# Normative Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Relationship

## Solmaz Tourani

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in
International Relations

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2014
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

_____
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Sozen
Chair, Department of Architecture

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Wojciech Forysinski
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Wojciech Forysinski    _____

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Umut Bozkurt    _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Altay Nevzat    _____

# ABSTRACT

Both, the European Union and the United States seem to have adopted certain norms and values in their foreign policy decision making. This thesis examines the application of these norms and values in the foreign policy decision making of both the EU and the US by making a comprehensive study of cases where claims to their neglect of such norms and values have been made. On the EU's side, the decisions made in regards of the Chechen conflict and its stance on Syria whilst on the American side its normative stance shall be reviewed together with its perceived hegemonic role in different cases. The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 shall be examined to picture how this combination of Norms/Hegemonic Role affects the decision making of the United States.

This thesis aims to answer the question of how has the adoption of the normative foreign policy by the EU and the US affected their mutual transatlantic relations? Whether the decisions made by these actors have indeed been normatively compliant with their perceived normative identity?

**Keywords**: Normative power, Normative Goals, Normative Means, Normative Impacts, EU's foreign policy, US foreign policy, Transatlantic relationship.

# ÖZ

Hem Avrupa Birliği hem de Birleşik Devletler dış politika yapımlarında belirli normlar ve değerleri benimsemiş görünmektedirler. Bu tez hem Avrupa Birliği hem Birleşik Devletler'de bu değer ver normların ihmal edildiği vakaların kapsamlı bir çalışmasını yaparak dış politika karar alımında uygulanışını inceler. Amerikan tarafında kararlar normatif tutumun farklı vakalarda algılanan hegemonik rolüyle birlikte incelenirken; Avrupa birliği tarafında kararlar birliğin Çeçen çatışması ve Suriye ile ilgili tutumu bağlamında alınıyor.Birleşik Devletlerin 2003'teki Irak işgali bu" normlar/hegemonik rol"ün kombinasyonun Birleşik Devletler'in karar alımını nasıl etkilediğinini resmederek incelenmeli. Bu tez, Avrupa Birliği ve Birleşik Devletlerin normatif dış politikaları benimseyişi bu iki birliğin ortak transatlantik ilişkilerini nasıl etkiledi sorusunun cevaplanmasını amaçlar.Bu aktörler tarafından alınan kararlar hakikaten normatif bir şekilde ve onların "algılanmış normatif kimlik"lerine uyumlu bir biçimde mi alınmıştır? Anahtar Sözcükler: Normatif Güç, Normatif Amaçlar, Normatif Araçlar, Normatif Etkiler, AB Dış Politikası, ABD Dış Politikası, Transatlantik İlişkileri

**Anahtar Kelimeler** : Normatif güç , Normatif Gol , Normatif araçları , Normatif Etkileri, AB'nin dış politika , ABD dış politikası , Transatlantik ilişkileri .

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am using this opportunity to express my gratitude to everyone who supported me throughout the course of this thesis project. I am thankful for their aspiring guidance, invaluably constructive criticism and friendly advice during the project work. I am sincerely grateful to them for sharing their truthful and illuminating views on a number of issues related to the project. I express my warm thanks to Dr. Forysisnski for his support and guidance at Eastern Mediterranean University. I would also like to thank all the people who provided me with the facilities being required and conductive conditions for my thesis project.

Thank you,

Solmaz Tourani

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Chapter 1

# INTRODUCTION

Both of the two main actors in the world politics, United States of America and the European Union have been grounded and introduced as normative systems in their first foreign policy declarations and testimonials. In the $18^{th}$ century, when the American founding fathers, were passing the drafts for establishing the foreign policy of the American republic, they put the normative principles and universal assertions as the core of their work. The US has become well-known as the ultimate pioneer of multilateral rules and institutions which is promoting the fundamental norms such as democracy, human rights and rule of law. By doing so, they were attempting to form a model consisting of rules and bodies which was established for handling the international relations of both US and rest of the world. Today, because of the unique political, economic and military power of the US in the world, its foreign policy methodology is a mixture of both hegemonic and normative styles. It Depends on its own interests, it has changed its face from a norm entrepreneur which is trying to convince others to follow its desired norms, to a norm externaliser which tries to bound others by the norms which are not bounding for itself and lastly to a norm blocker which has rejected and blocked the application of universal norms when they were opposed to its power position or its status quo. (Hamilton, 2004)

This was a similar story for the EU but in a more accentuated form. The word accentuated is so important and determining. By giving a history of the creation of

the EU, the importance of this word, will be elaborated. After centuries of conflict and separation among the European states, they tried to find and apply common values of peace, prosperity and security to conduct a more practical and aspiring relations among themselves. Consequently they transformed their political and economic systems internally and externally. Meanwhile, US were aware of this peace tendency among European states and at the same time, the lack of prerequisites such as military power and armament to provide a balance of security. Thus, the US took the opportunity and suggested the NATO security Authority, under which the European states could protect themselves from the danger of the outside world and therefore they could pay more attention to the expansion of perceived values for the sake of their own and the US benefits.

Because of the fundamental need for the afore-mentioned values among the European states, the establishment of the EU was grounded on the centrality of the values and for this reason, it has become known as a form of organization with the connotation of non-military. For the same reason, the nature of the EU as an international actor is considered as a distinctive and different nature with the most emphasis on values rather than 'balance of power and zero-sum logic'. (Nathalie Tocci, 2008)

Previously, we used the word accentuated to clarify the extent to which the EU is focusing on the values more than any other form of power. Except 'soft power', some other words such as 'civilian power' and lastly, the 'normative power have been used by different EU experts in order to describe the EU as a different form of international actor. The 'civilian power' was used by Duchene, for he believes that the EU is a unique actor who can create and increase the stability through the

economic and political means. He believed in a civilian character in the EU's nature which motivated both, the economic interdependence among the states and the use of diplomacy and negotiation rather than the coercion for halting the conflicts. He mainly focused on economic resources and economic means of cooperation, such as international trade and global market.

The next and actually the last key word which was created by Ian Manners for describing EU as a distinctive international actor, was 'normative power'. (Manners, 2002) By Normative power he meant that the EU had the ability to shape the conceptions of the Normal in the international relations. According to him, the time for considering the EU as normative power, above and beyond the two previous theorization of civilian versus military dichotomies, has come. He centered the 'state' as the core of his assumption and highlighted ideations and power of the norms 'as the functional elements which construct the internal component of the EU's identity and form its function in international platform'. Manners believes that three main characteristics of the EU converted it to a different actor in terms of norms expansion; its historical background which has stem from the post-war era (when European states seek to preserve and unify their resources in order to provide the lost peace and security) in which the EU has been established, its hybrid polity which shows the gradually changing form of EU to a supranational and international form of power which projects the Westphalian norms and at last its political-legal constitution which has resulted from the decisions of the elites in a treaty based legalized form of the order.(Manners,2002)

Although the universal principles and norms are outlined in the fundamental foreign policy declarations and drafts of both EU and US, these two actors could not remain

as purely and merely normative in real conditions. Conducting a normative action required the scrutinizing of three steps of normative goals, normative means and normative impacts. The normative goals have to be followed through normatively deployed means and the real outcomes have to be close to the intended norms (Tocci, 2007, p.6).

Based on the prioritizing and deploying of these three variables, states are categorized in to four categorize: normative, realpolitik, imperial and status quo. (Tocci, 2008) A normative actor is the one who is trying to fulfill both norms and means and consequently support the rights and duties protected by the international law and reinforce international law and institutions. It considers both the internal and international legal obligations as the sources of respect. The realpolitik actor is a selfish one which organizes all types of strategic instruments (regardless of being coercive and non-coercive) to satisfy its own interests. The imperial actor is the one who tracks the normative foreign policy goals but not in a way that binds itself by the international law. It tries its best and uses all at its disposal to enforce new norms to free it from obeying the universal principles, even if the new imposed norms cause the break of international law. It plays a dominant role in determining others rules and obligations in a way that it serves its interests in the best way. The last type which is the status quo one is the one which tries to respect the internal or international obligations and inspects the foreign policy goals with referring to those internal or international legal compulsions and when it is relevant acts within the framework of international organizations. Nevertheless, it acts as a status quo which although respect the rules but not permit to their further enlargement in all issues.

These categories have been identified by a team of experts in the center for European foreign policy studies including Nathalie Tocci, Hakim Darbouche, Michael Emerson, Ian Manners and some other researches. Through this paper, we will examine how EU and US would perform as all of these categorical actors based on their priorities in different critical conditions.

As a conclusion, this study is for explaining the role of the normative power in foreign policy of US and EU. The limitations which have been imposed by normative power on these two actors and the obligatory role of these two actors on the application of normative power are the core assumptions of this study. Likewise, the influence of norms on the whole relations between US and EU is another aiming concept through this reading. The importance of this subject is because of two reasons. The first one is the increasing role of the Norms in the political world, a world which is turning to a more ideological than physical one. Therefore the importance of norms in foreign policy of actors has increased. The second important point of this subject is the role of the EU and the US and their foreign policies in the world. The foreign policy of these two not only affect their own relations with each other but also it affect the whole world. So the place of the norms in the foreign policy of these two would reveal and justify other actions in other parts of the world.

## 1.2 Aim of the Study

This thesis is based on the assumption that indeed, the concept of normative power represents a valuable addition to our understanding of the nature and identity of the foreign policy of the European Union and United States as two actors in international system, it is also a useful means of explaining the relations of these two actors with the outside world and with each other. The convergences and divergences of these

two international actors in terms of foreign policy objectives and normative systems they pursue, makes their relationship particularly interesting to analyze from the 'normative power' perspective. How can these two actors cooperate with each other despite the divergences they have in their foreign policy and global governance is an interesting topic for research. The reason of choosing this topic as a research subject is because both actors are economic and political pillars in the contemporary world and their behavior determines the dominant trends in world politics, therefore understanding the role of the normative power in their foreign policy will be helpful for political interpretation and foreign policy contemplation of other actors.Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to look at Transatlantic relationship, an its dynamics, using the normative power approach and its rhetoric.

## 1.3 Research Question

In view of the aforementioned research objective, this research is aimed at answering the following question:

- How has the adoption of the normative foreign policy by the EU and the US affected their mutual transatlantic relations?

The sub questions are:

- What are the characteristics of a normative foreign policy?

- Is the EU, as an international organization, a normative actor? To what extent, has it acted as a norm expander?

- Is the United States, as a state, a normative actor? To what extent, has it acted as a norm provider?

- According to the history of the EU's formation, how has the US influenced the EU's foreign policy?

- What are the similarities and dissimilarities of the EU's and US foreign policies?

## 1.4 Research Methodology

The present work is of a descriptive nature. Research has been made on the topic of discussion with the use of primary and secondary sources to achieve its objectives. The author has made an effort to use the most up to date books and articles dealing with normative power and Transatlantic relations in this regard. Discourse analysis has been implemented on the issue under review together with the content analysis of related EU and US foreign policy instruments – international treaties, declarations, statements etc. As the focus of the thesis is on clarifying the similarities and differences of the implementation of norms in the two sides of the Atlantic, comparative analysis is made on the behavior of the two sides. When necessary, the thesis will use historical analysis and a number of cases to properly capture the dynamics of the EU-US relationship and contextual analysis to place this relationship in a broader international context.

## 1.5 Organization of the Study

Introduction to the study includes the statement of the problem, objectives, research questions, scope and methodology. Chapter two studies the characteristic of a normative foreign policy and its major and minor principles. Chapter three demonstrates the role of the normative power in the foreign policy of the EU .chapter four shows the role of the normative power in the foreign policy of the United States. The last chapter which is the conclusion tries to show the role and influence of the normative in transatlantic relations.

# Chapter 2

# NORMATIVE FOREIGN POLICY

## 2.1 Introduction

For studying the origin of the normative foreign policy, a definition of the word 'Norm' itself is needed for a better understanding of this conception. Finnemore and Sikkink presented the definition of norms by this statement:

> Norms are standards aiming at codifying the behavior of actors sharing Common principles and this in order to generate collective disciplines and to forbid certain conducts in the different fields of public policies (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998, p.887).

