get engaged in, and committed to, collective and potentially costly EU foreign-policy action in times of growing EU scepticism and austerity.

The revised ENP has been a function of these developments and, at least until mid-November 2015, when the European Commission and the EEAS presented yet another revised ENP, it was exposed to the dynamics of change occurring both inside the EU and even more so within the neighbourhood. These dynamics also led many students of EU foreign policy to push hitherto existing scholarly boundaries and go beyond the seemingly narrow preoccupation with analytically problematic normative power-related explanations (Cebeci 2012) of the foreign policy behaviour of an allegedly benevolent, civilising, postmodern and thus post-Westphalian actor such as the EU (Caporaso 1996; Manners 2002, 2006, 2014; Diez and Manners 2014) during what some observers have coined the latest wave of EU external relations and foreign policies studies (Telò 2013: 4). As a consequence, and building upon the large body of literature on the diffusion of EU norms, mechanisms, rules and institutions, EU democracy support, EU external governance and identity construction in the neighbourhood (Sasse 2008; Schimmelfennig and Scholz 2008; Youngs 2008; Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009, 2011; Gawrich et al. 2010; Tonra 2010; Whitman and Wolff 2010; Wetzel and Orbie 2011; Börzel and Risse 2012; Freyburg 2012; Korosteleva 2012; Peters 2012; Nicolaïdis and Whitman 2013), recent scholarship on the many facets of the EU's ENP has advanced further. For example, patterns of social practices between the EU and its neighbours and how these relations guide agents' interactions in various policy fields are nowadays as much subject to academic scrutiny (Korosteleva et al. 2013) as are more fine-tuned and nuanced approaches to the linkage between transnational networks, socialisation and democratisation (Freyburg 2014), the interplay between democracy promotion and functional cooperation (Leininger et al. 2013), and how the former relates to the international linkages of ENP partner countries (Sasse 2013).

Continuity and Change in Researching the ENP

While these more general research trends represent both continuity and change, they have largely left untouched and, in fact, reinforced the overarching epistemological feature that has characterised by and large the study of the ENP for years: even though the ENP is a multi-faceted, multi-regional and multi-sectorial umbrella framework, the analysis of which is bound to benefit considerably from interdisciplinary approaches, the *de facto* research agenda has been set and defined by, and implemented within

the (sub-)disciplinary social sciences, particularly by (western) scholars of International Relations, European studies and Comparative Politics. Arguably, such a dominion seems justifiable in view of the ENP being first and foremost an expression of EU foreign policy and thus subject to those disciplinary realms which, by nature of their focus, claim to possess the most adequate research tools and instruments for its analysis. That notwithstanding, this phenomenon has hitherto had repercussions for what are considered to be legitimate research objects in the first place and it legitimated certain approaches and research techniques over others. Also, whereas this process of constituting and re-constituting ENP-specific research themes and practices through just some disciplinary lenses has produced several admittedly valuable and rather rich strands of insights and findings, all too often these fell short of drawing from, and thus capitalising on, the expertise of other (sub-) disciplines. Put differently, these strands hardly transcend the disciplinary boundaries and engage with scholarly debates in other social science sub-disciplines or academic communities. All too often ENP-related research practices and designs suffer from few encounters of country- or region-specific expertise, the study of political economy, contemporary history, sociology, law or even social psychology on the one hand with EU foreign-policy scholarship on the other, even though noteworthy exceptions exist (Cremona and Hillion 2006; Joffé 2008; Koutrakos 2011; Van Vooren 2012; Freyburg 2014). Hence the temptation to sacrifice empirical relevance 'on the altar of theoretical coherence' (Basedau and Köllner 2007: 7) and the predominance of studies that adopt either an almost exclusive EU foreign policy analysis focus or discuss developments in (parts of) the EU's neighbourhood quite detached from the former. As the late Susan Strange poignantly put it, though in a different context, this resembles 'toy trains on separate tracks, travelling from different starting-points and ending at different (predetermined) destinations' (Strange 1988: 16), and crossing each other's paths only occasionally.

Most visibly, this intellectual divide is reflected in disciplinary scholarly journals and area journals with a specific geographical focus as these very rarely have the same contributors and address rather different readerships. One of the explanatory reasons for this problem, which goes much beyond the study of the ENP,[1] is the disagreement about 'what constitutes, or should constitute, the paradigm by which scholars construct knowledge about politics, economics, and international relations in major world regions' (Tessler et al. 1999: vii). In this context, area studies expertise has been exposed to particularly strong critique on the grounds that

area or regional specialisation is often considered to be incompatible with theoretical inquiry, is characterised by a lack of rigour, 'favours description over explanation, lacks analytical cumulativeness, and shows no interest in parsimony and generalization' (ibid.: viii).

This volume does not subscribe to these claims. Instead, it is based on the understanding that real-world problems and the analysis thereof seldom respect the boundaries of a single academic (sub-) discipline. Therefore, it sets out to demonstrate that the mutually constitutive relationship between the revised ENP and the EU's eastern and southern neighbours can be best understood through an integrative approach that allows for the incorporation of insights from different (sub-) disciplinary paradigms, thereby reducing the 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy that is so often apparent in the study of the ENP and the EU's neighbourhood. Moreover, it is embedded in Hill's and Smith's three perspectives on international relations and the EU. This means that it is a) anchored in an understanding of the EU as being a sub-system of international relations which, in order to generate external action, is engaged in processing internally occurring international relations of its member states, b) an integral part of the multi-facetted processes of cooperation and conflict in the international system, and is c) an actor in its own right that impacts on international structures and other actors through its foreign policy (in-) action and/or identity (Hill and Smith 2011: 8).

With these substantive considerations in mind, the aim of this volume is to map conceptually, methodologically and empirically issues related to EU foreign-policy making and implementation towards the EU's neighbourhood from the adoption of the revised ENP in 2011 until the revised ENP was submitted to yet another review in mid-2015. It has a multi-dimensional focus in so far as it takes into account local and regional dynamics in the neighbourhood itself and how they impact on, and resonate with, EU foreign policy and thus the revised ENP. The key rationale of the volume is that the revised ENP is confronted with multi-faceted and highly volatile dynamics of internal and external change and that these changes need to be understood holistically and contrasted with elements representing continuity.

Continuity and Change: Conceptual Considerations

As the pursuit of differently developed and institutionalised relations with partner countries in the EU's eastern and southern neighbourhood has generated a Euro-neighbourhood area of sorts (Pardo and Zemer 2005),

which in a minimalist understanding is conceived of as the vertical and horizontal intensification of governmental and transnational interactions among the EU and its neighbours across issue-areas and policy fields, continuity and change are henceforth used as organizing principles destined to allow for a better understanding of the functioning of the revised ENP since its adoption in early 2011. Taking issue with the lack of scholarly consensus on what exactly is meant by change, and in order to avoid falling into the trap of simply assuming that the distinction between change and non-change, or continuity, in international relations is self-evident, in what follows some conceptual considerations are put forward with a view to frame the analysis of the revised ENP and to generate overarching research questions that will guide the chapters in this volume.

Arguably, the issue of change is either explicitly or implicitly at the heart of the academic study of international relations and EU foreign policy, respectively (Buzan and Jones 1981; Rosenau 1990; Buzan and Little 2000; Baylis et al. 2008; Bindi 2009; Youngs 2010; Smith et al. 2014), with some pessimistic (neo-realist) scholars arguing that recurrence is the predominant feature in world politics. On the macro level this is considered to be the case because of the impossibility of transcending the consequences of anarchy (Gilpin 1981; Waltz 2010) whereas on the micro level the human condition to copy and imitate established and proven actions, in conjunction with the desire to reduce uncertainties, can serve as explanation. This perspective stands in stark contrast to those who claim that 'in any conception of the human condition, notions of change and continuity, and the tensions between them, are unavoidably a central focus' (Rosenau 1990: 70) and that the fundamentals of international life have changed dramatically, in particular since the end of the Cold War (Fukuyama 1992). Their conclusion is, therefore, that the main conceptual categories of the past are no longer useful to capture, describe and analyse the complexity of today's realities—a view that is best summarised by the general critique that 'social scientists, in politics and economics especially, cling to obsolete concepts and inappropriate theories (and that these) theories belong to a more stable and orderly world than the one we live in' (Strange 1996: 3). And yet others, as Holsti (1998: 2) points out, can be critiqued for not recognising continuity in change (Mearsheimer 1990), thus ignoring the possibility of a synchronic or sequential existence of both phenomena.

