



ROUTLEDGE ADVANCES
in EUROPEAN POLITICS

EUROPEANIZATION AND FOREIGN POLICY

State identity in Finland and Britain



ROUTLEDGE

JUHA JOKELA

Europeanization and Foreign Policy

State identity in Finland
and Britain

Juha Jokela

First published 2011

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

First issued in paperback 2016

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group,
an informa business*

© 2011 Juha Jokela

The right of Juha Jokela to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Typeset in Times New Roman by
Florence Production Ltd, Stoodleigh, Devon

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Jokela, Juha.

Europeanization and foreign policy: state identity in Finland and Britain/Juha Jokela.

p. cm. – (Routledge advances in European politics)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

(alk. paper) 1. European Union countries – Foreign relations.

2. European Union. 3. Finland – Foreign relations – 1981–

4. Great Britain – Foreign relations – 1997– 5. Intergovernmental cooperation – European Union countries. 6. European cooperation. I. Title.

JZ1570.J65 2011

341.242'2–dc22

2010025351

ISBN 13: 978-1-138-96914-8 (pbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-57787-8 (hbk)

Acknowledgements

Writing this book would not have been possible without generous support received from a University of Bristol Postgraduate Scholarship, the Economic and Social Science Research Council, a British Council Chevening Scholarship, the Finnish Cultural Foundation and a Kone Foundation Postgraduate Scholarship.

I am also most grateful for the guidance and advice provided by Richard Little and Jutta Weldes. You formed a brilliant supervisory team for my doctoral research. I have warm memories of our joint meetings, lively discussions and friendly debates. Much gratitude also goes to the staff and students of the Department of Politics at Bristol University, especially to Dibyesh Anand, Terrell Carver, Michelle Cini, Eric Herring, Vernon Hewitt, Johanna Kantola and Judith Squires. Your comments were most valuable for my doctoral studies. I am also most grateful to Brian White and Judith Squires for their sharp observations and brilliant suggestions as the examiners of my PhD dissertation.

The initial idea of this book developed at Birmingham University's Department of Political Science and International Studies. I would like to especially thank Stuart Croft, David Marsh and Collin Hay for inspiration and support. I also thank the Finnish Institute of International Affairs as well as my colleagues in the Network for European Studies at the University of Helsinki where this book was finalized. In particular, I wish to thank Teija Tiilikainen, Teemu Palosaari and Bart Gaens for their dedication to incorporate me into the Finnish university world. To all my friends in Turku, Birmingham, Bristol and Helsinki I am very grateful. You have been a source of support and always a delight.

Two people have been most important for this study. My deepest thanks go to Johanna. You have been a true friend and companion since the very first idea of this book. You have helped me to keep this endeavour on track and my life in perspective. Thank you for sharing your professional and personal life with me, thank you for everything. My loving thanks go to my partner Marko, whom I met while I was conducting field research for this book in Helsinki. Your love, kindness and curiosity towards life have been a unique source of inspiration and support. I also want to thank your family for helping me to rediscover Finland.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my family. To my mother Ritva, my father Timo and my brothers Ville, Heikki and Antti. Your love and support have been the most significant source of self-reliance, and crucial for this book and my life in general.

Abbreviations

APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CoE	Council of Europe
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
EC	European Community/Communities
ECAP	European Capabilities Action Plan
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EEA	European Economic Area
EEAS	European External Action Services
EEC	European Economic Community
ESS	European Security Strategy
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
EIS	European integration studies
EPC	European Political Cooperation
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ETA	European Trade Area
EU	European Union
Euratom	European Atomic Energy Community
FCMA	Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance
FPA	Foreign Policy Analysis
G7/G8	Group of Seven/Group of Eight
GPD	great-power discourse
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IR	International Relations
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
KFOR	Kosovo Force
MERCOSUR	Common Market of the Southern Cone (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay)
MP	Member of Parliament
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Area
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization

OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PfP	Partnership for Peace
SDE	Statement on the Defence Estimate
SDR	Strategic Defence Review
TEU	Treaty on European Union
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UN	United Nations
US	United States
WEU	Western European Union
WTO	World Trade Organization