This definition shows that Norms are an instrument for controlling and governing of other actors and it is less damageable and more durable than other means such as military means. According to Laïdi and Lamy (as cited in Laïdi, 2008) this is a more 'suitable political model' for an interdependent world since it constitutes a factor of equalization of power.

The foreign policy is a scope for every state through which it can peruse its own interests in the international system. Therefore, drawing an explicit line between the interests and the norms employed by the states would be impossible. A universal and conceptual tool is needed according to which the actions of the states could be estimated. Based on the theory of communicative action stated by Sjursen in his article, actors are considered rational when they are able to justify and explain their actions in relation to intersubjective valid norms, i.e. norms that cannot be reasonably rejected in a rational debate. The actors are responsible for the valuation of not only

their actions but also their norms in accordance with the principles of universalization. They also have to detect their action in a particular situation to see if it is correct or not. (Sjursen, 2006, p.243)

Acting in accordance with the legal principles and international law is a good way of binding itself and it connotes the meaning of acting normatively in the international system. Acting normatively means even if a particular interest coincided with legal obligations, the legal obligations would be respected.

Working for a multilateral system which is the core concept of European Social Survey shows us that the goal of the EU as a sample of a normative actor is to develop a stronger international society, well-functioning international institutions and a rule-based international order. The basis of this law-based international order is the United Nations. Multilateralism is a collective device for deploying the common principles .It coordinates the national policies in groups of three or more states based on principles of ordering relations among those states (Ruggie, 1992, p.567). In such a condition, the appropriate conduct is determined by the principles and not by the strategic interests of a particular situation. The legitimacy of the universal norms is determined by quantitative and qualitative elements. Mark Suchman has defined legitimacy of the norms in this way:

> A generalized perception or assumption that the action of any entity are desirable, proper, appropriate within some socially constructed system of the norms, values ,believes and definitions (Suchman, 1996,p.574).

According to this definition, a new norm has to be accepted by a large group of social actors in order to be replaced by the previous one. At the same time this new norm has to be constructed within a social framework of norms, values and definitions.

The accepted norms can be objective exactly like the definition presented by Ian Manners who has identified normative as what is considered normal in international affairs (Manners, 2002, p.32). In this definition, norm is projected as something good and ethical which is internationally accepted. The Norms were about to be non-neutral and universally accepted by all the states and actors. No state or specific actor has the right to abuse the norms in an imperialistic imposition way in order to expand its own national interests.

At the same time, in the real world, comparing the normative nature of the foreign policy of different actors revealed that Norms are subjective when they are regularized by the powerful states. In such a situation, the norms are more connected to power rather than being something totally impartial. Accordingly, in real political arena the norms are goals determined by the major powers and they are tools for them to strengthen their status-quo.

In another word, the subjectivity or objectivity of the norms mostly depends on the intention behind using them. When they are used impartially for the sake of people and society, they are objective but when they are used as a means of increasing power and promoting interests of one specific state, they are subjective norms. Similarly, Helene Sjursen believes that 'major international actors would have normative foreign policies by definition in that they all contribute determining and shaping the norms in international affairs' (Sjursen, 2007).

Regardless of being objective or subjective, normative foreign policy consists of three components including normative goals, normative means and normative impact. Based on a study conducted by the Center for European Policy Studies in

Brussels held by a number of experts such as Nathalie Tocci, Brantley Womack and Ian Manners, it takes three steps to make a foreign policy decision. The first step consists of the normative goal which means the values of one country based on which the state prioritized its foreign policies. The second step is the normative means which contained economic, social, diplomatic and cultural instruments and the last variable of the normative foreign policy is the impact that has been made by that foreign policy. In another word, the foreign policy should be influential in accomplishing its normative objectives. The next part is going to broadly explain these three main elements of the normative foreign policy.

## 2.2 Normative Goals

Normative goals in foreign policy are the universal values based on which a country constructs its external relations. Constructivists have defined values as theoretical principles which based the organization, clarification, ranking and practical procedure of the interests. Values are actually the international organizers of the interests of a country. [1] The understanding of these universal standards diverges when it comes to applying them in different states within different periods of time. Different actors would comprehend the so-called comprehensive principles including 'democracy', 'peace', 'human rights' and 'rule of law' in different ways based on their own specific conditions.[2] The main element which makes the contradiction of the interpretation of the shared principles is the alignment of interest. Consequently, there is an overlapping relation between the values and interests. While one is constructing the structure of the other, another one makes limitations for applying the other one in specific situations.

---

[1] Hans Morgenthau, In defense of National Interests (University of Maryland Press, 19820.34.
[2] Chris Brown, Ethics, Interests and Foreign Policy (2005),.26.

The interests are shaped by two elements of setting and the power of the authoritative actors. A good example of the effectiveness of power in determining the interests and thus the values is the idea of 'pre-emptive war' which was coined by US against Iraq in 2002.

Nathalie Tocci emphasized the priority of the strategic goals over the normative goals in the foreign policy of the US. In her view, conducting war in the name of democracy, which is one of the top external policies of the US, includes the strategic objectives such as providing energy, alleviating the security or increasing the hegemonic control.

> 'Likewise, the promotion of the normative goal of multilateralism may conceal a mid-level power's strategic objectives of asserting its power and promoting multipolarity within the international system (e.g. China)' (Tocci, 2008, p.7).

## 2.3 Milieu and Possession Goals

The milieu goals and the possession goals are two types of goals pursued by actors. The milieu goals are the beyond state goals which are more concerned with universal and international objectives. They are followed at any time in any state and are not bound by a specific occasion. The national interests and more generally the national boundaries are of no importance in following these goals. Most of the normative goals such as peace, human rights, promotion of international law and joining the international organizations that have become a fundamental part of the national obligations in different states, are stem from the milieu goals. [3] On the other end of the spectrum, the possession goals exist which are directly attached to the national considerations and strategic objectives. Improvement or the protection of the internal values and benefits is the top intention of the actors when they are trailing the

---

[3] Thomas Risse, "Let's Argue", Communicative Action in World Politics, (International Organization, 2000), 15.

possession goals. These national goals may range from stretching the territory to the beneficial economic strategies. (Wolfers, 1962, p.67-80)

By this explanation, it is now easier to give a definition of the normative goals. Like milieu goals, a normative goal is a beyond territory goal which tries to solidify a boundary over all the political parties regardless of their power position or their supremacy. As a matter of fact, controlling the deployment of the milieu goals is the main responsibility of those who are trying to implement the normative goals through the international regimes, organizations and law.

## 2.4 Normative Means

The next component of the normative foreign policy is related to how to deploy the normative goals in another country. For a better explanation of normative means, Duchene's concept of 'civilian power' (as cited in Manners, 2002) would be highly functional here. The normative means includes economic, social, diplomatic and cultural instruments which are placed on the opposite side of the military ones. [4]

The way of deploying normative means is very important because sometimes the normative means can be more harmful than military means. For example, economic sanctions are categorized as soft forms of punishment but in reality the destructiveness and damages of sanctions could be more than conduction of war. Manners explained the divergent results of expanding norms through two ways of dialogue and enforcement in this way:

> Methods based on joint ownership, cooperation and dialogue in principle hedge against the dangers of imposing allegedly 'universal' norms through sheer power and against the needs and desires of local populations in third

---

[4] Francis Duchene, The European Community and the Uncertainties of the Interdependence, in Nathalie Tocci, Profiling Normative Foreign Policy (Brussels: European policy studies, 2008) 9.

countries. These methods allow for and are driven by motivations which are 'other-empowering' rather than 'self-empowering' (Manners, 2006).

The soft ways of punishment are less interfering, less psychologically damaging, more practical in terms of preserving the political and diplomatic passages and in result less harmful for the local population of the third country. [5]

In spite of all that has been said and explained about the characteristics of normative means, there is no firm criterion for drawing a line between normative means and non-normative means. The only firm tool for measuring the legality of the afore-mentioned instruments is the two-dimensional commitment which every society has to make to its own people and to the UN authorization and consequently international law. (Nathalie Tocci, 2008)

## 2.5 Normative Impact

To make sure that attempts for conducting a normative foreign policy have been successful, observing the real results and outcomes is of pivotal importance. For example when a state like united states has tried to make foreign decisions based on normative rules and principles and at the same time it was so meticulous about the instruments that it has used for deploying those values but the result was not even near to the basic intents and objectives, so what would be the practicality of deploying those instruments? Perceiving the results would play a role as device for checking both the intentions behind the foreign policy and also the normative means used towards the third party.

---

[5] Josef Nye, Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics (New York: Public Affairs, 2004),

A normative foreign policy would thus pursue normative goals through normatively deployed means and it would be effecting in fulfilling its normative intent (Nathalie Tocci, 2007, p.6).

The impact may be of two types of intended or unintended. By intended, Tocci means that the outcomes are the exact results which had been predicted by the actors. When this happened, the implemented foreign policy is a powerful and strong policy which meets all the prerequisite elements of goal, mean and impact. The case is different for the less powerful or the weak states. Although, they may also take measures to implement the normative goals through normative means, because of their lack of interior competences or their internal purposes, forcefully, they have decided to protect themselves by supporting the international law and organizations. (Tocci, 2007, p.9)

## 2.6 Four Types of Foreign Policy: Normative, Realpolitik, Imperial and Status Quo

Three variables discussed in the previous section are needed for organizing a normative foreign policy. Based on the degree of the emphasis that an actor may put on every one of these three features (i.e. goals, means, and impacts), foreign policy would be categorized in to four types: normative, realpolitik, imperial and status quo.[6]

According to the Nathalie Tocci's study on normative foreign policy in all systems and specifically in the US and the EU, the **normative foreign policy** is the first and the most utopian type in which the actor tries to respect both of the internal and

---

[6] Thomas Diez and Ian Manners, Reflecting in Normative Power Europe,( Routledge: New York), 173.

external legal obligations. It obeys the universal rules and chases the milieu goals rather than considering its own strategic interests. Reinforcement of the institutions and whatever that has been specified within the context of international law, is the core aim of this kind of foreign policy. **Realpolitik foreign policy** is placed exactly on the opposite side of the normative foreign policy. The actor uses all models of coercive and non-coercive instruments in order to obtain the possession goals. The next type of foreign policy is a more conscious one in which the actor declares to track down the normative foreign policy goals but simultaneously it tries to set itself free from the bounding scope of the international law. Instead of being imposed by international law or transnational frameworks, the **imperial foreign policy** abolishes the existing law and devises new norms and obligations for others. It attempts to standardize its ideas in a way that best satisfies its welfares. In **Status quo foreign policy** type, the actor is respecting its domestic and international legal obligations but still is not compelled by them. In spite of the respect that it shows for the normative principles, trailing the goals or promoting the international law is not its ultimate objective. The actor is acting as a dominant status quo actor which is respecting the law just in terms without wishing them to have further interference in all the issues. (Tocci, 2007)

# Chapter 3

# EU NORMATIVE FOREIGN POLICY AND POWER

## 3.1 Introduction

After the failure of the European Defense Community in the early 1950's as well as the failure of the French initiatives to advance a common foreign policy in early 1960's, the members states became highly motivated to form the European political cooperation in order to obtain the unification in the field of foreign policy. It was a set of informal guidelines planned to check out the degree of the synchronization and coordination between the member states in all the other issues than the economic one. The ambiguity of the rules and the lack of enough instruments for deploying those rules were the weak points of EPC. The end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Union left so many of the Eastern European countries politically abandoned and consequently the national sovereignty transformed to the main issue for these countries. To halt the situation in the Eastern Europe a more coherent and efficient form of common foreign and security policy was needed and as a result the Treaty on European Union was signed in 1992. Common policies of humanitarian aid, conflict prevention, peacekeeping operation and economic sanctions for the lawbreaker states were the main points of this treaty. The idea of supranational power aroused in this circumstances and the focus of EU was moved from individual member states to a global common good.