Regardless of their theoretical underpinnings, most of these discourses have in common that they do not provide at least tentative

answers to the question how in more analytical terms change can be distinguished from continuity; equally, they underperform with respect to acknowledging that the interpretation of change and continuity depends considerably on the ideological and time perspective from which they are assessed. Or, as Rosenau (1990: 69) put it, 'where to look for change and how to appraise it'? In other words, different/differing worldviews, mindmaps and identities, as well as larger or smaller timeframes alter the assessment of change and continuity significantly and the same applies to the role and importance that is attributed to scope conditions, path dependencies, critical junctures (Collier and Collier 1991; Ruggie 1998; Wendt 1999) and the scope of change itself. It is in this light that it is particularly noteworthy to stress that a tendency is discernible, notably in times of crisis and uncertainty, to overrate the dynamics of change and their impact on actors, their cognitive (un) certainties (Natorski 2015), practices and interactions, and the system's structures in which they operate, whereas in fact well-established social and political patterns and institutions often tend to resume once the signs of crisis subside. Conversely, the same goes for continuity, given that it is directly rooted in history and experiences with the past, the latter of which is either regarded positively—and even idealised—or negatively and thus serves as a reference point for lesson-drawing for future action and policies.

Apart from these habitual tendencies, the scholarly appraisal of both continuity and change is also linked to whether both phenomena are studied through inductive or deductive research lenses and whether they are regarded as material or ideational and thus socially constructed realities. Obviously, from a rationalist understanding both change and continuity can be clearly delineated as they represent 'empirical' realities where systemic structures, actors, their capabilities and resources are seen as material facts. In contrast, constructivist approaches assume that they are social facts whose meaning is contested simply because they are derived from inter-subjective knowledge and the interpreted nature of social reality. In this light social learning is possible, interests are not static and discursive horizons are fluid (Wendt 1999). In the context of the ENP, as stressed by Browning and Joeniemi (2008), the EU's application of different geostrategies towards its (different) neighbours, resulting in rather different external images of the EU's underlying geopolitical models which, conversely, feed back into which neighbourhood-related geostrategies were viewed by the EU as attractive (ibid.: 544).

This acknowledged dynamism in EU neighbourhood relations links up directly with the issue of continuity and change in general and EU foreign policy in particular and thus Rosenau's question raised above. In fact, the latter does not only serve as a powerful reminder that still 'no shared vocabulary exists in the literature to depict change and continuity' (Ruggie 1993: 140). More importantly, it motivates this volume to undertake the study of the different dimensions of the revised ENP along some conceptions of change, all of which can serve as a minimum set of benchmarks and, by extension, as the cornerstones of a framework of analysis. Holsti's work on the problem of change in International Relations theory is particularly insightful in this regard, given that he addresses the two intertwined, yet analytically rather different and distinguishable aspects of change that Rosenau hints at. These are the occurrence of change and the nature of change. Put differently, Holsti is interested in two questions: when does change take place and what type of change can be identified (Holsti 1998).

Regarding the first question, he distinguishes four broad markers of change—'trends', 'great events', 'great achievements' and 'significant social/technological innovations'—while the question addressing the nature of change is answered with a reference to four types of change, namely 'change as replacement', 'change as addition', 'dialectical change' and 'change as transformation'. From a short-term micro perspective certain developments or events might appear as (harbingers of) change—gradual or profound, slow or rapid—but are bound to adopt a rather different form and can even be considered signs of continuity once they are assessed from a more long-term macro perspective. Trends analysis, according to Holsti, offers a way out of this conceptual challenge as it traces change through quantitative alterations of common practices. By singling out a quantitative increase or decrease of a category of behaviour, of 'social actions', 'competent performances', or 'routinized types of behaviour' (Korosteleva et al. 2013: 259–260), over a defined period of time, trends represent and record one kind of change. While the mere identification of such alterations is important as such, as it diagnoses general directions and movements, an exclusive focus on quantities though is too narrow as it would not allow for the designation of meaning to them. Therefore, trends analysis always resonates with consequences and implications, both of which, strictly speaking, transform quantities into qualities. It is only because of this duality that trends are interpretative phenomena and socially recognised as such.

As is the case with 'trends', 'great events' (the second marker of change that Holsti identifies) rely considerably on the extent to which significant variations of the regular occur. However, in contrast to 'trends', they change mainly in a dramatic, spectacular or at least highly noteworthy fashion previously existing and rather seemingly fixed practices, institutions and structures. Such disruptions of the past, or of past behaviours, while often cataclysmic in scope and breadth, often mark the beginning and/or end of an era or period and thus generate new patterns, which—over time—contribute to the demarcation of a new epoch and/or practices. For instance, the fall of the Berlin wall and the end of the Cold War have ushered in a new era marked by multi-lateralism and cooperation with an emphasis on the rights and privileges of human rights and democratic principles. Or, as regards EU foreign policy, the EU's eastern enlargement of 2004–2007 was decisive for the way the EU would henceforth relate to those countries and societies beyond its external borders that do not have a membership perspective. And yet, whether 'great events' are sources of cataclysmic change or just a result of other, previously occurring developments are ultimately subject to intersubjective choices and interpretations, not least due to the fluidity of historical contingency.

Holsti's two remaining markers of change, 'great achievements' and 'significant social/technological innovations', are linked with one another as the former encompasses the latter. Moreover, both share with the other markers that there is little consensus on the consequences of 'great achievements' and 'significant innovations'. While on the one hand both might generate new patterns of practices of difference and outlive their originators, it is equally possible that they produce just temporary or even ephemeral change, thus representing 'merely momentary deviations from central tendencies' (Gül 2009: 205).

This leads directly to the conceptions of change. Distinguishing them from one another is important for the theoretical implications that change may or may not produce, but it is also important with a view to differentiate different types of change as it is awareness and intersubjective understandings of the exact nature of change that have the potential to inform, substantiate and sustain practices and thus future policies destined to adjust to, and cope with, change. Undoubtedly, the most drastic type of change is best captured by what Holsti coins 'change as replacement'. This type of change is deeply rooted in the notion of novelty and the understanding that new practices, new structures and new ideas replace old and thus previously existing conditions and that the new forms are

fundamentally different from what existed before. The more evolutionary alterations aggregate and are compressed, the more likely it is that 'change as replacement' will occur. This unorganic and rather eruptive view of change stands in contrast to 'change as addition', which is not as wide-ranging and radical as 'change as replacement'. The reason is simply that it rests on the assumption that continuity and change—the old and the new—can occur and exist synchronically. Put differently: this conception conceives of change as a process which is additive and complementing. This is even more the case as far as 'dialectical change' is concerned—a conception that synthesises the aforementioned types. 'Dialectical change' makes use of the old in order to generate novelty, but stops short of total replacement. Instead, the old and the new—continuity and change—are in a mutually dependent relationship leading to cross-fertilisation and the production of increased complexity. The latter is a result of the possibility of the simultaneous occurrence/existence of mutually contradictory changes and signs of continuity and the absence of coherence—a condition that is much more prominent in the context of 'change as addition'. Lastly, 'change as transformation' 'can result from quantitative changes which, when accumulated over a period of time, bring new forms to life' (Holsti 1998: 9). It unites elements of 'change as replacement' and 'change as addition' as transformation cannot come from nowhere or operate in a contextual vacuum. Yet, it differs from 'change as replacement' to the extent that it is an open-ended, target-oriented and rather evolutionary process that is primarily concerned with structural and functional adjustments to fluid environments and that does not necessarily affect the overall identity of the old. Thus, this type of change revolves considerably around sustainability and attempts to make functional and structural adjustments irreversible.

One Neighbourhood or Several?