Contents

	<i>List of illustrations</i>	xii
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiv
	<i>Abbreviations</i>	xv
1	Introduction	1
	<i>European foreign and security policy</i>	3
	<i>Comparing state identities</i>	5
	<i>Structure of the book</i>	6
2	The Europeanization of foreign policy	9
	<i>Introduction</i>	9
	<i>The CFSP and the CSDP</i>	10
	The Lisbon Treaty and the new CFSP and CSDP	14
	<i>Theorizing European foreign and security policy</i>	16
	Intergovernmental approaches: the prevailing state-centrism	16
	Supranational approaches: from functionalism to top-down	
	Europeanization	20
	<i>The Europeanization of foreign and security policy: a top-down</i>	
	<i>and bottom-up process?</i>	24
	<i>Conclusion</i>	27
3	Foreign policy and state identity: towards comparative discourse analysis	28
	<i>Introduction</i>	28
	<i>Theoretical framework: bridging levels of analysis, and</i>	
	<i>structure and agency</i>	29
	Discourse analysis in international relations	30
	Discourse analysis in European integration studies	31
	<i>Methodological framework: towards comparative discourse</i>	
	<i>analysis</i>	35
	Comparison in discourse analysis	38

	<i>Methods, research design and case selection</i>	39
	Comparison and case selection	41
	Data collection and analysis	43
	<i>Conclusion</i>	45
4	The Europeanization of Finnish foreign and security policy discourse: from neutrality to alignment identity	46
	<i>Introduction</i>	46
	<i>The Finnish neutrality</i>	47
	Re-articulating the neutrality discourse	49
	The dominance of the neutrality discourse and the CFSP and the CSDP	56
	<i>The Europeanization of the Finnish foreign and security policy discourse</i>	58
	Articulation of the alignment discourse	61
	Interpellation of the alignment discourse	68
	<i>After EU membership</i>	72
	Re-articulation of the alignment discourse	74
	Interpellation of the alignment discourse	77
	<i>Conclusion</i>	81
5	The Europeanization of British foreign and security policy discourse: re-articulating the great-power identity	82
	<i>Introduction</i>	82
	<i>Britain as a great power</i>	83
	Re-articulating the great-power discourse	86
	The dominance of the great-power discourse and the CFSP and the CSDP	94
	<i>The Europeanization of the British foreign and security policy discourse</i>	97
	Re-articulation of the great-power discourse	100
	Interpellation of the Europeanized discourse	108
	<i>After St Malo</i>	110
	The re-articulation of the Europeanized great-power discourse	112
	Interpellation of the Europeanized great-power discourse	113
	<i>Conclusion</i>	116
6	Comparing the reproduction of state identities in Finland and Britain	118
	<i>Introduction</i>	118
	<i>Europeanization and comparative discourse analysis</i>	118
	<i>Comparing the Finnish and British discourses</i>	120
	The discursive context of Europeanization in Finland and Britain	120

The impact on the Finnish and British state identities	123
<i>The Europeanization of state identities</i>	131
<i>Conclusion</i>	134

7 Conclusion	136
<i>Empirical findings</i>	138
<i>Analytical findings</i>	139
<i>Notes</i>	142
<i>Bibliography</i>	149
<i>Index</i>	163

Illustrations

Figures

3.1	The reproduction of state identity in the field of foreign and security policy	40
3.2	Representation, articulation and discourse	41
4.1	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 1995 parliamentary debate	69
4.2	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 1997 parliamentary debate	78
4.3	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 2001 parliamentary debate	79
5.1	The Europeanization of the great-power discourse in the 1998 parliamentary debates	109
5.2	The Europeanization of the great-power discourses (GPD) in the 1999 and 2001 parliamentary debates	114
6.1	Interpellation of the alignment discourse	127
6.2	Interpellation of the 1998 re-articulation of great-power discourse (GPD)	130

Tables

4.1	Predication of the neutrality discourse	51
4.2	Predication of the alignment discourse	62
4.3	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 1995 parliamentary debate	69
4.4	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 1997 parliamentary debate	78
4.5	The neutrality and alignment discourses in the 2001 parliamentary debate	79
5.1	Predication of the great-power discourse in Britain	88
5.2	Predication of the 1998 re-articulation of the great-power discourse	101
5.3	The Europeanization of the great-power discourse (GPD) in the 1998 parliamentary debates	109

5.4	The Europeanization of the great-power discourse (GPD) in the 1999 and 2001 parliamentary debates	114
6.1	The Europeanization of foreign and security policy discourse in Finland and Britain	121
6.2	Structuring the meaning of the neutrality and alignment discourses	125
6.3	Structuring meaning in the pre- and post-1998 great-power discourses	128
6.4	Similarities and differences in the Europeanization of the state identities of Finland and Britain	132