## 3.2 Historical Calendar

This chapter is explaining the evolutionary process of the emergence of the norms in foreign policy of the EU. The focus of the chapter is not on any specific person or any specific period of the EU's history. Nevertheless, the focus is more on the looming of the norms (Duchene and Galtung, 1973) and flourishing of them (post-cold war era, Manners, 2002) within the EU's foreign policy structure. Instead of politicians or presidents and their specific policy procedures, we have focused on the events such as Palestine and Israel crisis and states such as Eastern and central European states, Ukraine, and Russia and the decisions which have been made in response by the EU as a whole.

## 3.3 Civilian Power

After the end of the cold war, the European Union (EU) started to present itself as an international actor in the world. In 1972, Duchêne (as cited in Manners 2002) defined the EU as a civilian actor, meaning a 'unique international actor whose power rests in its skill to stimulate and boost stability by economic and political means' instead of coercive power. Duchêne was one of the founding fathers of conceptualizations of Europe's international role who considered a distinctive role for EU in the world. He defined EU as a power which has a 'civilian' character rather than a military character and an entity which is more eager to solve the conflicts by using diplomacy and soft power rather than coercion.

## 3.4 The Evolution of EU's External Affaires

From the beginning, the EU has always tried for a coherency in its external policies and its external actions. Different titles such as civilian power and normative power are actually demonstrating this tendency of the EU for representing a coherent international identity. In the article 3(5) of the TEU, the structural aspects of this

consistency can be seen in its relations with the wider world, the union shall upload and promote its values and interests and contribute to the protection of its citizens. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and development of international law, including respect for the principles of united nation charters. [7]

As it is obvious in this paragraph of the TEU, the development of the values and interests within an institutional framework is the task of the EU. As a matter of fact providing a rule-based system with reference to the principles of international law and the guarantee of the consistency between its policies and actions is what the EU is seeking for in its international relations.

Consistency and harmony between different components of the EU foreign policy has been an important issue for the policy makers. This consistency could be horizontal which refers to the EU's capacity to impact other states and act as a single body. It could be vertical which refers to the consistency between the member states and the EU institutions and also between the member states themselves. (Koutrakos , 2011, p.15)

The Article 32 of TEU is emphasizing on the necessity of this consistency in this way:

---

[7] Panos Koutrakos, European Foreign Policy: Legal and Political perspectives (UK,:Edward Elgar Publishing limited,2011).

> Member states shall consult one another within the European Council and Council on any matter of foreign and security policy of general interest in order to determine a common approach. Before undertaking any action on the international scene or entering in to any commitment which could affect the union's interests, each member states shall consult the others within the European council. Member states shall ensure through the convergence of their actions that the union is able to assert its interests and values on the international scene. Member states shall show mutual solidarity.

The evolutionary process of the EU showed us that this consistency has always been a matter of concern. European political cooperation provided elementary structures for consultation and coordination at European level. EPC was a good demonstration of sparking coordination among the member states and their relations with institutions.

Single European Act was the next agreement contained the same concerns and preserved them by putting the responsibility for consistency on the commission and council's shoulder. The consistency between EPC's decisions and European community was the most important issue which had to be implied through this agreement.

The Maastricht Treaty established an institutional framework by which it linked all the policies of the union and in the field of external relations it linked community competences as well as intergovernmental areas covered by the second (CFSP) and the third (police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters) pillar. (Koutrakos et al, 2011, p.20)

The consistency became more important by the end of the cold war since the EU started more external relations in different fields such as trade, development and assistance. The EPC was succeeded by the CFSP which was an effort of the EU to

project itself as an actor on the international scene. The Amsterdam Treaty completed the CFSP by introducing the high representative for CFSP. This was for supporting the presidency in its international relations and consequently increasing the coordination.

The worldwide economic role of EU during 1970's and 1980's changed not only the depiction of EU in the world but also it made some changes in the quality of EU's international relations.

Nonetheless, the lack of military power in the EU's structure was strongly criticized by Bull. He believes that European community has to become more 'self-defense' and 'self-determinate'. (Manners, 2002, p.237)

The Treaty on European Union (TEU) was a climax in considering a military dimension by the European Communities. After rejecting the European defense community by the French National Assembly, it was the first time in history that military dimension became a vital and fundamental consideration of EU. The shift from a one structural body of EC to a three pillar structural body of EU demonstrated the shift from a civilian power to a civilian-military power and consequently resulted in the formation of a common foreign and security policy.

The common European security and defense policy (ESDP) which was agreed in 1999, showed EU's tendency for having military power (aside Civilian power) and using it as a complementary element of accompanying international relations.

## 3.5 The Essence of Normative Power Europe

Taking a general look at the historical documents of the EU's international and foreign policy developments will uncover the penetration of these Norms in the structural body of EU and the way they are personified in the initial treaties of EU. For example, in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), it has stated that:

> The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, nondiscrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail. [8]

Likewise, the European Security Strategy (ESS) reflects these values as the basic principles which are administrating the EU's external relations:

> Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights are the best means of strengthening the international order. (Whitman, 2011, p.2)

The notion of normative power Europe can be found in the thoughts of Duchêne (1973) with the name of 'idée force' and Galtung (1973) with the keyword 'ideological power'. Galtung has stated that the ideological power is the power of ideas' (Galtung, 1973, p. 33). He claims that ideological power is powerful because the power-sender's ideas penetrate and shape the will of the power-recipient through the media of culture (Galtung, 1973, p. 36).

Lack of the normative theorizing and the need to change the structure of post-Cold War world politics into a more principle-oriented structure pushed the EU to emphasize more on the doctrines of democracy human rights and the rule of law. (Whitman, 2011, p.4)

---

[8] Richard G.whitman, Norms, Power and Europe: A new agenda for Study of The EU and International Relations (Palgrave Studies in European Union Politics, 2011) 2.

In this regard, defining the EU's foreign policy in normative terms means that the EU's power cannot be dedicated to either military or purely economic means, it 'works through ideas, opinions and conscience' (Diez and Manners 2007, 175).

Post-cold war era is an era of the deformation of the EU's structure. Epidemic eruption of 'ethnic conflict' and genocide which was started from the collapse of Yugoslavia and suddenly climaxed in early 1990s and the role of the EU in Gulf tensions brought about a new point of attention for Europe which was the necessity of Military power. EC's status and its influence in the world order became a matter of challenge for most of the EU and world scholars. [9] The Normative power was developed when the suspicions about the nature of the recently established EU was raised. The normative power challenged three characteristics such as presence, capability and the international identity of the EU.

### 3.5.1 Presence

Because the status of EU's power was changing in the post-cold war era, some critics such as Dave Allen and Mike Smith expressed the need for scrutinizing Europe's presence in the world. This aspect of the normative power was actually a door for more inspecting of the EC through 'the place it occupies in the perceptions and expectations of policy makers' (Allen and Smith, 1990, p. 21). Chris Hill added a different point of view regarding the function of EU. He contemplated the EU's international role as following:

Europe's international role involved with understanding the gap between foreign policy expectations and rapidly evolving EU's capabilities. He defined the EU as a

---

[9] Ian Manners, Global Europa: Mythology of the European Union in the World Politics (Roskilde University, 2010) 75.

"system of external relation" which includes three constituencies of "capability, national foreign policies and EPC and EC external relations" (Hill, 2002, pp. 322–3).

The invasion of Kuwait and tensions of Yugoslav in early 1990's indicated the divergence of 'presence' and 'capabilities' to the degree that it motivated the member states to request a greater EU power.

### 3.5.2 International Identity

Since the EU felt the lack of a unified international identity in the world, the normative power was an instrument for EU to construct an applied multi-dimensional identity among the other actors. It paved the way for the creation of a "single, essential and categorical identity" which distinguished the EU from the rest of the world. (Whitman, 2011)

According to Manners and Whitman, in addition to the civilian and military identity, EU has a normative identity. Since lack of a firm international identity raised complexities and ambiguities over the competences of the EU, the existence of the normative dimension is pivotal and help the EU to push backward the civilian-military dichotomies of the cold war era (Manners and Whitman, 1998, p.246).

The formation of the EU has happened in a multidimensional and complex space .This is the exact reason behind the existence of numerous identities. Since the European countries became tired of nationalism which caused so much disaster for them, therefore they decided to react to this nationalistic and fascistic environment by a move toward a more post-national gathering. In another word, from the beginning, the international identity argument was not intended for the construction of a single unified identity and contrarily the existence of multiple identities was the

evidence showing the exhaustion from the European nationalism. (Manners 2007a, p. 85) In Whitman's point of view international identity is reflecting both presence and capabilities, as well as both external relations and foreign policy (Whitman, 1998).

## 3.6 Distinctive Characteristics

Historical context, hybrid polity and the Political-legal constitutionalism are the distinctive characteristics of the EU which made it different from other actors. [10] Manners believes that because the EU' institutions and policies were created in the aftermath of Second World War (in which the sense of nationalism of different members states has led to the brutal war and massacre); Europeans were committed to pool their resources to preserve and straighten peace and liberty (preamble to the Treaty establishing the European Communities, TEC).

He also believes that the EU contains hybrid polity which is a new form of polity trying to minimize the dissimilarity of the norms between the EU's inside system and its surrounding system which is the international system. (Manners, 2002)

In Manners' view the constitution of EU has occurred in an elite-driven, treaty based legal order. These Norms are on behalf of serious constitutive dynamics which are determining EU's international identity. The supremacy of many of these norms were constitutionalized in the TEU but For the first time it was in the Copenhagen declaration on European Identity which the principles of democracy, rule of law, social justice and respect for human rights became clear.

---

[10] Ian Manners, Normative Power Europe: A contradiction in Terms? (University of Kent at Canterbury, 2002) 240.

These three characteristics of the Union pushed the EU for concentration on the norm of peace, idea of liberty, democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights and place them at the center of its relations with the rest of the world.

## 3.7 The Component Principles of EU Normative Power

EU partnership and dialogue with third countries will promote common values such as respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, peace, democracy, good governance, and gender equality, the rule of law, solidarity and justice.

The EU's normative foundations are presented through a series of declarations, agreements, policies, standards and conditions. In this part, five core norms and four minor norms within the law, constitution and practices of the EU would be explained. [11]

1. The significance of *peace,* created in symbolic declarations such as that by Robert Schuman in 1950, in addition to the Preambles to the European Coal and Steel Treaty in 1951 and the TEC of 1957.

2. The idea of *liberty* found in the introductions of the TEC and the TEU of 1991, and in art. 6 of the TEU which sets out four foundational principles of the Union.

3. Democracy

4. Rule of law

5. Respect for Human rights and fundamental freedoms

Last three principles, altogether have been articulated in the preface of the TEU, the development co-operation policy of the Community (TEC art. 177), the common foreign and security provisions of the Union (TEC art. 11), and the membership

---

[11] See TEC of 1957,TEU of 1991, Art 6 of the TEU, Art 177 of the TEC

criteria adopted at the Copenhagen European Council in 1993. (Manners, 2002, p.242) [12]

There are also four minor norms within the structure of the EU, which are elaborated as following:

### 3.7.1 Social Solidarity

Social solidarity has been presented in the introductions of the TEC and TEU. European social preferences including social legislation, social welfare and social infrastructure are characterized under this category.

### 3.7.2 Anti- Discrimination or Equality in Core Labor Standards

This concept has presented in art 13 of the TEC. It is based on both commitments to the legal proscription of discrimination and preemptive policies to stimulate equality not only within the EU, but also in relations with the rest of the world.

### 3.7.3 Sustainable Development

It has been offered in art 2 of TEU, art 2 of TEC and the all-encompassing art 6 of TEC. The normative principle of solidarity is based on an obligation to provide a more 'social economy, social partnership and social justice' within the EU, and in dealings with the developing world

### 3.7.4 Good Governance

The OECD is one of the first organizations which have made crucial contributions for developing international argument on good governance. (Manners, 2002) Governance was understood as 'the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development' (OECD 1995, p.14).