Like its predecessor, the revised ENP continues to regard the 16 countries it reaches out to—Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus—as the constituting units of one space that is, according to the EU, marked by commonalities and similar, unifying political, economic and social challenges. In contrast to the 'Wider Europe' strategy of 2003, which spoke explicitly of proximity, prosperity and poverty as the three characteristics that define best the challenges and opportunities that

the 16 are confronted with (Commission of the European Communities 2003: 6), the 'New Response', underpinning the revised ENP, no longer refers to proximity as a uniting feature. Instead, it focuses on the absence of 'deep and sustainable democracy' (European Commission 2011a: 3) and places socio-economic challenges (for example, issues revolving around prosperity and poverty) at its centre, yet ignoring that, for example, Israel is already a consolidated democracy with a fully functioning market economy. On the one hand, this discursive discontinuity takes into account past critique pointing to the terminological inappropriateness, given the participation of the three South Caucasus countries in the ENP scheme, none of which can even be said to be geographically close to the EU or to share with it external land borders. On the other hand, while the disappearance of the term proximity might reflect discursive change, it does not offer greater clarity as regards the geographical and in fact geopolitical rationale (Aliboni 2005) that the revised ENP is based on. In other words, in the framework of the revised ENP the EU continues to stay silent as far as the elaboration and adoption of clear-cut selection criteria are concerned according to which non-EU member states are categorised as (potential) accession countries, as neighbours, or as 'neighbours of the neighbours' (Commission of the European Communities 2006: 11; Gstöhl and Lannon 2015). As a consequence, this practice, in conjunction with a politically motivated and incoherent interpretation of Article 49 Treaty of European Unity (TEU), has reinforced past tendencies to hold on to the reconstruction of an imagined Euro-neighbourhood space that is *de facto* characterised by fragmentation and heterogeneity and rooted in a culturally and linguistically highly disputed concept (Meloni 2008).

These tendencies have implications for the development of notions of 'self', 'selfhood', 'other', and 'otherness' (Diez 2005) to the extent that they largely left untouched the way the EU sees itself and thus the neighbours in this space. Moreover, in the revised ENP, the EU continues to place itself at the centre of relations and in doing so it feeds into notions of the 'self' and delineates the borders that separate the 'self' from 'others'. This process is further substantiated by the maintenance of a give-and-take attitude that continues to inform the revised ENP and that does not take seriously the underlying principle of true neighbourly relations commonly characterised as exchanges of mutual, neighbourly favours. In this light it is argued that the revision process of the original ENP in the second half of 2010 reflects yet again the EU's quite self-absorbed attitude and thus the fact that—like in 2002 when it developed the original

ENP—the EU was more concerned with itself (Del Sarto and Schumacher 2005: 25) and the notion that the ENP had to be adjusted to the Lisbon Treaty rather than to the realities in its eastern and southern borderlands (Del Sarto 2014).

It remains to be seen whether the rather diverse and to some extent even dramatic developments in parts of Eastern Europe and the Middle East and North Africa during 2011 and 2015 will eventually contribute to a changed geopolitical outlook of the EU and with it to a more realistic and adequate conception of what 'neighbourhood' truly entails. Recent calls for reconceptualising and redefining the EU's notion of neighbourhood, and the review of the revised ENP, which was initiated on 4 March 2015 and concluded on 18 November 2015, do however point to a growing awareness of the need to overcome an artificially constructed neighbourhood space whose targeted units only have in common that they are more or less centred on the EU and lack a membership perspective. Interestingly, these calls have come in waves and targeted originally only the EU's relations with its southern neighbours (Neugart and Schumacher 2004; Youngs and Echagüe 2010). More recently published studies go beyond this one-dimensional focus. They envisage a 'variable geometry' approach, 'involving various subsets of partners according to the functional requirements of the subject at hand' (Lehne 2014: 13) they make a plea for bridge-building between the immediate and the broader neighbourhood (Gstöhl and Lannon 2015) or conceive of the 'new' neighbourhood, as an extended strategic space stretching from West Africa and the Sahel to Central Asia and Russia, via the broader Middle East (Grevi and Keohane 2014: 16).

Undoubtedly, engaging in such reconceptualisation processes goes straight to the heart of the revised ENP's continuously problematic geographical scope. It takes into account the current neighbours' regional and sub-regional belonging, existing interdependencies, political and socio-economic ties, cultural, civilisational and religious linkages, as well as hard and soft security threats, but also strategic interests and vulnerabilities that they and the EU have in common. Addressing the much-criticised compartmentalisation of relations that is particularly discernible in the EU's dealings with the southern neighbourhood and the countries of the Middle East (Schumacher 2004: 99–101), would unavoidably lead to the revitalisation of the dormant Strategic Partnership with the Mediterranean and the Middle East of 2004 and, by extension, tackle the

unsustainable proliferation of proximity strategies (Lannon 2009).[2] Also, interpreting the neighbourhood as a conglomeration of several regional and sub-regional spaces better captures, as Grevi and Keohane (2014: 19) point out, the trends that shape the (extended) spaces that surround the EU, as well as the growing influence and engagement of other external actors, such as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries in the EU's southern neighbourhood or Russia in the EU's eastern neighbourhood, all of which attempt to involve the neighbours into seemingly unconditional and potentially competitive governance schemes.

Nonetheless, such a reconceptualisation of 'neighbourhood' and thus of the revised ENP's strategic horizon, is faced with four intertwined challenges: first, it requires the abolition of a mindset rooted in a widespread belief among EU decision-makers that the EU's neighbourhood can be territorially demarcated and semantically captured by one overarching terminological notion.[3] Second, much as a more inclusive and open approach promises to take into account the many interlinkages and regional particularities of the revised ENP's targeted countries, it has to strike a realistic and sustainable balance between the then expanded strategic horizon of the EU, the heterogeneity of the 'extended neighbourhood' and the EU's capacities. Third, in order for the EU's regional actorness (Ratka and Spaiser 2012: 18) to unfold fully, reconceptualisation requires an acknowledgement on the part of the EU of the limited attractiveness of its transactional and technocratic approach destined to induce domestic reform, given that many regimes in the EU's broader vicinity simply seek benefit maximisation and regime survival at the expense of democratic development. Fourth, leaving behind artificial notions of neighbourhood and looking beyond its external borders through the lens of functional, issue-area-specific and flexible cooperation is in fact a task that goes beyond just one geographically narrowly defined policy framework but rather is a function of a much broader process entailing the upgrading of the EU's entire foreign policy and the adoption of a new strategic discourse.

Continuity and Change in the Revised ENP

The initiation of the revised ENP stands in the tradition of construction patterns of past policy frameworks governing the EU's relations with its neighbours and its launch was the result of a mix of both endogenous and exogenous factors. While the original ENP responded primarily to the

emergence of new external borders due to the 2004–2007 enlargement and was marked by notions of insecurity and threat, the revised ENP was originally launched to adjust internally to the Lisbon Treaty and externally to the Arab uprisings drawing on the same logic. The 'New Response' makes it clear that notions of risk, instability and insecurity continue to guide EU policies towards its neighbourhood (and they are also closely associated with it) by arguing that cooperation 'allows us to tackle sources of instability and conflict in the region' (European Commission 2011a: 21) and that 'business as usual is no longer an option if we want to make our neighbourhood a safer place and protect our interests' (ibid.: 5).

In parallel though, the emergence of the revised ENP was considerably exposed to, and is embedded in, a new discourse on the normative duty and responsibility narrative (Schumacher 2015). The popular protests that have swept through North Africa and the Middle East since early 2011 have transformed the EU's southern neighbourhood and resemble something more than what Holsti would call 'trends'; they are considered as 'great events' which would potentially change in a highly noteworthy fashion previously existing and rather seemingly fixed practices, institutions, structures, approaches and 'ways of doing things'. At the same time though, there is the risk that in the long-term they might be 'reduced' to 'great achievements' as their ultimate outcome might prove to be only temporary and their change ephemeral. The same applies to the events witnessed in the eastern neighbourhood; the imprisonment and release of former Ukrainian prime minister Tymoshenko, the events following the Vilnius summit of 2013 and months of Euromaidan protests, the Russian annexation of Crimea followed by war-like clashes in eastern parts of Ukraine and the eventual signing of Association Agreements (AA's) in June 2014 between the EU, Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova. Elmar Brok (2014), Chair of the European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) put it bluntly when he said that 'the neighbourhood is on fire'. What kind of impact did those events have on the EU's policies towards the neighbourhood? And which elements of continuity can we observe? Did the EU successfully respond to the multi-faceted challenges or was 'old wine' just served in 'new bottles'?