1 Introduction

This book sheds light on the relationship between the European Union (EU) and its member states in analyzing how the Europeanization of foreign and security policy is shaping the identities of two different member states, Finland and Britain.¹ The analytical rationale emerged from empirical observations related to the variation in the debate on foreign and security policy in Finland and Britain in the 1990s. In Britain there were some far-reaching generalizations suggesting that attempts to establish a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) for the EU were delusional.² It was argued that the EU treaty declarations on these twin policies lacked political support, institutional capabilities and military resources. Consequently, the CFSP and the CSDP played a marginal role in the British political and scholarly debate. In Finland, meanwhile, the government argued that membership of the EU reinforces Finnish security. Consequently, the CFSP and the CSDP became the buzzwords of the new EU member state's foreign and security policy and a central element in the political and scholarly debate. Against this background, two particularly puzzling and interrelated questions arise. What accounts for the differences? What do these differences tell us about the European foreign and security policy?

The central assumption of this book is that we have witnessed the emergence of a distinct European foreign and security policy system, at the core of which is the European Union. It is a system that is based not on traditional state boundaries but on a progressively robust form of multi-level governance. European-level decision-making brings the vast majority of European states into constant interaction, and European institutions play an increasingly important role in the process. EU developments are of particular importance given the EU's increasing powers over its member states. Although these are more evident in monetary policy and single market, they have also been gradually strengthened in the field of foreign and security policy. Moreover, it has become increasingly difficult to distinguish between the more supranational EU external relations – such as trade and development policies – and the more intergovernmental CFSP and CSDP. For instance, implementation of the crisis-management decisions made by the intergovernmental Council of the European Union under the auspices of the CFSP and CSDP often draw on the resources governed by the more supranational

2 *Europeanization and foreign policy*

European Commission. On the other hand, the Commission-based EU trade and development policies must be taken into account in the formulation of the CFSP.

Moreover, the Lisbon Treaty, which came into force in 2010, aims to overcome the coordination problems resulting from the complex institutional and procedural web of the EU's external relations. The new institutional set-up brings the majority of its external policies under the leadership of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, with the assistance of the European External Action Services (EEAS). The High Representative is the Vice-President of the Commission. She chairs the Foreign Affairs Council comprising the member states and conducts the CFSP. Given the aim to bridge the Commission- and Council-based external activities of the EU, the distinction between the intergovernmental and supranational features of its external relations is increasingly difficult to sustain in practice. Arguably, it is the expansion of the supranational elements of EU's foreign and security policy that marks the difference between the EU and the other European or international security organizations. It is further suggested that this constitutes a challenge to the traditional analysis of foreign and security policy.

Although there is nothing inherently wrong in analyzing European foreign and security policy within an intergovernmental or supranational framework, the idea in this book is to investigate whether it is feasible to study the different levels concurrently within a single theoretical framework by utilizing the concept of Europeanization in a novel way. Europeanization studies have represented an analytical move from explaining the process of European integration to examining its effects on European (states') politics. In other words, instead of seeking to explain the integration process and European-level institution building from a bottom-up perspective, scholars have become progressively more interested in analysing the effects of EU institutions and policies on its member (and neighbouring) states within a top-down frame. The concept has recently been applied in analyses of European foreign and security policy, and some scholars have studied national adaptation to the CFSP and the CSDP (within a top-down frame). However, and given the continuing salience of the state in this field, the Europeanization of foreign and security policy has also been studied from a bottom-up perspective in terms of the national projection of state interests on the EU level. Similarly, some researchers have emphasized the reciprocal features of the process, thereby explicitly drawing on international relations (IR) theories. In so doing, they have often turned towards social constructivism and poststructuralism, and many have focused on change and continuities in national discourses and identities.

Against this background, this book contributes to two contemporary theoretical and methodological debates. First, it combines Europeanization with the study of identity within a discourse-analytical framework, thus explicating what social constructivism and poststructuralism can bring to EIS. It is argued that this facilitates more detailed and context-specific analysis of Europeanization, and hence complements the overall rationale of Europeanization studies – to account for national variation in light of increasing EU governance. Second, the study embraces the recent tendency within discourse theory to adopt a comparative framework, the aim being to contribute to the emerging literature on comparative discourse analysis (Howarth 2005, J. Kantola 2006).

European foreign and security policy

EU developments in foreign and security policy are notable in light of the theoretical developments in the study of IR. The emphasis on globalization (Clark 1999, Held 1999), regionalization (Fawcett and Hurrell 1997), Europeanization (Tonra 2001, Featherstone 2003, Radaelli 2004) and transnational (Keohane and Nye 1971) as well as multi-level governance (Hooghe and Marks 2001, Bache 2008) is challenging the autonomy of the state and emphasizes other institutions and interdependency. However, the state has largely retained its dominance and autonomous character, especially in the study of foreign policy. In light of this theoretical drift, the posited supranational tendencies of the EU's foreign and security policies are of particular empirical interest in that they connect these policy fields more directly to theories of general transformation suggesting the diminishing role of the state in international relations. Analytically they also allow the incorporation of theoretical innovations from European integration studies (EIS) into the study of international relations and vice versa.