---

[12] See the Copenhagen Criteria of the European Council set out in June 1993

## 3.8 EU's Foreign Policy Characteristics

Michael Smith has acknowledged some of the key characteristics of Normative power Europe in terms of its functional role. He tried to examine whether the idea of this power and its exercise have been harmonized in real sense. [13] He introduced three main elements for EU as a normative power.

First element is the secularity of EU norms. By secular he means that the uniqueness of the EU's self –perception has placed on its susceptibility to social differences, cultural variety of ends, means and targets in the world platform. Therefore, this explanation would lead us to contemplate EU as a critical and self-reflexive entity.

As the Second feature, Michael Smith believes that EU is a non-coercive actor whose most focus is on norm spread and negotiation, norm distribution and use of encouragements and rewards. Soft power, soft security and civilian means are used by EU for both presentation of the norms and implication of the mentioned norms.

The third element is the post-sovereign aspect of the EU norms which has challenged the comprehended concept of the sovereignty and took the softness of the governmental institutions as the central assumption.

## 3.9 Providing a Good World

Preparing a good world is an idea in the foreign policy of most of the actors specially EU. Michael smith specified three concepts of the European policy makers about preparing a good world by spreading the norms. First, the EU is largely supportive of a world which is ruled democratically and thus efficiently. This type of governance

---

[13] Michael Smith, The European union, the united states and global public goods( San Francisco: International Studies Association conference, 2008)

provided a good way of making relations among societies .These relations are distributed not only at governmental levels but also at sub-national and multinational stages, formed based on rules, cooperation, negotiation and orders. Second, the EU monitors the idea of the good world by putting its concentration on an all-inclusive form of security, an optimistic opinion of peace, conflict prevention, and the use of non-coercive means. Third, the EU grounded two policies of good governance and non-coercive method on commercial imperatives. The EU's good world emphasizes on exchange, interdependence, and multilateralism. That is why some scholars have called EU the 'trading state'. (Smith, 2009)

## 3.10 Contradictions and Limitations

There are so many critics about the way of deploying the norms by EU. One set of problems are related to the obvious paradox between declaring the spoken programs for hardening of European foreign policy and the constant use of soft or civilian power (Smith,2006). Another set of problems are associated with the influence of the policies that are produced through Normative Power Europe. They may be conceived as soft but may be received as something else in the target country. [14] Michael Smith has contemplated four main shortcomings within the EU's foreign policy structure.

The lack of effective institutions in the structure of EU is a problematic issue which needs mobilizing a number of institutional communities ranging from the member states to the European institutions, with the capability of organization and restriction. Reforms are about to solve these types of problems.

---

[14] Michael Smith, The European union, the united states and global public goods( San Francisco: International Studies Association conference, 2008)130-132.

Second inconsistency is connected to the extracting resources from member states or elsewhere. It means that whenever EU decides to put its ideas in to operation, it needs to collect resources from different communities particularly from its member states.  By resources, Michael Smith means both tangible resources such as financial or human resources or less tangible possessions like a shared pledge to agree courses of action on the part of member states or institutions. Since obtaining and extracting resources has been the focus of EU for many years, this process has become known as both time-consuming and unpredictable.

Third issue is the functionality of the operational moves. Due to the fact that the efficiency of operations (ranging from diplomatic to potential military action) is basically accompanying to the institutional and resource base, undoubtedly this would be an additional problem of institutions and resources.

Fourth contradiction is emptiness of the outcomes. [15] It seems that the EU is not an organization with the capability of focusing on results at the expense of process and this is exactly the core difference between EU and US; a process orientation and a results orientation division. EU has been addressed by so many critics for having 'cheap talk'  which means that any results from EU initiatives are dubious to be seen in material way in short term.

The elaboration of these contradictions and limitations shows us that although the initiation of the EU's world order based on international governance, comprehensive security and commercial exchange/interdependence is so beautiful, in reality there are several complications in changing the raw idea in to operational policies.

---

[15] Michael Smith, European Foreign Policy in a changing World ( Cambridge polity press, 2003).

## 3.11 EU's Empirical Changing Form of the Foreign Policy

EU has become known for being normative and implementing normative foreign policy. Nevertheless, involving with different political situations and crises has shown that even the EU is not always a normative actor and depends on the situation and its interests; it can function as any of the normative, realpolitik, imperial and status quo actor. In this part, we show how EU has acted in different circumstances.

### 3.11.1 Policies Towards Central and Eastern Europe

After the collapse of communism in the Eastern Europe in 1989, the EU programmed a new policy of enlargement and started to attract these states for the membership of the EU. The main objectives were to democratize and modernize these states by conditioning the membership for these states. [16] EU tried to enlarge the notion of the membership among the countries and the goal of this expansion was to navigate their domestic revolution. By this policy, principles of democratic governance and stabilization of relation with neighbors was injected to the internal structure of these states. The necessity of these deep economic and political changes was personified within the Copenhagen criteria. The principles such as democracy, market economy and legal harmonization were devises for EU to encourage these states to accept the EU's political economic and legal legislations before joining to the power sharing mechanism of EU. The implementation of the enlargement policy was a gate to the EU's identity since all the Copenhagen criteria are profoundly deep-seated within the EU's legal customs and collective policy practices. In another word, all the principles recommended to the eastern European countries were the same as principles valid to the EU members. According to Schimelfening & Sedelmeier (as cited in Tocci,2008) the major tool for the expansion of the normative principle was the 'carrots and

---

[16] Elsa Tolmet,European Foreign Policy Identity in Perspective: Back to Europe and the EU's neighborhood(London, Palgrave Macmillan,2014) 191-194.

sticks' policy in which the EU tried to abstain the punishment of the candidates and instead it focused on the rewarding of the good candidates by boosting the process of their membership. The only means of penalty used by EU through this process was refraining from the accession by delaying the process of their membership. During the process, EU was the powerful entity which was evaluating the appropriateness and readiness of every candidate and at last deciding on their accession. Although in terms, the candidates negotiated the accession, in reality this process was non-negotiable through which the EU was alone for making decision. Gradually, the EU used some tactics such as embarrassing, criticizing and public announcing of the shortcomings of the candidates in order to stimulate other international actors and as a result to organize additional reforms.

As a conclusion, the enlargement policy in the Eastern and central European countries was a successful normative policy in which the real outcomes were so closed to the designed scheme planned by the policy makers. It was recognized as the chief foreign policy achievement to date. According to Gross & Steinherr, (as cited in Tocci,2008) over just one decade, most of the Eastern and central European countries transcended from autocracies in to liberal democracies and civil societies with a new and totally transformed economic structure who became capable of establishing modern market economies and as a result, attracting billions of euros of foreign direct investment. [17] This successfulness was because of some factors which prepared the circumstances for the implementation of this policy. [18] The first factor was EU's internal political context which included the main members who were

---

[17] Nathalie Tocci, Who is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor? (Brussels: Center for European policy studies, 2008), 26.

[18] Hiski Haukkala, The European Union as a Regional Normative Hegemon: The Case of European Neighborhood Policy(Montreal: European Union Studies Associations,2007) 46-55.

ready for providing a collective consent and consensus for this policy. All of them were aware of the geopolitical and economic benefits which the candidate states may have for the EU and besides, they felt empathy and moral duty to the east European countries who had been detached from the European integration process after the Second World War. (Sjursen, 2002)

The second factor was the internal capacity of EU which means trust shown by the member states to the commission and its decisions around the enlargement policy. In addition, The commission as well, put all its effort to get the best result out of this opportunistic situation and by which elevated its official profile in foreign policy area.

The external environment is the third factor which determined some portion of EU's success. The US was so supportive and encouraging of this policy. It helped and contributed both policies of democratization and economic modernization within these countries. On the other side all of the Eastern European countries were so enthusiastic to incorporate in the euro-Atlantic structure. So, as it has been explained broadly, both the internal and external environment embraced and supported the enlargement policy and caused the success of the EU in spreading of the normative principles.

### 3.11.2 EU Policies Towards Russia

The policies of EU towards Russia between 1999 and 2007, was a good case of realpolitik policy breaching the EU's normative agenda. On paper, the EU's core objective was pursuing principles such as prosperity and security on its borders, supporting of the rule of law, good governance, respect for human rights (including the minority right), the elevation of good neighborly relations in addition to the

principles of market economy and sustainable development. [19] The increase of international security was a mutual goal which was about to be pursued by EU and Russia in equality and partnership. These goals were grounded on an international instruction which focused on 'effective multilateralism' and international law and all the international organizations such as United Nations, council of the Europe and organization for security and cooperation in Europe organized them. Nevertheless, the theoretical form of the objectives changed when they reshaped in to real form. After the Putin's second mandate, EU's focus was rotated from the mentioned-above principles in to the economic and energy interests that may become available through the Russia's WTO accession. The EU was seeking for more economic and energy assistance of Russia and the main reason of encouraging Russia for entering in to the WTO was to find a more powerful and reliable partner. This was the core concentrated objective of the EU to the point that it completely ignored the Chechen conflict due to the deliberate negligence of this crisis by Russia. The human rights dialogue which had been established between EU and Russia since 2005 was nothing but an empty show run by the two actors on the international scene to mislead the public opinion. During the Mafra Summit, The EU failed to use operational dialogue and convince Russia for deploying OSCE election observer mission in 2007. In other cases such as Moldova and Georgia, EU has done nothing to challenge and modify Russia's coercive policies such as selective visa and trade constraints. Another measure taken by EU which is not according to the EU's normative goals is the technical assistance and service to Russia. Although, this has decreased since the union's external assistance budget has decreased but it was an evidence of breaching

---

[19] Maxine David, Jackie Gower, Hiski Haukkala ,National Perspectives on Russia: European Foreign Policy in the Making?(New York: Routledge,2013) 65-68.

of the EU's normative goals. EU did not even effectively use the political conditionality as a means of stimulating compliance of the principles in Russia.

Therefore the result of the whole foreign policy process with Russia was not normative. Not only EU's policies did not make compliance of the principles within the Russian government, it worked as a reverse result which triggered the Russian to stick more to their own principles and to consider the right to interpret democracy in a different way. The Russia not only criticized the democratic deficiency in some EU's member states but also it blamed EU as being an intrusive entity within the Russia's internal government. [20] According to Epstein & Gheciu (as cited in Tocci, 2008) in general, EU's enlargement aims juxtaposed totally with the Russia's traditional sovereign privileges.

Besides, Russia reacted to the EU's struggle for a common internal energy policy and request for cooperating with Russia in ruling of energy market, by contracting some two-sided agreements with selected member states in order to strengthen its domination in the international market.

In the case of Russia, not only the there was no consensus among the member states in dealing with the Russia's case but also there was an inadequate capacity at EU level. Some states such as three Baltic States and Poland were eager to preserve the EU's unification towards Russia and tried to deal with Russia's problem at the EU level. On the other side, countries such as France, Germany and Italy were more interest oriented and placed more attention on their own bilateral agreements around

---

[20] Nathalie Tocci, Who is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor? (Brussels: Center for European policy studies, 2008), 37.

the energy issues. Lack of unified EU foreign policies and lack of integrated external energy policy weakened the EU as a whole in managing an effective relation with Russia and motivated the member states to independently sign bilateral agreements with Russia. Russia was aware of this divergent environment among the EU's members and tried to increase it by both rejecting the EU standards and using its energy leverage as a means of promoting division among the EU's states.

### 3.11.3 Policies Towards Israel-Palestine

The peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and Palestine has always been one of the EU's foreign policy principles and norms. The EU's objectives towards these two states and their critical situation have grounded on two main points:

The first point is the importance of respecting the right for self-determination of the people in both countries of Israel and Palestine. From the beginning of the conflict, the EU supported the Israeli's right for having a country with official recognized borders in which their people can live in peace and security. [21] The recognition of Palestinian's right by EU was a gradual process which took decades to be confirmed. First, it was through the Venice declaration in 1980 when the right for self-determination was officially approved by EU and then it was in 1999 when the European council in Berlin declared that " the creation of a democratic, viable and peaceful sovereign Palestinian state would be the best guarantee of Israel's security"( European council,1999). After the collapse of Oslo process, the EU formally sponsored the creation of the two states of Palestine and Israel.