Following the events of the so-called Arab Spring and an initial 'numbness' on behalf of the EU, the latter reacted by admitting its mistakes with regard to its relations with the southern partners. Stefan Füle (2011), Commissioner for Enlargement and ENP declared in February 2011 that:

> Europe was not vocal enough in defending human rights and local democratic forces in the region. Too many of us fell prey to the assumption that authoritarian regimes were a guarantee of stability in the region. This was not even Realpolitik. It was at best, short-termism.

Füle's speech was considered a major departure from the EU's traditional reluctance to make an explicit acknowledgement of failures of its policies by adopting new documents and/or launching new initiatives and policies whose relationship it leaves unanswered. This was followed by High Representative Ashton's presentation of a 'Partnership for Democracy and Shared Prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean' on 8 March 2011 (European Commission 2011b) and of the 'New Response', which was presented in May 2011. In these two documents, the latter of which converged with the former, the EU, as mentioned above, presented an approach towards its neighbourhood based on elements of both continuity and change.

One of the allegedly new elements of the first document was the principle of 'more for more', based on the premise that the more governments undertake relevant reforms, the more they will be rewarded and supported by the EU. The logic of 'more for more' though has been hardly new as the emphasis on positive conditionality had already been placed in the original ENP (Van Hüllen 2012). What might be considered as new was the EU's rhetoric of 'less for less' and its preparedness to use negative conditionality by stating that 'support will be reallocated or refocused for those who stall or retrench on agreed reform plans' (European Commission 2011a). This rhetoric, which resembles 'change as addition', 'breaks with past traditions and points to greater determination on the part of the EU to no longer ignore governmental reneging' (Schumacher 2011: 109). However, given the EU's general reluctance to use negative conditionality in its relations with its neighbours, it is rather doubtful that it will underpin future relations with EU neighbours after the 2015 revision.

Another innovation of the March 2011 document was that it shed some light on the EU's definition of democracy by stating that 'a commitment to adequately monitored, free and fair elections should be the *entry qualification* for the Partnership' (European Commission 2011b: 5, emphasis added). This was elaborated more in the 'revised' ENP document where the EU introduced the idea of 'deep and sustainable democracy', which would go hand in hand with so-called people partnerships and inclusive growth and would be achieved through the infamous three

Ms—money, market (access) and mobility. But, although the idea of 'deep democracy' is a break with the previous EU focus on political stability, which had resulted in the EU's support and strengthening of autocratic regimes (Durac and Cavatorta 2009; Völkel 2014), the lack of definition of all these concepts and their often interchangeable use, makes it difficult to assess whether they represent something truly new (Del Sarto and Schumacher 2011). To this end, 'the EU continues to draw on the same conceptually fuzzy and methodologically incoherent toolbox' (Behr 2012: 15). In fact, while some indexes were eventually included as 'deep democracy indicators' in the 'Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2011 Statistical Annex' (e.g., The World Bank Governance Indicators, Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index, Transparency International Corruption Perception Index, Freedom House Assessment, UNDP Human Development Index, World Bank's 'Doing Business' Ranking) (European Commission 2012) which could have served as potential 'benchmarks', half of them disappeared from the 'Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2012' (European Commission 2013)—a document published by the EEAS just one year later.

Arguably, the 'revised' ENP is also an expression of a 'back to the future' logic to the extent that it reinforces strongly the principle of differentiation which was already at the centre of the original ENP. The 'New Response' for example states that:

> The partnership will develop with each neighbour on the basis of its needs, capacities and reform objectives. Some partners may want to move further in their integration effort, which will entail a greater degree of alignment with EU policies and rules leading progressively to economic integration in the EU Internal Market. The EU does not seek to impose a model or a ready-made recipe for political reform, but it will insist that each partner country's reform process reflect a clear commitment to universal values that form the basis of our renewed approach. The initiative lies with the partner and EU support will be tailored accordingly (European Commission 2011a: 2).

Despite this, in reality, the EU continued to rely on the same instruments and approaches without questioning their attractiveness to the recipient countries. As a result, what is witnessed, is a 'double continuity' which is framed as change; the offer of 'Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas' (DCFTAs) to the southern neighbours (which had already

been offered to the eastern ones) and the offer of AA's to the eastern neighbours (already signed with the southern neighbours in the years that followed the initiation of the EMP). This has led, at least in parts, to a 'copy-pasting process' of sorts on the part of the EU despite the fact that in theory the revised ENP was supposed to reinforce the principle of differentiated bilateralism which was already included in the 'original' ENP, as mentioned above. Moreover, there is a continued over-reliance on a purely technocratic interpretation of the ENP, coupled with capitalist-market economy recipes and neoliberal policies. The problem though is that these prescriptions, combined with the persistence of authoritarian or semi-authoritarian rule in the neighbourhood(s), seem to have exacerbated the problems rather than solved them, as can be seen by the decision in early 2015 to review the revised ENP.

'Dialectical change' that originated in the 'New Response' is closely linked to the EU's approach to civil society. The establishment of a 'Civil Society Facility' (CSF) and the creation of 'The European Endowment for Democracy' (EED) are destined to allow the EU to give more support to non-registered NGOs as well as political actors and movements, including (in theory) faith-based groups. This is a major departure for EU-policy makers who had opted to keep for example Islam out of the political arena (Balfour 2012: 28; Jünemann 2013: 40). The establishment of the CSF and the EED has thus brought both novelty and continuity. On the one hand, the novelty lies in the fact that both institutions are new and reinforce the idea that the EU should not only engage with governments but also with marginalised societies and thus non-governmental actors in the neighbouring countries (Keukeleire and Delreux 2014: 254). At the same time though, the EU has demonstrated little novelty in the way it looks at civil society and the main focus has been once more on the engagement with 'professionalised' civil society, which is not always representative of the broader society (Falkenhain and Solonenko 2012). The 'New Response' offers very few insights on how the EU was planning to engage with the whole spectrum of civil society and it remains to be seen whether the re-revised ENP of November 2015 will provide answers to that.

Moreover, the revised ENP does not offer any explanations on how the EU intends to overcome barriers occurring from internal limitations and juridical constraints in the neighbourhood partner countries themselves. How, for example, is the EU going to address the fact that in Egypt, Law 84 (2002) puts barriers to the receipt of external funding for Egyptian NGOs (Elagati 2013)? Or how is the revised ENP going to bring about

greater engagement with civil society organisations in Belarus, for example, if a genuine democracy dialogue is prohibited by Belarussian laws?

Finally, despite the fact that the 'New Response' is supposed to pay closer attention to the local needs and not 'impose a model' (European Commission 2011a: 2), the reality is different as both the Board of Governors as well as the Executive Committee of the EED for instance, are comprised of only European individuals without including any representatives from the neighbourhood (EED 2015). As a result, voices from the neighbourhood still remain in the margins rather than brought to the centre of the decision-shaping process. To this end, it is evident that there has been little change in the way the EU conceptualised support to civil society and democracy promotion as well as in the way the EU approached the principles of 'co-ownership' and 'partnership', both of which are supposed to be at the core of the revised ENP (European Commission 2014: 6).

Additionally, the 'revised' ENP also continues to be a seemingly inappropriate tool for geopolitics as the EU remains bound to a Eurocentric vision that neglects the strength of other actors (Lehne 2014: 7). While when the original ENP was launched in 2003 the EU did not face much 'competition'—back then, Russia for example showed little interest in the ENP and in the southern neighbourhood only the USA could 'challenge' the EU's presence—the situation has been quite different in the last few years. The setting up of the EaP for example, resulted in increased Russian opposition towards the EU and in 2011 alongside Kazakhstan and Belarus, Russia launched its own 'Eurasian customs union' (Casier 2013: 132) which on 29 May 2014 turned into the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU). In the run-up to the Vilnius summit of 2013, Russian policies (and threats) forced Armenia to abandon the prospect of signing a DCFTA and join the EEU not least in response to the incompatibility between the two (Charap and Troitskiy 2013; Emerson and Kostanyan 2013; Lehne 2014). Moreover, in the southern neighbourhood, the EU has witnessed the emergence of more external actors with countries such as Turkey, Russia, China, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar acquiring a stronger voice and influence and providing unconditional and competitive incentives (Gillespie 2013: 124).