Thus far the debate on European foreign and security policy has largely focused on three interrelated dimensions (White 2001: 40–41, Carlsnaes 2004: 1). The first of these relates to the traditional and distinguishable activities of European states in the context of foreign and security policy. Despite the increasing cooperation and rapid institutional developments on the European level, these activities have increased rather than decreased. The second dimension concerns the development of the EU's foreign and security policy, referring to the increased coordination of the member states' political and military relations with the outside world, and the third reflects developments in other fields of the EU's external relations such as financial, trade and development. In these areas the EU is becoming increasingly recognized as a key player in world politics. As a result of rapid developments related to the second and third dimensions, a fourth distinct dimension has become increasingly visible in that a number of scholars are focusing on the EU as an international actor in world affairs. As such it has thus been used as an empirical example in many analytical approaches, highlighting the increasing regional and global governance in foreign and security policy.

Given the broad scope of scholarly interest, the terms used to clarify and define the subject matter are numerous. In recent years two terms have become dominant in book and journal articles: whereas some refer to European or Europe's foreign policy, others call it EU or the EU's foreign policy (S. Smith 1994, Hill 1996a, Nuttall 2000, Zielonka 2002, K.E. Smith 2003, M.E. Smith 2004, Tonra and Christiansen 2004). Furthermore, some influential accounts employ longer expressions such as 'the foreign policies of the European Union member states' (Manners and Whitman 2000). Although the different labels are mostly carefully considered choices reflecting the author's take on the different dimensions of the debate, at times they are used interchangeably. In order to establish conceptual clarity for the analysis, a brief discussion about the subject matter and focus of this book is called for.

Although this book focuses largely on developments in the EU and two of its member states, it adopts the broad definition of European foreign policy, rather

than the narrower EU foreign policy. The analytical rationale behind this choice comes from the recognition that given the EU's pivotal role, foreign policy activities in Europe are not coterminous with the institutional and discursive boundaries of the European Union. Norway, for instance, is not an EU member state, but its foreign policy has been shaped by the CFSP and the CSDP to a significant degree (Sjursen 2003: 7–8). On the other hand, some of the EU member states' foreign policies seem to be remarkably detached from the CFSP and the CSDP, but not, for instance, from North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) policies. The broader definition also accommodates the increasing interplay among European security organizations, most crucially the EU, NATO and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The term 'European foreign policy', which incorporates individual states' foreign policies and the increasing role of European-level institutions and policies, therefore serves this book well in that it incorporates all the key actors and institutions, as well as the complex processes among them.

The conceptualization of foreign policy constitutes another challenge for this study. The broad scope of this policy area is recognized, and the book draws on theoretical approaches questioning narrow conceptualizations. Although global and regional regulation has penetrated many areas of national politics, domestic actors increasingly bypass the state and operate directly in other states, as well as regionally and globally. Indeed, the processes of globalization and regionalization have blurred the previously sharp distinction between domestic and foreign policy, thereby challenging state-centric accounts of domestic and international politics. This has paved the way for broader research agendas – a move often labelled a shift from government to governance. This is symptomatic in the European context in at least two ways. Regional institutions such as the EU are shaping the domestic politics of EU member states to an increasing degree, and many areas of internal policy are high on their external agendas. This has certainly broadened the scope of foreign policy in Europe. On the other hand, the EU has been recognized as a particularly influential actor in world affairs, mainly in other fields than traditional foreign policy. This has also widened the focus of foreign policy analysis. Accordingly, a growing number of policy-makers and scholars are referring to external relations rather than foreign policy, especially in the context of the EU's policies towards other states, regions and international organizations. This being said, the focus and the empirical material of this book rely largely on documentation reflecting rather conservative foreign policy matters, such as security and defence. There were practical and analytical reasons for this choice. On the practical level these areas have been predominant in the debate on European foreign policy in light of the development of the CFSP and the CSDP. Analytically these areas are pivotal in that they are widely held to be immune to the process of European integration, and to be one of the strongholds of state power. Given the focus on traditional foreign policy matters, largely but not exclusively related to state security and defence, the term 'European foreign and security policy' is applied throughout.