---

[21] Sharon Pardo, Joel Peters, Uneasy Neighbors: Israel and the European Union (UK: Lexington Books, 2010) 120-123.

The second point was the significance of respecting human rights, international humanitarian law, democratic standards and good governance by these two states. Respectively, the EU has criticized and condemned both Palestine and Israel for the breaking of the human rights principles in different situation. Most of the EU's declarations on Middle East were dealing with the conflict between Palestine and Israel. It has blamed the Palestine for its use of violence, terroristic attacks and suicide bombings while on the other side it has condemned the Israel for the forceful conquest of the territories and settlement in those areas, military invasion, extra-judicial killings and at last for the building of the west bank barrier.

Nevertheless, the Palestinian, Israeli case is one of those cases in which the EU did not use normatively deployed means in order to pursue its normative goals. Although it has formed association agreements with both Israel and Palestine, it has suspended the agreements due to the violation of the international law, human rights and democratic standards. The Palestinian agreement has been frozen since the election of Hamas in 2006 and by unelected Fatah government in the west bank it may be revitalized. In the Israeli agreement, there are six 'priorities for action' among which there is only one statement which refers to the conflict and human rights and has remained open ended. As a matter of fact, the EU is conceding the Israeli's violation of human rights Since the EU is obtaining trade profits out of the preferential export of the Israeli goods. Reversely, the EU is funding the Israeli entities in the occupied territory without any protection device to guarantee that the money will not be used for violating of public international laws.

The EU has acted in a non-normative way as well, in dealing with Palestinian issues. From 2002 to 2005, the EU was effective in conditioning its aid policies to

constitutional and fiscal reforms of the Palestine. [22] In addition, the EU found mechanisms to certify that the funding resources were not using for violation and terroristic actions. Though, the EU always refrain from wide-ranging suspending of the assistance to Palestine because of the possibility of the downfall of the Palestinian authorization which will be resulted in the obligation of Israel to undertake all the fiscal responsibilities as the conquering state. The EU recognized the Quartet's settings on the new Palestinian government after the election of Hamas. Continuing the financial support by EU in a different way (a temporary mechanism consisting of making confidence in presidency and organizations and directly preparing material supplies for the individuals) which was a policy designed for evading from the Hamas government, concluded in the modification advancement by the EU in recent years. The incorrect policy was deployed by the EU when it continued supporting of the Palestine even after the separation between Fatah/west bank and Hamas/Gaza. This was resulted in negative outcomes and diminished the altruistic effects of the conflict. The EU decided to make a two-state resolution without considering and comprehending the Palestine performance and on the other side, the Israel's escalating control in the occupied territory.

The possessive goals seeking by EU, affected it to use imperialistic foreign policy in dealing with Israel-Palestine conflict. Historically, maintaining close relations with Israel has been the prior strategy for EU since the anti-Semitism has produced a profound sense of inclination for some member states and therefore motivated them to advance their close relations with Israel. This tendency has been to the point that it

---

[22] Münevver Cebeci, Issues in EU and US Foreign Policy (UK: Lexington Books, 2011) 136-139.

caused EU to break its own laws and rules for the sake of accepting Israeli policies. Furthermore, the commercial advantage that EU is achieving in its relations with Israel is of the main importance for most of the EU members. Another privileged objective for the EU that has undermined the pursuit of normative principles was preserving its close relations with US. During the conflict, EU has changed its policy for several times, whenever the US wanted it to change. In the time of the Oslo peace process, the Union disregarded the parties' actions just in order to keep the US-backed peace process active. Subsequently, it concentrated on the Palestinian modification since it was the main focus of the US as well. Shortly afterward, it embargoed the Hamas government and started supporting of its Fatah division in west bank when it decided to reconstruct relations with Washington on the Middle East.

Another main reason of using non-normative means by EU was because of the lack of necessary hard power which although the EU would not use it directly against the parties, it could use it as a device of provoking fear and threat among them and accordingly compel them to revise their policies.

### 3.11.4 Policies Towards Ukraine

The reaction of the EU towards the Ukraine (demand of inclining to the EU and becoming a member) has been normative in language. It has not only refused the offer of membership to Ukraine but also it has rejected Ukraine's goal of full membership for the long-term. The reason for this rejection has been claimed by EU as a general opposition towards further enlargement of the EU outside the contemporary promises. The EU's concern is about how the institutional capacity of the EU would function if more major enlargements happen.

This reason is an impartial justification of the disagreement on Ukraine's proposal on membership but it is not the core reason. There are two original reasons hided by EU. The first reason is that the EU's six major members care for their own power not to be weakened by further enlargement. They care more about this alarm rather than widening and spreading the EU's democracy, human rights and rule of law. [23] The next reason is the idea of 'Russia first' which has been the dominant perspective exactly in the post-soviet era. Although this notion became less prevailing after the decreasing of Russia's democracy and occurring of the Ukrainian independency, it has not been totally diminished and continued to the point that it caused the blocking of the Ukrainian membership.

The policies used by EU in front of Ukraine were mostly normative and they were presented within normative framework of the means. At first stages, the policies were offered thorough the partnership and cooperation agreement (PCA) which was the first invitation to the EU's Norms such as democracy. It contained 21 main policies recommending the approaching of EU laws as a prerequisite for membership. Responsively, Ukraine formed a ministry of justice which started a series of judicial programs to attend this goal. The PCA was succeeded by another agreement which contained 300 lines of political, social and economic reforms. This agreement was the European neighborhood policy by which the EU put the pressure on Ukraine for negotiating and accepting the EU's criteria.

Another normative action done by EU was accepting the Ukraine and Moldavia invitation to deliver a border management mission to control the smuggling and

---

[23]Rosa Balfour, Human Rights and Democracy in EU Foreign Policy: The Cases of Ukraine and Egypt (New York: Routledge, 2012) 55-58.

subsequently to bring the rule of law in the Moldavian secessionist province of Transnistria which was a corrupted part.

In spite of the participation of Ukraine in PCA process, some of its wrong policies such as widespread corruption of its regime, sending simultaneous contradictory messages to Brussels and Moscow and lastly the murder of Gondgadze ( a troublesome journalist in the eyes of the president Kuchma) ,make the Ukraine a discredited actor in the EU's point of view. [24] The Ukraine remained an insubstantial and a malfunction state in terms of democracy within which the oligarchs took all parts of the political system under their control and is still challenging with the struggles between the pro-western and pro-Russian interests.

Because of the division among the EU member states which existed around the Ukraine membership perspective, the EU acted as a status quo actor. The member states where divided in to two groups. The first group consisted of Poland and Sweden which were in favor of the membership perspective and the second group involved Belgium and France who opposed the membership. There was a third group including Germany and UK who decided to remain neutral. Since the whole process of confronting with the enlargement cases and specifically the Ukraine issue needed harmony, by default, the EU refused to accept Ukraine as a member. The unintended aspect of the EU's policy towards Ukraine was because of the Russia's realpolitik form of the policy towards Ukraine. Russia destabilized the union of Ukrainian statehood by taking measures towards building a land bridge to a central island of Ukraine. It sparked the orange revolution by supporting Yanukovich in a deceitful

---

[24]Susan Stewart, Democracy Promotion and the 'Color Revolutions'(Routledge, 2013) 70-74.

41

election. Russia intended to protest against the NATO policies by renting groups of private army. The Russia's policies towards Ukraine merged the national unity and identity of Ukraine and rotated the Ukraine policy towards attaching to Europe.

## 3.12 Conclusion

EU is an international actor which has acted in diverse ways. In some cases such as the Eastern Europe, it acted as a normative actor which spread normative principles through normative means like reward and avoiding punishment and consequently, it has been successful in democratization and economic modernization of these states. In another case, it acted as a realpolitik actor which has prioritized its possessive goals such as energy and commercial interests and ignored the breaching of human rights and rule of law (cases such as Moldova, Georgia and Chechen conflict) like what has been done by EU towards Russia. Sometimes it acted as an imperialistic actor which was trying to follow a two-state solution perspective towards both Israel and Palestine and fulfilling both its own possessive goals such as commercial interests provided by Israel and milieu goals such as economic funding of Palestine and helping the reform process in its structure but at the end of the day was resulted in the ignorance of the violations of human rights and international law by Israel and at last, it acted as a status quo actor in the case of Ukraine when it preferred the Ukraine's European orientation and assisted its reform process but its internal divided structure (resulted from the power competition among its members) caused its failure in permitting the Ukraine to be a member.

So many factors were and are involving within the foreign policy process of the EU. These factors could be internal such as unification among member states, the consensus about the deployed instruments and lack of a hard power capability, or

could be external such as its preserving relations with US as its number one ally, the policies of Russia which has biased EU's policies in different cases and the Israel which has always been a prominent actor for the EU.

Collecting of all these factors determines the EU's foreign policy in different situations. As it has been studied, the EU is like every other actor which has both possessive goals and milieu goals. Sometimes, when its interests converged with the milieu goals, it preferred the pursuit of the universal goals and sometimes it prioritized its welfare and tried for their achievement.

In order to be more normative, the EU has to enhance its internal structure which means to improve its internal competences. These competences and capabilities are not necessarily its military capabilities. Reversely, these capabilities would destruct the nature of the EU existence by orienting EU's incentives to break the rules and laws for the pursuit of its foreign policy goals. Instead, it has to reinforce the network of its connections with the third parties so it will be bound by its own promises. By reinforcing its relations, more strict sets of rules and laws would restrict the EU's external performance and consequently, the possibility of acting non-normatively or using the non-normative means would reduce. In addition, it would be good as well for strengthening the official regulator mechanism within the EU's structure. Therefore, tracking down the actions of the member states, in times of violation of the rules would be easier.

# Chapter 4

# US NORMATIVE FOREIGN POLICY AND POWER

## 4.1 Introduction

In US foreign policy, different schools and different policy makers have different views about the role of the norms in the foreign policy of the actors especially the US. For example, George Kennan who was the architect of US foreign policy after the World War II didn't believe in norms such as human rights and democratization. He asserted: "we should cease to talk about vague and- for the Far East- unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of living standards, and democratization. The day is not far off when we are going to have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are hampered by idealistic slogans, the better of we are (Jensen and Faulkner, 1991, p.8)

Kennan put emphasis on the so-called necessity defense. For him the international relations are a chains of necessity situations in which morality has a little place. He insisted on the power relations and national interests rather than democratization and human rights because he believes that any other option would be rejected by other nations and peoples. In his view, norms are not universal and they can change from individual to individual and from society to society. On the opposite side, the national interest and national security are something shared universally by the people.

Thomas Jefferson is a person who has the opposite view of Kennan's view. As the third president of the US, he stated in the declaration of independence that "all men are created equal, are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights" (Jensen and Faulkner, 1991, p.7). American moral commitments are universal and they not only can be applied to US citizens but also they can be applied to all citizens. According to him, universal norms are opportunity to improve standard of living and a democratic political system. National security is defined by the morality and the political power must be restrained by morality.

In this chapter, the foreign policy of US and the role of the norms in the empirical decision making of the US will be studied. Since the American foreign policy is changing by changing of the president in different period of time, we do not concentrate on any specific president or any specific period of time. Four types of American foreign Policy and different empirical policies of the US towards different states like Iraq and Iran and organizations such as WTO in terms of the application of the norms will be studied through this chapter.