Another important domain addressed by the revised ENP is conflict resolution. Here, the EU seemed determined to increase its engagement in conflicts in its immediate neighbourhood and move beyond mere crisis *management* and conflict *prevention* (which were envisaged in the original ENP). Instead, it focused on conflict *resolution* which is closely

linked to the EU's increased ambitions after the entering into force of the Lisbon Treaty to strengthen its global role. Despite this though, it soon became obvious that the lack of explicit carrots and sticks had little influence on conflicting parties, be they in the eastern or southern neighbourhood.[4] Moreover, rather than outlining concrete steps that go beyond the implementation of the revised ENP, the emphasis was on continuing what has already been ineffectively tried: continuation of operational presence through existing CSDP missions, membership in the Middle East Quartet and employing instruments that promote economic integration and sectoral reform to support confidence-building measures and conflict resolution objectives (Wolff 2011). While the revised ENP could have addressed a number of shortcomings of its predecessor in the domain of conflict resolution, this has not been the case as the EU has continued applying its double standards. In the eastern neighbourhood for example, the EU-Azerbaijan Action Plan of 2006, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 by Freizer, prioritised the 'peaceful solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict' (EU-Azerbaijan Action Plan) while the EU-Armenia Action plan cites the resolution of the same conflict as priority number seven. Similarly, in the southern neighbourhood although the Western Sahara conflict was mentioned both in the 'original' and in the 'revised' ENP, not a single reference to the conflict in the EU-Morocco ENP Action Plan was made (see Fernández-Molina, Chapter 11 of this volume).

Structure of the Volume

Against this backdrop, this volume addresses the EU's foreign policy towards both the eastern and southern dimension of the revised ENP simultaneously in the period 2011–2015. While this is not meant as an implicit recognition of the EU's conception of its peripheries and thus its notion of 'one neighbourhood', it follows this path for the simple reason that it aims at breaking with widespread habits to study and discuss EU foreign policy towards the (countries of the) EU's neighbourhoods in a geographically rather narrow sense, focusing on either EU-southern neighbourhood or EU-eastern neighbourhood relations. While such a cross-neighbourhood and cross-neighbourhood partner-country approach promises to generate useful insights and findings with respect to the true nature and substance of differentiated bilateralism, applying a cross-comparative perspective also facilitates a better understanding of the extent to which different or similar scope conditions, path dependencies, historical legacies and

critical junctures resonated with, and impacted on the revised ENP itself. Moreover, in order to let the study of the revised ENP benefit from interdisciplinary scholarship, this volume brings together contributors from a range of academic disciplines and sub-disciplines, such as political science, international relations, comparative politics, European studies, area studies, migration studies and law. Drawing on this disciplinary diversity and eclecticism, and based on the assumption that processes of continuity and change have been occurring both simultaneously and sequentially in EU-neighbourhood relations and thus in a non-conformist fashion during the period 2011–2015, the chapters in this volume are interested in identifying markers of change, types of change, as well as processes of continuity within change that occurred in EU-neighbourhood relations during the period under study. Accordingly, four overarching and interlinked questions are at the heart of the volume. First, which markers of change and what types of change can be singled out in the EU's eastern and southern neighbourhood that are of relevance for relations with the EU? Second, how have the changes in the EU's institutional and legal mosaic and thus its foreign policy system influenced its approach towards the neighbourhoods? Third, what do potential changes in the neighbourhoods and in the EU's response to them mean for our methodological and conceptual understanding of them? Fourth, how are internal and external changes reflected in the implementation of the revised ENP during 2011–2015?

This set of questions will be addressed to a different degree by the contributing authors and will be grouped along four themes that also provide this volume with its structure. Part I will address methodological, theoretical and conceptual approaches to the study of the revised ENP and is mainly interested in enhancing our knowledge as regards the processes of conceptual constructions, as well as the challenges and limits they are faced with.

In Chapter 2, Theofanis Exadaktylos and Kennet Lynggaard analyse the pitfalls and pathways of research design aimed at the study of the ENP and map out the literature on questions of knowledge ambition, research ontology and epistemology, and choices of approaches to the research object. The chapter includes a review of traditional research designs in ENP research, through a systematic meta-analysis of a selection of the most-cited articles on the ENP. Inspired by earlier work on awareness of research design in EU studies, ENP research is categorised according to typical choices of research design in the form of dichotomous trade-offs. The chapter then discusses how individual contributions to this volume deal with research design challenges of the past and present innovative ways of studying the revised ENP.

In Chapter 3, Münevver Cebeci aims to reveal the EU's governmentality in its neighbourhood through a poststructuralist analysis of its foreign policy in general and the revised ENP in particular. The chapter's major argument is that the EU's representation as 'a positive force' in world politics—that is, as an 'ideal power'—legitimises the Union's imposition of its governmentality on its 'others', especially on its neighbours east and south. Taking the ENP as a boundary-drawing exercise and a security apparatus, the chapter offers a second reading of the EU's foreign policy practices in its neighbourhood, tracing continuity and change between the original and the revised ENP. It concludes that in spite of some changes in the EU's discourse and 'dialectical change' in the Union's policy as far as civil society support is concerned, past practices of governmentality—a major feature of EU-neighbourhood relations for many years—are also present in the revised ENP, thus contributing to the reproduction of the 'ideal power Europe' meta-narrative.

Similarly, Chapter 4 by Hiski Haukkala discusses the revised ENP by putting it into a wider conceptual and global setting. It analyses the recent developments both in the areas surrounding the EU and its policy responses and develops conceptually the notion of normative hegemony. Haukkala discusses how the latter has been reflected in the EU's revised and continuously changing neighbourhood policy framework, arguing that in fact both continuity and change can be detected in the EU's positioning towards its neighbours. On the one hand, according to him, the EU's claim for a normatively hegemonic position still persists while on the other hand, the EU's claim for hegemony seems increasingly regional and perhaps less normative than was previously the case. This has been accompanied by mounting 'hard realities' both regionally and globally, which contested and test—and keep on doing so—the EU's ability to deliver on the objectives of its neighbourhood policy framework.

Part II of the volume focuses on intra-EU-governance-related aspects and offers an overview of the changes that the entering into force of the Lisbon Treaty brought about with respect to the new formal and informal powers of the European Parliament (EP) and the EEAS to influence ENP decision-making and thus EU foreign policy. It also offers legal insights into the revised ENP and its central elements—AAs and DCFTAs. To this end, Chapter 5 by Peter Van Elsuwege and Guillaume Van der Loo analyses the revision of the EU's bilateral legal relations

with its neighbours, focusing on the new generation of AAs with the EaP countries prior to, and in the context of the revised ENP of 2011. In addition, different sectoral agreements are explored dealing with mobility, energy and aviation. Van Elsuwege and Van der Loo argue that the evolving legal framework under the revised ENP is essentially based upon past experiences, reflecting the well-known phenomenon of path dependency, in combination with spill-over effects from other EU policies. In that regard, and in spite of some legal innovations, mirroring change and tailored to the specific ENP objectives, they demonstrate that despite the introduction of a new neighbourhood clause in the Lisbon Treaty (Art. 8 TEU) and references to new 'neighbourhood agreements' in the first ENP Action Plans, there continues to be a clear preference under the revised ENP to develop the EU's bilateral relations with neighbouring countries on the basis of a classical association formula. This entails the DCFTA's rise to centrality and the inclusion and further expansion of a significant sectoral dimension, based on specific agreements in areas such as mobility and migration, energy and aviation.

Embedding intra-EU institutional changes in the change-continuity dichotomy, Hrant Kostanyan in Chapter 6 assesses the role of the EEAS in the revised ENP and addresses the following question: did the establishment of the EEAS change the institutional balance of the EU and the way in which it conducts its policies towards its eastern and southern neighbours? As EU member states closely monitor the EEAS, and as the European Commission continues to hold sway over the ENP, he argues that although the establishment of the EEAS constitutes considerable institutional change, its creation and involvement in the revised ENP did not alter significantly the EU's institutional balance in the post-Lisbon period.