Although the aim of the book is to shed light on European foreign and security policy, and in so doing to make a valuable contribution to foreign policy analysis in general, it is not in itself a book of foreign policy analysis: it is about Europeanization and foreign policy. Whereas European foreign and security policy refers to the overall context in which EU and state-level policy-making take place, the term 'Europeanization of foreign policy' relates to the process of ongoing transformation in this context. In other words, Europeanization is symptomatic of the emergence of a distinct European foreign and security policy system and of the increasing importance of European-level governance in this context, namely but not exclusively the CFSP and the CSDP.

Comparing state identities

The recent theoretical developments within IR triggered the choice of national and state identity as a key concept of this study. Whereas the concept of national identity – predominantly associated with the nation-state – is broadly applied within different theoretical orientations in IR, analysts have also written about state identity. This terminological and conceptual choice is often left without explanation, however. Although some accounts seem to favour the term on account of an explicit focus on the state (Wendt 1999, Mitzen 2006) others use it to elucidate the relationship between state and nation (Biswas 2002). The concept of state identity is preferred here given the focus of the study first and foremost on state practices, specifically their foreign and security policies. On the more implicit level, this conceptual choice highlights the need to problematize the amalgamation of state and nation in IR. On the one hand, states may comprise more than one nation, and nations' borders do not necessarily coincide with the borders of the state in question. On the other hand, although state practices constitute a major site for the reproduction of national identities, the identities cannot be reduced to such practices: other important and often institutionalized sites include for example ethnicity, language and religion, often directly and indirectly linked to the state.

Similarly, the reproduction of state identity should not be reduced to state practices or certain policy fields such as foreign and security policy. Non-state institutions and other policy fields also play a role. Nevertheless foreign and security policy is largely considered critical to the existence of the state, and is understood almost exclusively in terms of the state. Indeed, the EU appears to be the only non-state actor that explicitly claims to have a foreign and security policy. As such, the state and its foreign and security policy constitute a privileged site for the construction of the state identity.

Against this background, states' foreign and security policies are understood in this book as boundary-producing political practices. As such they do not merely reflect state identities, but are rather part of their reproduction (Weldes 1996, Campbell 1998, Weber 1998). In order to examine this reproduction, specifically what difference, if any, the EU foreign and security policy has made to Finland and Britain, the study turns towards discourse analysis, which has proved increasingly

valuable in IR and EIS but is rarely applied in Europeanization studies. The premise in this book is that discourse analysis provides the analytical tools with which to elucidate the relationship between the EU and its member states.

The core ideas of this work are pursued through a comparative study of Finland and Britain. These two states provide rich and analytically interesting material with which to investigate what difference, if any, the Europeanization of foreign and security policy made to the Finnish and British foreign policy discourses in the 1990s and early 2000s, as well as to these states' identities. Whereas Finland represents a small and previously neutral state, and is a relatively new EU member, Britain stands for a major state and an internationally engaged security actor with long-term membership of the European Union. Interestingly, both share a problematic historical relationship with European integration: Finland in terms of its neutrality and special relationship with the Soviet Union and Russia, and Britain due to its great-power status and special relationship with the United States. Given the differences, both states have re-articulated their relationship with the EU: Finland after its accession in 1995 and Britain in the 1998 British–French joint declaration on European security and defence signed in St Malo.

Although the Europeanization of foreign and security policy does suggest a degree of convergence in member states' identities, divergence should not be ruled out either. Comparison of the similarities and differences between Finland and Britain in light of Europeanization thus highlights the need for a context-specific theory of foreign policy. The assumptions on which the book is based and the theoretical framework thus point away from the idea of a grand theory and general laws, which tend to highlight particular actors such as states with given identities and interests. Accordingly, the key characteristics of a particular state, such as Finland's smallness and Britain's greatness, are not taken for granted but are seen as socially constructed through specific state discourses and practices. Similarly, comparison of the discourses of foreign and security policy and state identity does not necessarily correspond with the conventional methods of comparative politics: it rather reflects the methodology of discourse analysis, which suggests a problem- rather than a method-driven approach, as well as a broad historical and contextual understanding of the case studies. Thus this volume also aims to add to our knowledge of Finnish and British foreign and security policy in the 1990s and 2000s.

Structure of the book

The book is organized along the following lines. Chapter 1 begins with a description of European foreign and security policy with the EU at its core. It outlines some of the key institutional developments of the CFSP and the CSDP, and highlights the importance of the EU. The literature focusing on recent developments reflects two distinct approaches, labelled the intergovernmental and the supranational approaches. Whereas the former draws largely on the IR literature, the latter is more closely associated with EIS. In light of globalization and regionalization and the development of the EU's foreign and security policy,