## 4.2 US as a Normative Power

The US advanced normative and non-normative goals and organized normative and non-normative means in different periods of time therefore; the issue would be about the extent to which the US is normative. ( (Hamilton, 2008, p. 77)

Expanding the normative goals such as democracy and good governance is considered by some scholars as an inevitable part of the US policy because of the US vision of the good world. Mandelbaum is one of those experts who believe that this

global form of democracy has stem from a domestic form of it which leads directly to the protection and promotion of democracy at universal level.[25]

On the other hand, Mandelbaum has described the expansion of democracy as a so-called service provided by US which has derived from the responsibility of being hegemony through which the consent of the target states has no importance. He has put this issue in this way:

> Rather, the global promotion of democracy is seen as a service provided by the US for the rest of the world, with the active or passive consent of those who receive it but not with a connotation of accountability. The pursuit of democracy, that is to say, is seen as a responsibility or a prerogative of hegemony; and the complaints of others when this responsibility is exercised in a cavalier or destabilizing way are defined as a means by which governments elsewhere in the world deflect attention from their own failings (Mandelbaum 2005,p.150).

Many US and also European critics are on the same track about the use of hard power (as the prominent foreign policy) by US. Daalder and Lindsay(as cited in Smith, 2004) have extracted assumptions such as 'American Exceptionalism' and 'unilateralist policies' from different policies conducted not only under the presidency of George W. Bush but also roughly by all the American presidents from the beginning.

All of these critics see US more attentive to consider material interests, use material power and as a result, obtain the material outcomes. For US politicians, ideas and values have influential functions rather than just normative purposes. In his book, (The Case for Goliath, 2005) Mandelbaum believes that the US hegemony is acknowledged by others in the world scene. Combination of this supremacy and its material possessions has transformed it in to a supplier of other government's pre-

---

[25] Michael Mandelbaum, The case for Goliath: How America acts as the world's government in the twenty first century (New York: Public Affairs, 2009) 150-153.

requisites such as, security, economic stability and resources in the international context of services. In his opinion, Clinton and George W. Bush administrations (with respect to the ultimate goal which is service preparation) are more alike than distinctive. They may differ in deploying different means but not in following similar goals.

Mandelbaum has identified four basic characteristics for US self-image in providing the world order:

The US self-perception is instructed intensely by religion which in some cases can take an absolutist form. It is unlikely to be identified as relativist orientation. It can be reflective of moral positions which do not permit to negotiation and this aspect results in the foundation of fundamental conceptions of debaters and opponents.

A second characteristic is that it is coercive and action-oriented which is centered on the need for and ability to actualize hard power. This feature of the US self-perception has deep cultural roots and is directly connected to the availability of the contemporary capabilities and its relationship to the capabilities of others. In other words, capabilities have a strong influence on perceptions of the possible and the desirable.[26]

The US self-perception is a 'pro-sovereign' concept which follows a solid form of a Westphalian version of sovereignty. The boundless pursuit of sovereignty by US is an almost automatic limitation on the sovereignty of others.

---

[26] Michael Smith, The European union, the united states and global public goods( San Francisco: International Studies Association conference, 2008)

## 4.3 US and Providing a Good World

As a powerful actor, the US is an actor which considers the responsibility of providing a good world for all around the world. This responsibility is not accepted by all other states though it is a kind of opportunity for the US to expand its own hegemony. How the US expands its hegemony and how it tries to provide a good world is explained in this part.

The US vision of the good world mostly concentrates on democracy and good governance. Democracy is a domestic method directing to shelter and support democracy at the global level. The detection of democracy is understood as a duty or a privilege of hegemony .when the US is implementing this responsibility in a threatening way and confronting with the protests of others, it defines the protest as a device uses by the other governments in order to distract attention from their own shortcomings (Mandelbaum, 2005, p.150).

Secondly, US good world strongly is determined by the accessibility of coercion and importance of preservation of security. The US is capable of preparing 'reassurance' at the universal level and simultaneously it can provide its own security objectives (these two levels of security are mutually reinforcing).

Thirdly, the US good world is grounded on forms of exchange and interdependence. The US is a sponsor of the spread of the free market. Although US public doesn't seem to be convinced, fortunately the free market is good for US economy. The domestic management of US economy parallels with the international rules. The US acts as the banker of last resort (as in the Asian and other financial crises of the late 1990s) and as the consumer of last resort, supplying requests that then fuels the

economies of others. Mandelbaum sees a big paradox in the coexistence of extensive anti-Americanism and equally acceptance of the services provided by US.

## 4.4 Four Types of American Foreign Policy

There are four types of American foreign policy .Hamiltonian, Wilsonian, Jeffersonian and Jacksonian are four schools which have diversely, defined and explained the American foreign policy. Hamiltonians mostly focus on the integration between national government and economy and considers it as the key for internal economic constancy and external economic successfulness. The attachment of the US to the global economy (with the conditionality of taking advantages) is the pivotal notion in this school. Wilsonians concentrated more on the importance of the spreading of the American values throughout the world for making a more diplomatic international society which has a more obedience of the rule of law. They believe that democracies can improve more effective forms of the legal system and because the US is a democratic state which has separated from the rest of the word by its values and principles, therefore it has the moral responsibility to spread democracy to all parts of the world. [27]

Jeffersonians have a more cautions point of view about breaking the political and economic boundaries between the US and the world. They believe that instead of wasting the time and energy outside, the American government should be busier for the inside issues of the society and tries to safeguard the democracy at home rather than outside. They have criticized the Hamiltonians and Wilsonians perspectives for being more prone of increasing the risk of the war. The last school is the Jacksonians School which focuses more on the security and economic well-being of the

---

[27] Ole Rudolf Holsti, Public opinion and American Foreign Policy (University of Michigan Press, 2009) 54-56.

American people rather than any other issue and prescribes the American government to place it at the top of the priorities.

### 4.4.1 Hamiltonian

This school has taken its name from Alexander Hamilton who was the first secretary of the treasure. Based on Hamilton's focus on transaction relations in his writings called *Federalist paper,* this school considers that the US interests have placed in open, international trading relations (especially naval relations) with all parts of the world. He has asserted that an exposed global market covered by a world order which has aroused from the international law is the only guarantee for the peace in the world.[28]

During the cold war, Hamiltonians pay much attention to the building of a skilled military competence and international security coalitions to preserve the US interests. Simultaneously, they were obsessed by the idea of a worldwide economic organization which allows every state to participate freely. Hamiltonians with the cooperation of the Wilsonians head off for the establishment of the international institutions which were based on the rules and corporations and intended for the spread of this cooperation through the universal security, economic and political territories. This perspective and its implementation worked as a surviving factor for the cold war crisis. George H.W. Bush is a classic Hamiltonian who rejected much of the Wilsonians ideologies because of being unrealistic and misleading. He believes in a more interconnected democratic community as the gate to the gratification of both the US principles and interests.

---

[28] Yannis A. Stivachtis. International Order in a globalizing world( USA: Ash gate publishing, 2013) 45-51.

Establishment of so many associations like Asia-Pacific economic community, World Trade Organization, Uruguay Round of multilateral free trade negotiations and the creation of the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement by Bill Clinton are good evidences of the influence of Hamiltonian school on foreign policy process of the US. Therefore, Hamiltonian school combined the interests with norms in a way that it deceived the public opinion. The establishment of the institutions connoted the American norms and simultaneously, they were securing the American interests.

### 4.4.2 Wilsonian

As mentioned before, the core concentration of this school is the spreading of the American values and therefore it considers a moral responsibility in terms of the distribution of those principles to the rest of the world. This school is stemmed from the ideas of Woodrow Wilson the president of the US who believed that "the idea of America is to serve humanity" (Moss, 1919, p.3). The interventionist policies were resulted from the main idea of Wilson which was the spread of peace through the distribution of democratic principles .In order to reach his objectives, he never conflict with the use of the force. The so-called humanitarian interventions of Mexico, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Cuba and Nicaragua show how serious he was in implementing his objective which was the distribution of democracy. Although, the Wilsonian approach mostly used the non-normative means to improve the normative goals, it popularized the US as normative power.[29] The Wilsonian approach has been recognized as the opponent of colonialism when it decided to develop decolonization against some of its closest partners. It has conducted as a war prevention system with some tactics such as arms control, arbitration treaties and development of international organizations for collective security such as the League

---

[29] Ole Rudolf Holsti, Public opinion and American Foreign Policy (University of Michigan Press, 2009) 54-56.

of Nations, the world court and the United Nations. It always tried for the expansion of a democratic Atlantic community and it has been successful.

Nevertheless, some aspects of this approach make the foreign actors so uncomfortable. Aspects such as its insistence on considering the responsibility of changing the world's behavior by the US or interfering in all policies of other actors including both the internal and external policies have irritated other actors.

This approach brought about much international influence and power for the US and this is exactly the reason of why the US is supporting it. The US has provoked elements in other countries to motivate them to associate with this ideal. This approach has become known as the prevailing approach which is describing the norms of American foreign policy.

### 4.4.3 Jeffersonians

This school has sparked from the Ideas of Thomas Jefferson the third American president who believed that the main mission of the US is to protect and provide democracy at home. Instead of wasting the energy and money abroad, he proclaimed that the US could be the best example of providing the democratic capacities of its revolution at home. For him a policy of aloofness or political detachment from international affairs-isolationism- was the best way to preserve and develop the nation as a free people.[30]

Jeffersonians believe in the instability and delicacy of the liberty therefore they believe that it can be destroyed from both inside and outside. With this fragility of

---

[30] Eugene Wittkopf, American Foreign Policy (USA: Thomason higher education, 2007) 31.

the liberty, too much interference in international politics would be dangerous for the democratic order of the American policy. This school has been established as a result of worries behind the susceptibility of the norms and values by exporting them to abroad.

The Jeffersonians did not clash with the commercial and beneficial relations of two states but they more emphasized on America to play a role of a pattern for other states. They contrasted the American ways of capitalizing excessive energy and resources within countries with different cultures and histories. The American system of checks and balances, constitutional restrictions on excessive power and the role of the congress in foreign policy are the favorite policies accepted by Jeffersonians.

This school was faded during the initial years of the World War II but after the termination of the world war and the initiation of the Vietnam War and the cold war, it has been revived. They combined with the Wilsonians for controlling the American arms and showing the hatred toward the American behavior with the prisoners in Abu Gharib and Guantanamo Bay. They also opposed the war on terrorism because of its profound impact on the civil liberties and internally its impact on the soul of the US as a republic.

### 4.4.4 Jacksonians

The name of this school has stemmed from the US seventh president Andrew Jackson. From the beginning it was not similar to a political movement but it was more like a manifestation of social and religious culture of a large percentage of American public. In the Jacksonians' point of view, the mission of the US domestic and foreign policy is to preserve and provide the security and economic prosperity of the American people. They consider a never-ending dangerous in the outside world

and believe that the US should be cautious of this danger by providing a well-armed military. Nevertheless, restricted involvement with the outside world is the best way of preserving the interests from the outside danger.

In general terms, this school is so cautious of any kind of interdependence and interrelation between US and the outside world. They opposed the creation of UN, NATO, World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and rejected the distribution of troops to EU. They believe that the only necessary foreign measure is the implementation of military power to overthrow the soviet project. [31]

## 4.5 Empirical US Foreign Policy

The US foreign policy trend is not proclaimed to be merely normative. It is mixture of normative and hegemonic perspectives. The reference for this part is an article by Daniel s. Hamilton which is an observation about the extent of acting normative by US in the world politics.

### 4.5.1 Creating the WTO

The creation of WTO was a normative policy towards the establishment of a new open international economic order which was more official and treaty-based than the weak General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) created after the Second World War. Creating a firm and non-biased trading order within a multilateral framework was the main goal of the US within this project and in order to expand the trust among the member states, it had to constrain itself by the same obligations and commitments. Lack of practicality under the GAAT made the US to use more compulsory multilateral rules which guarantee more foreseeable trading

---

[31] Daniel Hamilton, The United States: A normative power (Brussels: Centre For Europan Policy Studies)

relationships. Under the WTO, 60 different agreements are designed to bind 151 member states under the name of international legal system. It is a kind of dispute settlement mechanism with the aim of solving the trade clashes and offering a substitute for trade wars.

In spite of all arguments over the enduring of WTO in some countries, the ratification of 151 states, the vast number of resolution cases conducted by WTO and accordingly, the submission of the judgments by member states has shown the successful results of this project in accomplishing the milieu goals.