In contrast, in her chapter, focusing on the strengthened powers of the European Parliament (EP) in EU foreign policy matters after the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty, Joanna Kaminska argues that the EP has indeed succeeded in generating greater room for manoeuver for itself, in particular as far as its ability to shape the revised ENP is concerned. Thus, Chapter 7 addresses both formal and informal paths of influence in the ENP policy-making process that the EP and the AFET committee have been taking in the last five years. It discusses the role and impact of the EuroNest and UfM Parliamentary Assemblies as part of the EP's wider parliamentary diplomacy, touches upon the role of the EP in the context of the negotiations on the European Neighbourhood Instrument for

2014–2020 and analyses the EP's Cox-Kwasniewski mission to Ukraine in 2012–2013. The chapter offers valuable insights into some of the changed practices and patterns that have occurred in the last five years affecting the EU's institutional setting and, as a result, the revised ENP. Also, it contributes to a better understanding of the transformation of the EP's roles and its actions as a supposedly new EU foreign policy agent in the EU's neighbourhood.

Taking into account the revised ENP's generally ambitious provisions on unresolved conflicts, Part III is mainly interested in identifying and unpacking markers and conceptions of change and continuity in the way the EU has been dealing with conflicts and crises in its eastern and southern neighbourhood. Accordingly, Sabine Freizer, in Chapter 8, examines to what degree the revised ENP, and especially its eastern dimension, marks a change in the EU's foreign policy and enables the EU to play a greater role in addressing unresolved conflicts in the South Caucasus. Since the 2008 Russian intrusion in Georgia, the desire to better integrate the countries of the East, as well as the deterioration of relations with Russia, have spurred change in EU policy as renewed attention was put on security issues. However, more than having a direct effect on conflict resolution, the revised ENP has contributed first and foremost to the consolidation of the CFSP, communitarian and EaP responses under an increasingly complex ENP framework.

In Chapter 9, Michał Natorski examines the dominant continuity of the EU's transformative policy in Ukraine during the 2013 crisis. The chapter scrutinises how the Euromaidan revolution, the annexation of Crimea and the war in Donbass affected the dynamics of EU policy reproduction since 2013 and explains the EU-Ukraine-Russia discussions on the potential trade consequences of the EU-Ukraine DCFTA. The dynamics of continuity of EU policies towards Ukraine and the altered role of Russia are explained in terms of the discursive representations of the crisis in Ukraine by the EU. Natorski concludes that policy reproduction and change depend on what actors make of the crisis and to what extent crisis representation can be mediated coherently through background discursive schemes.

Addressing unresolved conflicts in the EU's southern neighbourhood, Chapter 10 by Patrick Müller examines how changes related to intra-EU governance introduced by the 2009 Lisbon Treaty and the revised ENP have impacted on the EU's policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Using the latter, one of the most longstanding and widely debated issues

on the EU's foreign policy agenda, as a case study, Müller discusses continuity and change in the EU's comprehensive approach to conflict resolution through the framework of Europeanisation. Following the conceptual considerations underlying continuity and change, the types of changes produced by Europeanisation effects with respect to consistency, coherence and supra-nationalisation are assessed in terms of 'change as replacement', 'change as addition', 'dialectical change' and 'change as transformation'. Müller argues that while the EU has certainly made important efforts to improve the coherence and consistency of its conflict resolution policy in recent years, it has shown little imagination and capacity for critical reflection on its overall political strategy. According to him, this is particular true for the revised ENP, which primarily facilitated technocratic change at the level of modifying priorities and adjusting policy instruments in line with the 2011 review. More fundamental problems of the EU's approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, by contrast, have not been addressed. Thus, in a political context in which the Palestinians remain politically divided, the feasibility of creating a viable Palestinian state is continuously undermined, and the peace process has been deadlocked for years, the EU's approach looks increasingly 'self-centred' and more substantive change to the EU's conflict resolution approach is needed.

Chapter 11 by Irene Fernández-Molina examines the degree of change and continuity that can be observed in the EU's handling of the protracted conflict of Western Sahara in the context of the revised ENP. Taking as a starting point the fact that not a single reference is made to this conflict either in the EU-Morocco Joint Document on the Advanced Status (2008) or in the previous 2005 ENP Action Plan or in Morocco's 2013–2017 Action Plan, it argues that there has indeed been some relative change in the EU-Western Sahara relationship. This change has occurred regardless of the continuity of the minimalist EU official position and against the backdrop of rather specific preferences of some powerful actors in the EU's foreign policy system. Fernández-Molina demonstrates that change has mainly originated from the 'inward turn' ('dialectical change') of the conflict as such and is a result of the agency of some Sahrawi and pro-Sahrawi actors, rather than a function of the revised ENP. According to her, these have pursued new international 'low politics' and 'parliamentarian' strategies. They seized opportunities generated by intra-EU institutional 'change as addition' under the Lisbon Treaty, as is demonstrated by the EP's rejection of the EU-Morocco fisheries protocol in 2011.

Given the revised ENP's broad sectoral scope, Part IV focuses on sector-specific cooperation in two policy areas that obtained particular salience in EU-neighbourhood relations in recent years, i.e. energy and mobility and migration. Tracing the evolution of energy cooperation in the context of the ENP, Chapter 12 by Anna Herranz-Surrallés argues that the 2011 ENP review signifies a new step in line with the previous additive and dialectic pattern of change. On the one hand, after the attempts at decentred and lighter-weighted multilateral energy cooperation of the late 2000s, the revised ENP placed the emphasis back on instruments to promote EU-centred regulatory harmonisation (here characterised as energy governance). On the other hand, the EU has put in place new instruments of energy diplomacy directly aimed at increasing its security of supplies. Against this backdrop, the chapter examines this double development, contrasting different explanations for why (and to what effect) the EU and neighbouring countries have engaged in those initiatives.

Chapter 13 by Agnieszka Weinar explores the types of change that occurred in the external dimension of the European migration policy in the aftermath of the so-called Arab Spring and in the run up to Russia's annexation of Crimea in early 2014. It analyses the various migration policy tools used in cooperation with the EU's eastern and southern neighbours before the overhaul of the ENP in 2010–2011 and continue to be used ever since. It presents the changes that have occurred, focusing especially on mobility partnerships as a comprehensive tool of the Global Approach to Migration and in order to examine the receptiveness of the neighbours, provides a brief overview of the development of the migration policy dialogues, a tool not mentioned in the communication of 25 May 2011. Weinar concludes by arguing that the revised ENP has in fact promoted the same policy tools, though in a slightly changed form in order to adapt them to the partners' needs, thus differentiating between the eastern and the southern neighbourhood.

Finally, in Chapter 14, the conclusions, Laure Delcour examines the implications of the analysis at three levels. First, the chapter briefly discusses the implications of the broad research perspective favoured in the volume and underlines the added value of an integrative approach for understanding the ENP. Second, the chapter looks at the implications of the volume's empirical findings for the EU's policy in the neighbourhood and points to contradictions between continuity and change in the EU's actorness. Delcour concludes by exploring how the 2015 ENP review

addresses continuity and change against the background of tensions exposed in the volume and recent developments in the neighbourhood.

Notes

1. This problem has been at the core of the so-called area studies controversy that emerged for the first time in the mid-1970s and re-emerged in the late 1990s in the USA. See, for example, Bates (1997), Shea (1997) and Hall and Tarrow (1998). See also Pye (1975).
2. The Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean and the Middle East was presented by the Irish EU Presidency, the Council Secretariat and the Commission in early 2004. The interim report can be found in the Council of Minister s press release 7383/04 (Presse 80), 2572nd Council meeting—External relations. See also Lannon (2008).
3. This is, for example, reflected in the 'New Response' which states explicitly that it is 'sixteen countries whose hopes and futures make a direct and significant difference to us', thus reiterating the notion that these can be treated regardless of their 'hinterlands' and (sub)regional belonging. See European Commission (2011a: 1).
4. The EU for example, offered a 'Special Privileged Partnership, which will ensure unprecedented economic, political and security support for both parties in the event of a final status agreement' (Council of the European Union 2014) to Israelis and Palestinians but never made explicit what this 'special' and 'privileged' partnership would mean in practice.

References

Aliboni, R. (2005). The geopolitical implications of the European Neighbourhood Policy. *European Foreign Affairs Review, 10*(1), 1–16.

Balfour, R. (2012). Changes and continuities in EU-Mediterranean relations after the Arab Spring. In S. Biscop, R. Balfour, & M. Emerson (Eds.), *An Arab springboard for EU foreign policy?* (pp. 27–47). Gent: Academia Press.

Basedau, M., & Köllner, P. (2007). Area studies and comparative area studies: A primer on recent debates and methodological challenges. *Japan Aktuell, 2.*

Bates, R. (1997). Area studies and the discipline: A useful controversy. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 30*(2), 166–169.

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owen, P. (Eds.) (2008). *The globalization of world politics—An introduction to international relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Behr, T. (2012). After the revolution: The EU and the Arab transition. *Notre Europe Policy Paper, 54.*

Bindi, F. (2009). *The foreign policy of the European Union: Assessing Europe's role in the world.* Washington: Brookings.

Börzel, T., & Risse, T. (2012). From Europeanisation to diffusion. *West European Politics, 35*(1), 1–19.

Brok, E. (2014). *Elmar Brok on challenges abroad: "The neighbourhood is on fire".* http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/content/20140716STO52703/html/Elmar-Brok-on-challenges-abroad-The-neighbourhood-is-on-fire. Accessed 25 July 2014.

Browning, C., & Joeniemi, P. (2008). The geostrategies of the European Neighbourhood Policy. *European Journal of International Relations, 14*(3), 519–552.

Buzan, B., & Jones, B. (1981). *Change and the study of international relations.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Buzan, B., & Little, R. (2000). *International systems in world history: Remaking the study of international relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caporaso, J. (1996). The European Union and forms of state: Westphalian, regulatory, or post-modern? *Journal of Common Market Studies, 34*(1), 29–52.

Casier, T. (2013). The European Union and Russia: Partners by default? In T. Cierco (Ed.), *The European Union neighbourhood: Challenges and opportunities.* Surrey: Ashgate.

Cebeci, M. (2012). European Foreign Policy research reconsidered: Constructing an 'ideal power Europe' through theory? *Millennium—Journal of International Studies, 40*(3), 563–583.

Charap, S., & Troitskiy, M. (2013). Russia, the West and the integration dilemma. *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, 55*(6), 49–62.

Collier, R. B., & Collier, D. (1991). *Shaping the political arena: Critical junctures, the labor movement, and regime dynamics in Latin America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Commission of the European Communities. (2003). *Wider Europe—Neighbourhood: A new framework for relations with our eastern and southern neighbours,* COM (2003) 104 final.

Commission of the European Communities. (2004). *European Neighbourhood Policy: Strategy paper,* COM (2004) 373 final.

Commission of the European Communities. (2006). *Communication from the commission to the council and the European Parliament on Strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy,* COM (2006) 726 final.

Council of the European Union. (2014). *Council conclusions on the Middle East peace process.* http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/142555.pdf. Accessed 13 May 2014.

Cremona, M., & Hillion, C. (2006). L'Union Fait la Force? Potential and Limitations of the European Neighbourhood Policy as an integrated EU foreign and security policy. *EUI Law Working Paper No2006/36.*

Del Sarto, R. (2014). Defining borders and people in the borderlands: EU policies, Israeli prerogatives and the Palestinians. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 52*(2), 200–216.

Del Sarto, R., & Schumacher, T. (2005). From EMP to ENP: What's at stake with the European Neighbourhood Policy towards the Southern Mediterranean? *European Foreign Affairs Review, 10*(1), 17–38.

Del Sarto, R., & Schumacher, T. (2011). From Brussels with love: Leverage, benchmarking, and the action plans with Jordan and Tunisia in the EU's democratization policy. *Democratization, 18*(4), 932–955.

Diez, T. (2005). Constructing the self and changing others: Reconstructing "normative power Europe". *Millennium—Journal of International Studies, 33*(3), 932–955.

Diez, T., & Manners, I. (2014). Reflecting on normative power Europe. In T. Diez (Ed.), *A different kind of power?: The EU's role in international politics* (pp. 55–73). New York: Idebate Press.

Durac, V., & Cavatorta, F. (2009). Strengthening authoritarian rule through democracy promotion? Examining the paradox of the US and EU security strategies: The case of Bin Ali's Tunisia. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 36*(1), 3–19.

Elagati, M. (2013). Foreign funding in Egypt after the revolution. *FRIDE Working Paper.* http://www.fride.org/publication/1117/foreign-funding-in-egypt-after-the-revolution. Accessed 23 July 2014.

Emerson, M., & Kostanyan, H. (2013, September 17). Putin's grand design to destroy the EU's Eastern Partnership and replace it with a disastrous neighbourhood policy of his own. *CEPS Commentary.*

European Commission. (2011a). *A new response to a changing neighbourhood*, COM (2011) 303 final.

European Commission. (2011b). *A partnership for democracy and shared prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean*, COM (2011) 200 final.

European Commission. (2012). *Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2011 Statistical Annex*, SWD(2012) 122 final.

European Commission. (2013). *Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2012 regional report: A partnership for democracy and shared prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean*, SWD (2013) 86 final.

European Commission. (2014). *Neighbourhood at the crossroads. Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2013*, JOIN(2014) final.

European Endowment for Democracy. (2015). *Website.* https://www.democracy-endowment.eu/about-eed/. Accessed 20 July 2015.

Falkenhain, M., & Solonenko, I. (2012). The EU and Civil society in Eastern Europe: Partners in the pursuit of policy change? In T. Börzel & K. Böttger (Eds.), *Policy change in the EU's immediate neighbourhood: A sectoral approach.* Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Freyburg, T. (2012). The two sides of functional cooperation with authoritarian regimes: A multi-level perspective on the conflict of objectives between political stability and democratic change. *Democratization, 19*(3), 575–601.

Freyburg, T. (2014). Transgovernmental networks as apprenticeship in democracy? Socialization into democratic governance through cross-national activities. *International Studies Quarterly, 59*(1), 59–72.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man.* New York: Free Press.

Füle, S. (2011). *Speech on the recent events in North Africa.* http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-130_en.htm. Accessed 24 July 2014.

Gawrich, A., Melnykovska, I., & Schweickert, R. (2010). Neighbourhood Europeanization through ENP: The case of Ukraine. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 48*(5), 1209–1235.

Gillespie, R. (2013). The European Neighbourhood Policy and the challenge of the Mediterranean Southern Rim. In M. Telò & F. Ponjaert (Eds.), *The EU's Foreign Policy: What kind of power and diplomatic action?* (pp. 121–133). Surrey: Ashgate.

Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grevi, G., & Keohane, D. (Eds.) (2014). *Challenges for European Foreign Policy in 2014: The EU's extended neighbourhood.* Madrid: FRIDE.

Gstöhl, S., & Lannon, E. (2015). *The European Union's broader neighbourhood. Challenges and opportunities for cooperation beyond the European Neighbourhood Policy.* Oxford: Routledge.

Gül, M. (2009). The concept of change and James N. Rosenau: Still international relations? *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 3*(5), 199–207.

Hall, P., & Tarrow, S. (1998, January 23). Globalization and area studies: When is too broad too narrow?. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Hill, C., & Smith, M. (2011). International relations and the European Union: Themes and issues. In C. Hill & M. Smith (Eds.), *International relations and the European Union* (pp. 3–20). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holsti, K. (1998). The problem of change in international relations theory. *Working Paper No. 26*, Institute of International Relations, The University of British Columbia.

Joffé, G. (2008). The European Union, democracy and counter-errorism. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 46*(1), 147–171.

Jünemann, A. (2013). Facing a dilemma: The EU's promotion of gender-democracy after the "Arab Spring". In J. Horst, A. Jünemann, & D. Rothe (Eds.), *Euro-*

Mediterranean relations after the Arab Spring: Persistence in times of change (pp. 39–58). Surrey: Ashgate.