This positive result has stemmed from the US domestic unanimity in acceptance and helping for the initiation of such organization. One of the main reasons of the downfall of the GATT was the lack of agreement for its establishment and consequently for its enforcement procedures. Nevertheless, the case of the WTO was different because it had the Hamiltonians and Wilsonians unanimity as a backbone. This harmony paved the way for the US backing of the dispute settlement mechanism which was grounded on this idea that free trade and open market would not only stimulate the economic prosperity but also it will endorse democracy and moderate hostile clashes with the trading allies. According to this idea, opening of the markets would lead to the opening of the societies. Two opposition groups were Jeffersonians and Jacksonians which considered the WTO as interference on US sovereignty. However, they did not have enough power in congress or in executive to challenge the WTO project.

Another reason of the effectiveness of the WTO program was the ability of US in setting the norms. It successfully developed the milieu goal of creating the WTO and

its dispute settlement mechanism. It enhanced this milieu goal by expanding the view that in the absence of an international enforcement procedure, the congress would carry on the unilateral remedy which is considered as imbalanced trade practices by other countries.

**4.5.2 The US Policy Towards Iraq During the Iran-Iraq War**

At the beginning of the Iran-Iraq war, the US was playing an impartial role. However, after one year, Reagan administration concluded that the victory of Iran would not serve the US interests and subsequently decided to support Iraq against Iran. The state department crossed out the name of the Iraq from the terroristic states and the white house obliged the export-import bank to provide financial aid for Iraq and increased its credit to enable it for getting loans from other financial institutions. The US assisted Iraq militarily and intelligently and prepared loans to ease the obtaining of the US supplies for it.

Through this war, because of the Iran's diplomatic isolation which was climaxed by the US embassy hostage crisis conducted by Iranians in Tehran, the use of the chemical weapons by Iraq was neglected not only by US but also by the international community. The US was more worried about its own interests which were the oil facilities and the enhancement of the US military capabilities within the Persian Gulf. Even in the meeting held between Donald Rumsfeld and Saddam Hussein, the use of the chemical weapons and human rights issues were not expressed. They just affirmed and emphasized the mutual interest between US and Iraq as issue areas.

In 1984, the US officially condemned the use of the chemical weapons by Iraq only to show her superficial care about the human rights issue but the core of the discussions went around the banning of the military equipment export to Iran. In

spite of the non-normative situation of the war, the US was willing to expand diplomatic and commercial relations with Iraq.

Iran proposed a draft resolution to UN to judge the Iraq's chemical weapons use and as a response the Security Council convicted the use of chemical weapons in general without identifying Iraq as the criminal party.

As the main goal, the policies of the US towards Iraq can be justified as an obstacle for the victory of Iran within this war. Alleviating the crisis, controlling the balance of the power in the Middle East and keeping the Middle East oil flowing are the main subsidiary reasons for isolating Iran and consequently banning its victory.

In spite of the superficial concerns of the US about the use of chemical weapons, the domestic environment and accordingly the Reagan administration did not show any serious objection towards the policies of Iraq and the US embassy hostage crisis was stimulation for the reinforcement of Iraq's policies by US. The US used all the tools at its disposal to prepare the loans, agricultural supplies and military and intelligence information capabilities for Saddam. Not only the US internal environment but also the external environment including the prominent UN members cared more about the stability of oil flows rather than the human rights issue and as a result they all agreed to provide assistance for Iraq during the war.

The policies of US towards Iraq were a good example of the realpolitik form of foreign policy. Since the power struggle and the energy interests were core concentrations of the US, she tried to fulfill her interests in expense of behaving in a

non-normative framework and spreading a non-normative reputation of herself through the world.

### 4.5.3 The US Invasion of Iraq

The US foreign policy strategies towards Iraq in the four years' war were an imperial form of foreign policy which failed to fulfill the intended objectives. The strategies were designed and conducted outside the context of the international law principles and the boundaries of international institutions. Disarming of Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and setting the Iraqi people free of the aggressive internal policies of Saddam were claimed as the reasons of this invasion. Nevertheless, when it became clear in 2005 that Iraq had terminated its WMD manufacture in 1991 and actually had no WMD at the time of the invasion, the imperialistic form of the US foreign policy revealed for the world.

After the Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1991, the containment policy including 'the economic sanctions and the US and UK patrols of Iraqi no fly zones in order to protect the Kurds and Shiites' was chosen and maintained by both US and international community towards Iraq. (Hamilton, 2008)

In 1998, the foreign policy towards Iraq changed from containment policy to regime change. After the September 11, President Bush announced a new 'war on terrorism' complemented by a policy of pre-emptive military action. The targets were suspicious terroristic groups and individuals such as Al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. Bush administration planned for the elimination of the Saddam Hussein's regime, verbally in order to reestablish the international peace and security but in reality to gain the power control of the Middle East. Pivotal US allies such as Germany and

France were critical of this plan and tried to encourage US to follow diplomatic ways such as weapons inspections and deploying severe penalties for disobedience.

US secretary of state, Collin Powell tried to convince the international community by giving proof at UN declaring that Iraq was dynamically fabricating chemical and biological weapons and had ties with Al-Qaida. Following this proclaim, US, UK and Spain suggested a UN resolution permitting the use of force in Iraq. Contrary, US NATO allies including Canada, France and Germany in parallel with Russia announced their objection for using military intervention to Iraq.

Confronting with these objections and rejections, US and UK did not respect the UN Security Council endorsement and decided to continue their policy without waiting for UN permission. As a result the invasion occurred on 20 March of 2003 without UN consent. The US used the notion of existing a link between Saddam Hussein's regime and Al-Qaeda as a devise to impress the public opinion and consequently to justify the invasion. Nevertheless, shortly afterward this assertion was questioned by the intellect community and also denied by the secretary Powell himself. As a result, this revelation ruined the US reputation in the world.

Although some justifications such as disarming of Iraq of WMD, removing Saddams's regime in order to set the people free of the suppressive regime and creating a more democratic and steady Iraq were claimed as the reasons of invasion, lack of efforts to distribute the security after the invasion showed the uselessness of the fake normative measures took by US. As a matter of fact, US did nothing to prepare the efficient environment for reestablishing of Iraq's politics and economy.

The whole process was a devastating failure for US in terms of acting normatively since it lost its legitimacy due to the unilateral exercise of military power. It was no more considered as a multilateral actor by the international community.

The US used all tools at its disposal including deceiving the public opinion to neglect and ignore the principles of international law and the authorization of international institutions such as UN to serve its own energy and security interests. This war was unintended because it failed to reconstruct the political and economic structure of Iraq in contrast with promises made before starting of the war.

# Chapter 5

# NORMS AND TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP

## 5.1 Introduction

During the first half of the twentieth century, most of the European states could not come up with an alliance and agreement to increase the unity among them and maybe some were more eager to remain as colonial powers and preserve their colonies. Because of some reasons such as legacy of the Second World War which was influenced by Russian threat, they failed in providing a coherent foreign policy mechanism and foreign policy instruments for confronting the real pressures and dangers they faced. Therefore its number one political partner, the US tried to solve the European's security problems by offering an umbrella under which they could merge and come to an agreement according to norms and rules and therefore they could better work with each other and also with other states. Under this umbrella, Europe could solve its security problem when European states considered it as an integrated requirement. This umbrella which guaranteed the security for the European states was nothing but the NATO. As a matter of fact, the American federal system was an inspiration to European leaders such as Jean Monnet and to Americans who saw the European project as a means of creating a united states of Europe (Hill and Smith, 2005, p.344).

## 5.2 History

The creation of the EU was for two main reasons. First it was for preventing the European states from dragging the world in to chaos and great depression for another

time and for decreasing the influence of the Soviet Union in Europe. This US support was everlasting for the EU and enabled the member states to construct and improve their union. The main logic behind the suggestion of NATO was to motivate the European states to join not only EU but also NATO. Hamilton is of the opinion that the membership of these two organizations was the target for the US. (Hamilton, 2008)

Christopher Hill and Michael Smith believe that the economic interdependence of the EU and the US has always been the core of their relations which has been sparked through the European economic reconstruction by the Marshal plan and has been climaxed during the cold war and Globalization process in 21th century. Hill and Smith accept this truth that this historical economic integration continuously has got deepen and widen and consequently has led to a number of important trends in mutual relations of these two entity. They have explained these trends in this way:

> "The first of these trends concerns the consistent growth of the economic links between the EC/EU and the US: in other words there has been a continuous deepening of economic links over a more than 50-year period, and these links have notably continued to deepen and widen even when transatlantic political or security relations have been troubled (for example during the later years of the cold war, or during the period leading up to the war in Iraq during 2002/2003). A second trend concerns the way in which the EC/EU, through processes of economic growth and enlargement, has increasingly come to be seen as an economic superpower. Both the EU and the US are of continental size, are advanced industrial and service-based economies, and both are deeply entangled with each other and with the development of the global economy" (Hill & Smith, 2005, p. 345).[32]

Economic integration was not the only reason behind the transatlantic relations of the two sides. There were some political forces such as "the defeat of almost all of the European states during the world war two, the de-legitimization governments and

---

[32] Christopher Hill and Michael Smith,.International Relations and The European Union(NewYork: Oxford University Press,2005) 344-46.

underlying regimes in all parts of Europe and the looming threat of Soviet political domination in Eastern Europe" were the political key causes which played a fundamental role in initiation of the new Europe after the 1945. (Hill & Smith, 2005, p. 346)

In contrast with all those mutual economic realms and political convergences, there was an important point of divergence between EU and US. The EU wanted to remain a 'civilian power' and tried to stay far from the realm of hard security and high politics. After the end of the Cold war when the integration process caused the foreign policy cooperation and therefore inspired some new capabilities and expectations within the structure of the EU which contrasted with the security agenda of US, the EU preserved its civilian nature.

The appearance of the EU as a power became a point of tension with the US. The end of the cold war provided a new power situation in which two qualitatively different types of power existed; American and European. The European power was constructed around the notion of the soft power while the American power was rooted in the hard power.

## 5.3 Different Nature, Different Forms of Foreign Policies

The European Union is a kind of supranational organization with a different nature from a state. "The EU's foreign policy is distinct since it does not have sovereignty (one similar to that of the state) in the traditional sense and a government – a centralized hierarchical structure of authoritative decision-making and specially a foreign ministry. Nevertheless, once the characteristics of this *Sui generis* foreign

policy are established, it can actually be compared and contrasted with the foreign policy of states, in particular with US foreign policy"( Cebeci,2011,p.2).

The EU has become known as a *Sui Generis* actor which means to be a unique form of actor. It is something between a state and an international actor. It can act like a state in limited ways or it can act like an international organization with even broader range of competences and responsibilities. Like the US as a state, the EU does not have a government but with its system of governance it can be compared with a state. Although the difference between the system of governance and the government has made difference in the decision-making structures of these two actors, some similarities in outcomes of their foreign policies can be found.

## 5.4 Similarities and Dissimilarities of the EU and US Mechanisms

It has become obvious for most of the observers of the transatlantic relationship that internationally, these two actors are on the opposite side. EU has become known as Venus while US is well-known as Mars .EU is a multilateral, trading actor with civilian power in contrast with US which is a unilateral, warrior state with martial power. (Smith, 2004)

However, some similarities exist between these two actors which stemmed from the American influence and its security dominance over its European allies:

Both actors indicate a sense of 'Exceptionalism'. Although this term has become specified for US foreign policy, the normative power of the Europe is also a kind of exceptionalism which is trying to impose the uniqueness of its normative model on different countries. This is a mutual self-image by which these two actors can reinforce their mutual relations towards the rest of the world.

The notion of normative power is a reflection of hegemonic practices similar to the hegemonic practices applied by the US. The EU's power is used as a strategy for the enlargement of norms in different countries and this is a systematic application of the concept of Hegemony or dominance which would make the subordinated countries have the same experience as the countries under the US Hegemony. The hegemony is not just an adjective of US, though it is an adjective of the EU as well.

Another point of similarity is the 'hard edges' of the EU power which is intensifying by the EU politicians who are attempting for 'hardening' the European foreign policy. When the EU is managing to use hard power as a consequence of enlargement strategy, it would present a new form of real foreign policy which contradicts with the normative principles. [33]

In spite of these similarities, there are some dissimilarities of mechanisms used by these two actors:

The EU focuses more on soft power, and ways to achieve both economic gains and key welfare objectives. The Europeans are more likely to compromise with bad regimes and bad leaders than those who saw the real nature of the international power game (Hill and Smith, 2005, p.358). On the opposite side, the US focuses on hard power. It can address the problems in a way that the Europeans cannot simply envisage. The US capacity to intervene on the global scale is the exact point of deficiency in the EU's structure.

---

[33]Michael Smith, The european union,the united states and the global public good:competing models ortwo sides of the same coin? In R. whitman, *Normative power EUrope: Empirical and theoritical perspectives* (London: pilgrave macmillan) 127-139.

Second dissimilarity is that the EU is a process-oriented actor while the US is an action- oriented and result-oriented actor. This difference caused so much condemnation of the EU of being talkative and shooting cheap talks.

The US is more religious and absolutist in relation with other states while the EU is flexible and relativist. This made the EU a negotiable actor with so much enthusiasm for diplomatic methods.

Functioning as a member of the Quartet group on the Middle East consist of US,UN and Russia shows the ability of the EU in providing peace settlement for the Israeli-Palestine conflict.

## 5.5 The US role in EU's Foreign Policy

Many believe that the EU is an alternative player of the US for implementing the diplomatic purposes in regional conflicts. Others believe that it is a balancing force for hard policies of the US. Its policy towards Iran's nuclear program shows the overlapping objectives (defusing the Iran's nuclear capacity) with US. The tensions between different member states toward the Iraq war is another evidence of the US power and its influence on the EU's foreign policy. The US power is something which is always with the EU and is an everlasting issue with which the European political leaders always deal.

The EU and US relationship is the most strategically important relationship in the world. Both together, combine 60 percent of the world's GDP, 40 percent of the world trade in goods and services. They are each other's chief transaction partner and receiver of foreign direct investment. They have overlapping values and interests and

common objectives for the promotion of the peace stability and economic development. [34]

The US needs a more powerful and unified form of the Europe in order to reach out for its objectives. Therefore the EU has to strength its institutional and operational capacities to become more effective in the international arena.

## 5.6 Conclusion

The creation of the EU was sparked by the US tendency for promoting liberal democracies. The US is present in the EU's system and is influencing many parts of this system especially the security aspects.  This influence is obvious not only in theory but also in performing the real policies. Actually, whenever is needed, the policies of the EU is changing in favor of the US interests. The EU is using the soft form of the US hard policies.

---

[34] Dashwood and Maresceau, Law and Practice of EU external Relations (New York: Cambridge University Press,2008).

# Chapter 6

# CONCLUSION

The research on the role of the normative power in the foreign policy of both US and EU and their interrelated relations revealed so many realities about the real position of principles in the foreign policy of these two actors. The main argument of this thesis is about the influence of the adoption of normative foreign policy by the EU and US on their transatlantic relations. The EU and the US have so many strategies and policies in common. These common strategies and foreign policies towards other states have made these two actors supportive of each other in every sense. Their different nature (state versus international organization) made them divergent in terms of sovereignty, the structure of foreign policy making and their governing system. Nevertheless, in reality their external policies are similar to each other. In both cases, the norms are at the center of their foreign policy but are less important than other national interests such as security or energy advancement. The NATO is protecting the EU militarily while the EU is concentrating on the expansion of the shared values beneficial for both EU and US. The normative power helped the EU to construct a unified identity and become a distinctive form of actor form the rest of the world.

Despite some differences between the mechanisms of applying the norms such as using force or using conditioning policy, these two actors have remained number one ally for each other and adopting norms and normative policy would not and won't

make a rift in transatlantic relations. Most of the European states simultaneously had to join NATO in addition to EU and this is a good evidence to show the high level of interdependence between these two actors. Preserving the relations with US has been always the first priority for most of the EU's members because this will preserve their power position. Like policies deployed by EU towards Israel-Palestine conflict, most of the policies applied by EU have to be approved by US in order to be safer and more secure.

According to this research, a normative foreign policy is the one which contains three components of normative goal, normative means and normative impact and can serve all of these components as best. It tries to follow a norm through normative means and at last makes sure that the norm has been conducted in the real situation. According to this definition, the EU wants to be a normative actor and to some extent it has been successful but its military dependency to the US refrains it from being a fully normative actor in the international arena. The US is a normative actor in verbal sense. In reality it is a status quo actor which tries to externalize the norms for the other states. Whenever is needed, it acts according to the international norms and tries to bold their importance and whenever is needed to belittle their importance, she fades their importance in the eyes of the international community.

Lack of institutional framework, military power and the security support provided by the NATO made the EU more reliant to the US. The EU is a power in the international arena but its relations with the US is so determining in the development of its power position. The norms are important and applied by the EU in different countries but whenever these norms contrasted with the interests of the US, they have to be ignored and belittled.

The US is more eager to be a hard power while the EU is trying to solve the problems through negotiation and compromise. One is known as Mars while the other is known and Venus. The US is more result oriented and more focuses to extract real outcomes out of a situation while the EU is more focusing on the process of a situation. Nevertheless, both are playing the role of hegemony with different mechanism. One is hegemony through conducting hard policies and another is a hegemony through expanding the soft policies such as norms.

The EU and the US prefer to preserve their own security and energy requirements. Whenever is needed, they designed secret policies in order to fulfil their own energy necessities and security prerequisite and the normative identity is a deceiving character in the international scene. The EU is the number one ally of the US which is helping the US in expanding the US's favorite principles by playing the role of the last resort for those states who are against the policies of the US.

Therefore this study revealed the strong transatlantic relations between these two political friends and showed weak influence of the norms for restricting the common goals in their foreign policies. What the research has not made clear are different ways of turning the EU to a more independent and impartial form of organization with a stronger decision making structure. What other elements rather than military power are needed for EU to claim its cohesive rejection against some of the US foreign policies towards the rest of the world.

# REFERENCES

Allen, D. Smith, M. (1990). *Western Europe's Presence In The Contemporary International Arena*. (P.21).UK: Review Of International Studies.

Balfour, R. (2012). *Human Rights And Democracy In EU Foreign Policy: The Cases Of Ukraine And Egypt*. (Pp.55-58)New York: Routledge.

Burghardt, G. (2008). *The EU's Transatlantic Relationship*. In A. D. Maresceau, Law And Practice Of EU External Relations (Pp. 376-378). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cebeci, M. (2011). *Issues In EU And US Foreign Policy* (Pp.2-5). UK: Lexington Books.

Dashwood, A. Maresceau, M. (2008). *Law And Practice Of EU External Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

David, M. And Gower, J. And Haukkala, H. (2013). *National Perspectives On Russia: European Foreign Policy In The Making*? (Pp.65-68)New York: Routledge.

Diez, T. Manners, I. (2007). *Reflecting On Normative Power Europe* (P.175). New York: Routledge, Center For International Studies And Research.

Finnemore, M. Sikkink, K. (1998).*International Norm Dynamics And Political Change* (P.887-917). IO Foundation And The Massachusetts Institute Of Technology.

Galtung, J. (1973). *The European Community:A Superpower In The Making Oslo*. Universitetsforlaget.

Hamilton, D. S. (2008). *The United States: A Normative Power*? In N. Tocci, *Who Is A Normative Foreign Policy Actor?* (P. 78). Brussels: Centre For Europan Policy Studies.

Haukkala. H, (2007), *The European Union As A Regional Normative Hegemon: The Case Of European Neighborhood Policy* (PP.46-55) Montreal: European Union Studies Associations.

Hill, C. (2002). *The Actors Is Europe Foregn Policy*(P.322-3), Routledge, Center For International Studies And Research.

Hill, C. Smith, M. (2005). *International Relations And The European Union* (Pp.344-46). Newyork: Oxford University Press.

Holsti, O. (2009). *Public Opinion And American Foreign Policy* (Pp.54-56) University Of Michigan Press.

Jensen, K. Faulkner, E. (1991). *Morality And Foreign Policy:Realpolitik Revisited* (Pp.2-15). Washington DC:United States Institute Of Peace.

Jensen, M. , E. P. (1991). Morality And Foreign Policy:Realpolitik Revisited. United
   States Institue Of Peace, 3-5.

Koutrakos, P. (2011). *European Foreign Policy: Legal And Political Perspectives*
   (P.15) UK:Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Laïdi, Z. (2008). *EU Foreign Policy In A Globalized World: Normative Power And
   Socil Prefernces* (Pp.4-5) France: Routledge,Center For International Studies
   And Research.

Mandelbaum, M. (2005). *The Case For Goliath: How America Acts As A World
   Government In The 21 St Century*. New York: Public Affaires.

Manners, I. (2002). *Normatiev Power: A Contradiction In Terms*. University Of Kent
   At Canterbury, 235-258.

Manners, I. (2010). *Global Europa: Methodology Of The European Union In World
   Politics*. Juornal Of Common Market Studies, 72-77.

Manners, I. (2008). *The Normative Power Of European Union In A Globalized
   World*. In Z. Laidi, *Eu Foreign Policy In A Globalized World:Normative
   Power And Socil Prefernces* (Pp. 24-33). France: Routledge,Center For
   International Studies And Research.

Manners, I. And Withman, R. (1998). *Towards Identifying The International Identity
   Of The European Union: A Framework For The Analysis Of The EU's*

*Network Of Relations* (Pp.231-49). Journal Of European Integration, Vol. 21, No. 2.

Moss, F. (1919). *America's Mission To Serve Humanity*: (Wilson, A Proghet In Lines Of Proghets. Electronic Texts In American Studies, 8.

Pardo, S. And Peters, J. (2010). *Uneasy Neighbors: Israel And The European Union* (Pp.120-123). UK: Lexington Books.

Ruggie, J. (1992). *Multilateralism: The Anatomy Of An Institution*, MIT Press, Vol. 46, No. 3, (P.567).

Sjursen, H. (March 2006). *The Eu As A Normative Power:How Can This Be?* Journal Of European Public Policcy, 240_246.

Smith, C. H. (2005*). International Relations And The European Union*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, M. (2006). *The European Union, The United States And The Global Public Good:Competing Models Ortwo Sides Of The Same Coin?* In R. Whitman, *Normative Power Europe: Empirical And Theoritical Perspectives* (Pp. 127-139). London: Pilgrave Macmillan.

Stewart, S. (2013). *Democracy Promotion And The 'Color Revolutions'*(Pp.70-74).Routledge.

Stivachtis. Y. (2013) *International Order In A Globalizing World* (45-51). USA: Ash
    Gate Publishing.

Suchman, M.C. (1996). *Managing Legitimacy: Strategic And Institutional
    Approaches*. Academy Of Management Journal, Vol 20, No3, (P574).

Tocci, N. (2008). *Profiling Normative Foreign Policy:The European Union And Its
    Global Partners*. In Who Is A Normative Foreign Policy Actor? (P. 3).
    Brussels: Centre For European Policy Studies.

Tulmets, E. (2014).*Foreign Policy Identity In Perspective: Back To Europe And The
    EU's Neighborhood* (P.191-194) London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whitman, R. (2011). *Norms,Power And Europe: A New Agenda For Study Of The
    EU And International Relations*. In R. G. Whitman, *Normative Power
    Europe:Empirical And Theoritical Perspectives* (Pp. 1-13). London: Palgrave
    Macmillan.

Withman, I. M. (1998). *Toward Identifying The International Identity Of The
    Uropean Union: Aframework For Analysis Of The EU's Network Of
    Relations*. Journal Of European Integration, 240-245.

Wittkopf, E. , C. J. (2007). *American Foreign Policy: Pattern And Process*. USA:
    Thomason Higher Education.

Wolfers, A. (1962) *Discord And Collaboration: Essays On International Politics* .Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, Pp. 67-80.