Keukeleire, S., & Delreux, T. (2014). *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Korosteleva, E. (2012). *The European Union and its eastern neighbours: Towards a more ambitious partnership?* Oxford: Routledge.

Korosteleva, E., Natorski, M., & Simao, L. (2013). The eastern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy: Practices, instruments and social structures. *East European Politics, 29*(3), 257–272.

Koutrakos, P. (2011). *European Foreign Policy: Legal and political perspectives*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Lannon, E. (2008). The EU's strategic partnership with the Mediterranean and the Middle East: A new geopolitical dimension of the EU's proximity strategies. In A. Dashwood & M. Maresceau (Eds.), *Law and practice of EU external relations. Salient features of a changing landscape* (pp. 360–375). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lannon, E. (2009, February 23). The proliferation of EU's proximity strategies: Towards a multi-speed Neighbourhood Policy?. *BEPA Monthly Brief*.

Lavenex, S. (2008). A governance perspective on the European Neighbourhood Policy: Integration beyond conditionality? *Journal of European Public Policy, 15*(6), 938–955.

Lavenex, S., & Schimmelfennig, F. (Eds.) (2009) European Union external governance, special issue, *Journal of European Public Policy, 16*(6), 791–949.

Lavenex, S., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2011). EU democracy promotion in the neighbourhood: From leverage to governance? *Democratization, 18*(4), 885–909.

Lehne, S. (2014). *Time to reset the European Neighbourhood Policy*. Brussels: Carnegie Europe.

Leininger, J., Grimm, S., & Freyburg, T. (Eds.) (2013). *Do all good things go together? Conflicting objectives in democracy promotion*. London/New York: Routledge.

Manners, I. (2002). Normative power Europe. A contradiction in terms. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(2), 235–254.

Manners, I. (2006). Normative power Europe reconsidered: Beyond the crossroads. *Journal of European Public Policy, 13*(2), 182–199.

Manners, I. (2014). Theories and myths of European foreign policy. In J. Magone (Ed.), *Handbook of European Politics* (pp. 875–889). London: Routledge.

Mearsheimer, J. (1990). Back to the future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War. *International Security, 15*(1), 5–56.

Meloni, G. (2008). Who is my neighbour? In L. Delcour & E. Tulmets (Eds.), *Pioneer Europe. Testing European Foreign Policy in the European neighbourhood* (pp. 35–42). Baden-Baden: NOMOS.

Natorski, M. (2015). Epistemic (Un)certainty in times of crisis: The role of coherence as a social convention in the European Neighbourhood Policy after

the Arab Spring. *European Journal of International Relations*. doi:10.1177/1354066115599043.

Neugart, F., & Schumacher, T. (2004). Thinking about the EU's future Euro-Neighbourhood Policy in the Middle East: From the Euro-Mediterranean partnership to Barcelona Plus. In C. P. Hanelt, G. Luciani, & F. Neugart (Eds.), *Regime change in Iraq: The transatlantic and regional dimensions* (pp. 155–168). Florence: RSCAS Press.

Nicolaïdis, K., & Whitman, R. (2013). Special issue on normative power Europe. *Cooperation and Conflict, 48*(2), 167–329.

Pardo, S., & Zemer, L. (2005). Towards a new Euro-Mediterranean neighbourhood space. *European Foreign Affairs Review, 10*(1), 39–77.

Peters, J. (Ed.) (2012). *The EU and the Arab Spring: Human rights and democracy promotion*. Lanham: Lexington.

Pye, L. (Ed.) (1975). *Political science and area studies: Rivals or partners?* Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.

Ratka, E., & Spaiser, O. (2012). Introduction: Understanding European Neighbourhood Policies. In E. Ratka & O. Spaiser (Eds.), *Understanding European Neighbourhood Policies. Concepts, actors, perceptions* (pp. 15–24). Baden-Baden: NOMOS.

Rosenau, J. (1990). *Turbulence in world politics: A theory of change and continuity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ruggie, J. (1993). Territoriality and beyond: Problematizing modernity in international relations. *International Organization, 47*(4), 140–174.

Ruggie, J. (1998). What makes the world hang together? Neo-utilitarianism and the social constructivist challenge. *International Organization, 52*(4), 855–885.

Sasse, G. (2008). The European Neighbourhood Policy: Conditionality revisited for the EU's Eastern Neighbours. *Europe-Asia-Studies, 60*(2), 295–316.

Sasse, G. (2013). Linkages and the promotion of democracy: The EU's Eastern Neighbourhood. *Democratization, 20*(4), 553–591.

Schimmelfennig, F., & Scholz, H. (2008). EU democracy promotion in the European neighbourhood. Political conditionality, economic development and transnational change. *European Union Politics, 9*(2), 187–215.

Schumacher, T. (2004). Riding on the winds of change. The future of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. *The International Spectator, 39*(2), 89–102.

Schumacher, T. (2011). The EU and the Arab Spring: Between spectatorship and actorness. *Insight Turkey, 13*(3), 107–119.

Schumacher, T. (2015). Uncertainty at the EU's borders: Narratives of EU external relations in the revised European Neighborhood Policy towards the southern borderlands. *European Security, 24*(3), 381–401.

Shea, C. (1997, January 10). Political scientists clash over value of area studies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A13–A14.

Smith, M., Keukeleire, S., & Vanhoonacker, S. (Eds.) (2014). *The diplomatic system of the European Union, evolution, change and challenges.* Oxford: Routledge.

Strange, S. (1988). *States and markets: An introduction to international political economy.* London: Pinter.

Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Telò, M. (2013). Introduction. In M. Telò & F. Ponjaert (Eds.), *The EU's Foreign Policy: What kind of power and diplomatic action* (pp. 1–14). Surrey: Ashgate.

Tessler, M., Nachtwey, J., & Banda, A. (1999). Introduction: The area studies controvery. In M. Tessler, J. Nachtwey, & A. Banda (Eds.), *Area studies and social science: Strategies for understanding Middle East politics* (pp. vii–xxi). Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Tömmel, I. (2013). The new neighbourhood policy of the EU: An appropriate response to the Arab Spring? *Democracy and Security, 9*(1–2), 19–39.

Tonra, B. (2010). Identity construction in the ENP: Borders and boundaries, insiders and outsiders. In R. Whitman & S. Wolff (Eds.), *The European Neighbourhood Policy in perspective. context, implementation and impact* (pp. 51–72). Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Van Hüllen, V. (2012). The European Union and democracy promotion in the Mediterranean: Strategic choices after the Arab Spring. In T. Börzel & K. Böttger (Eds.), *Policy change in the EU's immediate neighbourhood: A sectoral approach* (pp. 119–144). Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Van Vooren, B. (2012). *EU external relations law and the European Neighbourhood Policy: A paradigm for coherence.* Oxford: Routledge.

Völkel, J. (2014). More for more, less for less—More or less: A critique of the EU's Arab Spring Response à la Cinderella. *European Foreign Affairs Review, 19*(2), 263–282.

Waltz, K. (2010). *Theory of international politics.* Long Grove: Waveland Press.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetzel, A. & Orbie, J. (Eds.) (2011). The substance of EU democracy promotion. Special issue, *European Foreign Affairs Review, 16*(5), 565–734.

Whitman, R., & Wolff, S. (Eds.) (2010). *The European Neighbourhood Policy in perspective: Context, implementation and impact.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Wolff, S. (2011). *The EU's New European Neighbourhood Policy.* http://www.stefanwolff.com/notebook/the-new-european-neighbourhood-policy. Accessed 20 July 2014.

Youngs, R. (2008). Trends in democracy assistance. What has Europe been doing? *Journal of Democracy, 19*(2), 160–169.

Youngs, R. (2010). *Europe's decline in world politics. A retreat from liberal internationalism.* Oxford: Routledge.

Youngs, R., & Echagüe, A. (2010). Europe, the Mediterranean, the Middle East and the Need for Triangulation. *The International Spectator, 45*(3), 27–39.

Zartman, W. I. (2015). *Arab Spring: Negotiating in the shadow of the intifadat.* Athens, GE: University of Georgia Press.